DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION AND EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
BY-LAWS

I. MISSION AND VISION

The mission of the Department of Teacher Education and Educational Leadership (TEEL) is to prepare students to become **Empowered Professionals Making a Difference**. Programs are designed *to provide students with knowledge, opportunities to take action, and leadership skills in order to produce graduates who are decision makers, problem solvers, critical thinkers, lifelong learners, counselor/mentors, and ethical moral professionals.*

TEEL's vision is *to educate and prepare 21st Century educators who solve educational problems using advanced knowledge and skills to become educational leaders who make a difference.*

II. DEPARTMENT MEMBERSHIP

1. All full time faculty members in TEEL are eligible to participate in Department discussions and vote on non-personnel matters.

2. Voting procedures related to personnel matters will be governed by TEEL Tenure and Promotion Criteria.

III. OFFICERS

The TEEL Chair will be appointed by the Dean with consultation from full-time TEEL faculty. The Associate Chair and additional TEEL officers will be appointed by the Chair as needed.

IV. TEEL MEETINGS

1. TEEL meetings will be held as needed and will be scheduled by the Chair.

2. A preliminary agenda for each meeting will be made available to each faculty member at least one day in advance of the meeting.

3. A final agenda of items for consideration will be distributed at the meeting and any TEEL faculty member may add to this agenda and bring forward an issue for consideration.

4. TEEL meetings follow an open forum discussion format.

5. There will always be an attempt to reach consensus, but when a consensus cannot be reached on a given topic or when a vote is required, a formal vote will be taken from all full-time TEEL faculty with a simple majority ruling.

6. Minutes will be kept by a TEEL Office Manager.

V. COMMITTEES

1. The Chair will appoint Program Administrators and TEEL committee members.

2. TEEL has the following standing committees that are governed by their respective charters:
   a. Assessment & Accreditation Committee
   b. Advisory Review Team
   c. Program Review Committee

3. Ad hoc committees will be formed by the TEEL Chair in consultation with the faculty.

4. A TEEL Advisory Committee of external stakeholders will be formed by the Chair in consultation with the faculty.

VI. TEEL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The TEEL organizational structure is intended to promote and support communication and shared decision-making, and was developed with three specific foci in mind:

1. To create a structure that is inclusive of all courses and programs;

2. To create areas of responsibility that are manageable in size—allowing individuals to "see and hear" their area as a whole and to understand how it fits into the larger picture of the department;

3. To expand opportunities for individuals to participate in leadership and governance.

The structure is expected to evolve over time in response to enhanced understandings of assets and needs; substantive changes resulting from that process will be made in consultation with faculty.

See appendix A for detailed information about the current structure, including roles and responsibilities.

VII. **PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE**

The purpose of the Program Review Committee (PRC) will be to review pertinent candidate and program level data and issues related to undergraduate and graduate programs in TEEL. The PRC will meet at least once per semester, with additional meetings as needed. Following a continuous improvement model, aggregated candidate and program level data will be used to evaluate programs, procedures, and the assessment system. Candidate and program level data and reports will be provided to the TEEL Chair who will present these to program administrators for review and consideration within their respective programs. Program administrators will then participate as PRC members to share and discuss results from program level work and make recommendations to the Chair concerning the assessment system, policies and procedures, program development and implementation, and staffing issues related to programs in TEEL. The TEEL Chair will consider PRC recommendations and may take recommendations to the faculty as a whole for discussion, vote and final disposition.

Specifically, and building on the results of program-level work, the PRC may:

• Evaluate data for program improvement
• Evaluate the assessment system
• Review and maintain programs within the guidelines and standards established by CAEP, the Florida Department of Education, and other appropriate professional and learned societies
• Review curriculum organization
• Review curriculum change requests (CCRs)
• Review faculty concerns relative to programs, degree plans, requests for new programs and other curriculum related issues
• Review and make recommendations related to staffing issues.

The PRC will be composed of the following voting and non-voting members:

• Program Administrators
• Coordinator of Student Teaching
• • TEEL Chair (ex-officio, non-voting)
• TEEL Associate Chair (ex-officio, non-voting)
• DOE/CAEP Coordinator (ex-officio, non-voting)

VIII. **ADVISORY REVIEW TEAM**

TEEL will have an Advisory Review Team comprising all tenured faculty members in the department. This committee will meet at least one time a year, will seek input from the faculty as a whole as part of its

deliberations, and will provide feedback and make recommendations to the TEEL Chair related to the Bylaws, general concerns, program growth and development, and other issues pertinent to the life of TEEL.

IX. **CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR MERIT, PROMOTION AND TENURE**

1. Allocation of merit will be made by the Dean following consultation with the TEEL Chair.

2. Annual evaluation procedures are detailed in the **Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Annual Evaluation Procedures** (see Appendix B) section entitled Annual (and Merit) Evaluation Procedures for TEEL Faculty, following University guidelines.

3. Tenure and promotion criteria follow all university guidelines and are provided in TEEL's **Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Evaluation Procedures** (see Appendix B).

VIII. **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

1. Annual work assignments will be made by the TEEL Chair in consultation with the individual faculty member.

2. Extra state compensation will be requested by the chair according to department needs, following college and university guidelines, and in consultation with individual faculty members.

3. Summer appointments will be made by the TEEL Chair according to department needs and in consultation with individual faculty members.

4. Requests for TEEL resources should be submitted following established protocols, and will be supported when possible. The department recognizes that activities related to teaching, service and research are necessary for professional growth and program vitality.

5. Each faculty will post a schedule each semester in which he or she shall observe a minimum of ten office hours weekly (face-to-face and/or online). Faculty members are expected to make themselves available to students at additional mutually agreed upon times.

6. TEEL assignments, responsibilities, and conflicts will be discussed between the TEEL Chair and the individual faculty member. If a resolution to a conflict is not reached, procedures from the established Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) shall be utilized.

7. Adjunct Instructors and Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) will be appointed by the TEEL Chair. The TEEL Chair will review and submit the credentials of the potential adjuncts and GTAs for approval by the Dean's office. The lead instructor will assist the adjunct instructor or graduate teaching assistant in preparing and delivering the course to ensure continuity of content, delivery and grading. Performance evaluation for continued employment of adjunct faculty and GTAs through review of student assessment of instruction and/or other materials will be conducted by the TEEL Chair and/or Associate Chair.

IX. **ADOPTION / REVISION**

1. These By-laws have been accepted on the following date: [TBD]

2. These By-laws will be reviewed annually and can be revised by a majority vote of the Department of Teacher Education and Educational Leadership.

Appendix A: TEEL Organizational Structure

The current TEEL organizational structure was developed utilizing the following *achieve/avoid matrix* to articulate (1) what we hope to achieve with the structure and (2) what we are committed to avoiding:

Achieve	Avoid
Meaningful clusters or chunks that facilitate continuous improvement work (curriculum, assessment, action planning, monitoring, etc.) **Coherent areas of responsibility and accompanying roles that facilitate shared decision-making processes and ensure that every element of the department is "seen and heard" by someone closer to it (in terms of both expertise and attention) than the chair or associate chair** **Rational organizational lines that facilitate efficient communication and completion of operational tasks (like scheduling)**	**Creation of silos that work against the integration that is a major asset of TEEL** **Dismantling of existing structures that make sense and support efforts**

The resulting system and structure includes 14 *programs* grouped into 4 *program areas*. A *program administrator* is assigned to each program, and a program area coordinator is assigned to each program area.

The following roles and responsibilities are assigned to lead instructors, program administrators, and program area coordinators within this system/structure:

Lead Instructors

- Maintain and revise/update (as needed, in collaboration with program colleagues, and vetted by the chair/associate chair) current "standard syllabi" (i.e., including all common elements—e.g., standards addressed, common assessments).
- Facilitate use by other instructors/adjuncts of the standard syllabi as the template for their section-specific syllabi.
- Share instructional materials with other instructors/adjuncts as needed/requested.
- Recruit and/or recommend potential adjunct instructors to the program administrator.

note: lead instructors utilizing coaches in the AP delivery model will have additional responsibilities.

Program Administrators

- Work with TEEL office to maintain and update roster of lead instructors for designated courses.
- Work with lead instructors to maintain current "standard syllabi" (i.e., including all common elements—e.g., standards addressed, common assessments) and facilitate use of the standard syllabi as the template for section-specific syllabi.
- Work with lead instructors and TEEL office to identify adjunct instructors and get them processed/cleared for assignment (goal is a "bullpen" that exceeds demand).
- Work with chair/associate chair to lead continuous improvement efforts at the program level (analyzing data, reviewing analysis results, action planning for improvement, implementing and monitoring action plans—including, but not limited to, leading one data review session per semester).
- Work with faculty to prepare draft schedule for designated courses.
- Work with faculty and TEEL office to prepare CCRs for course and program changes as needed.
- Plan and facilitate monthly (and as needed) program meetings (to include faculty working within the program).
- Participate in bi-monthly (and as needed) meetings with other program leaders within the designated program area.

Program Area Coordinators

- One of the program administrators will serve in this role (serving on a one-year rotating basis)
- Organize/lead bi-monthly meetings with all program leaders within the program area.
- Participate in bi-monthly meetings with the chair and associate chair.

Appendix B: Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Annual Evaluation Procedures

Faculty in the Department of Teacher Education and Educational Leadership (TEEL) must be responsive to multiple constituencies, diverse student audiences, and a demand for scholarship. To satisfy the demands and expectations of each, a faculty member is expected to fulfill various responsibilities in the areas of (a) teaching, (b) scholarship and creative projects, and (c) professional, community-at-large, and university service.

While adhering to these stated demands, faculty are expected to demonstrate professional growth over a period of time that will culminate in the achievement of excellence in all three areas of professional contribution consistent with the guidelines approved by the UWF Faculty Senate and the Division of Academic Affairs. It is the aspirational goal of the department that TEEL faculty will demonstrate growth over time that will enable each to meet the standards for promotion to Associate Professor and culminate in attainment of the rank of Full Professor.

ANNUAL EVALUATION

The annual evaluation process for TEEL faculty will adhere to approved CBA and the current year of the *UWF Policies and Procedures for Promotion, Tenure, Annual Evaluation, and Sustained Performance Evaluation* document.

Annual Goals. TEEL faculty members will include within their written statement of contributions both (1) reflection on goals from the previous year's annual goals, and (2) annual goals for the next academic year. The TEEL Chair will review the goals and offer feedback on their appropriateness, with specific attention to how such goals support progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

Annual Evaluation Process. Following the schedule adopted by the college, TEEL faculty will submit evaluation materials to the TEEL Chair following established protocols. These materials will detail the faculty member's performance over the Annual Evaluation period in relation to teaching, service, and scholarship and should provide compelling evidence of the quantity, quality and impact of the faculty member's performance. Materials to be submitted include (1) a statement of contributions (using a provided template) with appendices detailing productivity in designated areas, (2) a current vita with those items added since the last evaluation highlighted, and (3) accompanying materials supporting claims made in the statement of contributions (e.g., student evaluation ratings).

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to present supporting materials that provide compelling and convincing evidence of having met the specified criteria for the self-rating in each of the designated areas of responsibility for the respective faculty member (i.e., teaching, service, and scholarship). Please note that the performance indicators listed below are intended to be illustrative not exhaustive, and the process of assessing productivity and the relative value of individual products should be attentive to discipline specifics, emerging trends, and new technologies. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide

sufficient context and/or explanation to clarify and justify the qualitative weight that should be afforded to a particular piece of evidence. Examples of information that may be used to demonstrate competence in teaching, service, and scholarship include:

Teaching:

- student evaluations,
- evidence from students, commentary from professional peers related to excellence in teaching
- course materials and products that demonstrate innovation and academic rigor
- course materials that demonstrate innovation/organization and are reflective of current scholarly knowledge
- self-solicited professional peer reviews of the quality of the instructor's courses
- information related to a unique aspect of a course
- teaching awards
- statements from former students concerning the value of the instructor's courses

Scholarship
- copies of publications or products with accompanying information illustrating the professional integrity of the journal or the publication process
- synopses of grants and outcome of applications (funded and non-funded)
- documentation of conference paper presentations with accompanying information noting the selection process (peer-reviewed or not) and professional integrity of the conference and/or sponsoring organization
- statements from peers related to research skills or products

Service

- statement of service activities, hours involved and the relationship to the community, department, college, university, governmental agency or the professional community

While evidence is a required element of the evaluation materials, it is not sufficient in and of itself. It is imperative that the faculty member demonstrate the <u>impact</u> of professional activities and products by elaborating on and contextualizing activities and productivities within the narrative statement of contributions. The evaluation materials will be examined by the Chair and used to develop an annual evaluation and assess progress toward tenure and for promotion.

TENURE AND PROMOTION

<u>Annual Evaluations and Mid-point Review</u>. Annual evaluations should provide evidence of progress towards tenure and promotion, identifying successes and critical areas of concern. As part of the mid-point review

process, each candidate for tenure/promotion must prepare a complete promotion and tenure binder (minus letters of support) two years in advance of going up (to be adjusted accordingly for individuals who bring in years of service from another institution as part of his/her appointment). This file will be evaluated by the Chair, an Ad Hoc committee of tenured faculty from the Department of Teacher Education and Educational Leadership, and *at least two independent evaluators selected by the Chair*. Candidate strengths and weaknesses should be identified in this process, and after conferencing with the Chair, the candidate should develop a plan to address any deficiencies. This binder can then be used to develop the final binder to be submitted for tenure/promotion. Candidates should carefully address the products, activities, and evaluation criteria associated with tenure and promotion that are presented in this document. The Ad Hoc faculty committee will make written recommendations to the Chair and candidate about the quantity and quality and form of the candidate's credentials. The Chair will submit a written recommendation to the Dean based on all available documentation.

Tenure and Promotion Process. The tenure and promotion process for TEEL faculty will adhere to the approved CBA and the current year of the *UWF Policies and Procedures for Promotion, Tenure, Annual Evaluation, and Sustained Performance Evaluation* document.

As stated in the TEEL by-laws, teaching effectiveness, service efforts and scholarly activities are evaluated in terms of both quantity and quality. This approach necessitates that applicants for tenure and promotion develop a well-crafted narrative statement with accompanying evidence (included in the binder) to effectively make the case for the substantive effect of his or her efforts in teaching, scholarship and creative projects, and service. This binder, taken as a whole, should provide a compelling case that would be judged by reasonable professionals from a variety of academic institutions as indicative of the candidate's competence.

While candidates are expected to use data and evaluative criteria identified in the UWF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (included here in the TEEL by-laws) to support the case for tenure and promotion, they also must have a complete understanding of university criteria and process associated with tenure and promotion. *It is the candidate's responsibility to prepare a credential file that provides compelling and convincing evidence to internal and external reviewers of professional competence*. This process recognizes that professional activities such as journal articles, conference presentations, and grants may differ significantly in elements such as scholarly content, length, and research effort. It is the applicant's responsibility to review UWF tenure and promotion guidelines and policies and to build a credential file that meets or exceeds those criteria.

TEEL Statement on Teaching

Teaching is both a science and an art. A TEEL faculty member is expected to have knowledge of his or her content area and an understanding of how best to share this information. Thorough preparation for each course is expected as well as the incorporation of the latest information on the subject matter. A demand for *near-perfect* mastery of the material by students should be tempered by a willingness to reinforce *successive*

approximations so that every capable and dedicated student can achieve the desired objectives. Faculty should rekindle a student's interest in re-examining old ideas and spark critical thinking about new ideas. To do so, a range of innovative teaching strategies should be employed in the learning process. Additionally, faculty should be readily available to provide feedback and guidance to students related to their courses or program of study. A skilled faculty member should seek to share a vision of and guide students' inquiry about the past, present, and future of their disciplines.

<u>Specific Criteria in Teaching</u>

1. Demonstrates teaching competence in a chosen content area and guides and inspires students.
2. Integrates current scholarly activities within a given discipline into instruction.
3. Experiments responsibly with instructional methods and techniques.
4. Periodically reviews and revises course materials, including textbooks, syllabi, evaluation instruments, and instructional media.
5. Provides students with objectives relevant to the course taught, appropriate references, information about the topics to be covered, and criteria for performance.
6. Makes opportunities available for students to learn of the primary sources of information associated with a particular discipline or area of study.
7. Provides for student evaluation of the course and instructor and uses the results of such evaluation to revise course and methods of instruction.
8. Attends conferences, conventions, and meetings, relevant to teaching in the chosen discipline when support is provided.
9. Contributes to the development of both library and other learning resources relevant to content area of teaching.
10. Seeks opportunities to interact with colleagues to improve instruction.
11. Provides students with relevant, innovative and rigorous course content.
12. Provides relevant data illustrating the rigor, usefulness, and relevance of courses taught.

TEACHING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Distinguished Performance

Distinguished performance demonstrates a consistent or sustained high degree of skill and leadership in teaching with a notable impact to the profession and recognition at a national and institutional level as shown by the following indicators that build upon performance indicators for excellence. Please note that the performance indicators listed below are intended to be illustrative not exhaustive, and the process of assessing productivity and the relative value of individual products/activities should be attentive to discipline specifics, emerging trends, and new technologies. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide sufficient context and/or explanation to clarify and justify the qualitative weight that should be afforded to a particular piece of evidence.

Performance indicators that may be used to support distinguished ratings:

a. Invitation to be keynote speaker at national or international conferences on topics related to teaching and/or curriculum.
b. Invited presentations at other universities on topics related to teaching and/or curriculum.
c. Teaching awards honor high caliber of performance recognized at local and national levels.
d. Leadership evident in the promotion of high quality teaching and curriculum development recognized nationally or internationally.
e. Develops innovative teaching techniques that are recognized or widely adopted by others that integrate original research within the discipline into instructional activities.

Excellent Performance

Excellent performance represents consistent high quality teaching with positive outcomes for students as reflected by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

a. Numerical student evaluation data document clear statistical exceptionality
b. Narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences
c. Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (above average)
d. Teaching philosophy provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities
e. Syllabi outlines comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations
f. Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs
g. Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of successful continuous improvement effort
h. Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions
i. Student support practices facilitate optimal student development
j. Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review
k. Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) executed with expert skill
l. Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights
m. Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility

Good Performance

Good performance demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness but some minor areas for concern. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that teaching performance is below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions.

Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

a. Student evaluations data document adequate impact on learning
b. Teaching philosophy expressed in course planning and activities
c. Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations
d. Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to department needs
e. Goals and course content give evidence of continuous improvement effort
f. Majority of pedagogical practices are appropriate and effective
g. Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective
h. Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices are appropriate and effective
i. Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, gen ed) executed with reasonable skill
j. Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights
k. Participates in teaching development activities when directed to do so

Fair Performance

Fair performance demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes but produces major areas for concern for the department. The weight of evidence suggests that teaching performance in this performance category is below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions.

Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings:

a. Student evaluations data document areas of moderate concern (ratings below the department average)
b. Teaching philosophy may not be clearly expressed in course planning and activities
c. Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations
d. Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting department needs
e. Goals and course content reflect limited continuous improvement effort
f. Some pedagogical practices need attention
g. Some student support practices need improvement
h. Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices need improvement
i. Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) could be executed with greater competence
j. Occasional challenges related to academic integrity.
k. Some indications of disrespect for students and their rights
l. Does not typically participate in teaching development activity

Poor Performance

Poor performance demonstrates *serious* problems in attaining success in teaching role as reflected either by (1) a combination of many negative indications, or (2) fewer but more extreme behaviors that produce

substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning. In general, the weight of evidence suggests teaching performance is well below the department norms. Because of the high priority placed on teaching at UWF, this level of performance requires major remedial work.

Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

a. Student evaluations data document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the department average)
b. Teaching philosophy missing, poorly articulated or poorly expressed in course activities and planning
c. Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations
d. Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and department needs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are not effective or fair)
e. Goals and course content reflect no continuous improvement efforts
f. No assistance rendered for department assessment plan
g. Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; disengaging, chaotic, or hostile classroom environment)
h. Student support practices are unsound (e.g., late or absent for class, not responding to email, not keeping keep office hours, showing favoritism)
i. Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and supervision of students scholarly or creative activities
j. Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) avoided or poorly executed
k. Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.

TEEL Statement on Scholarship and Creative Projects

The standard scholarly definition of publications is the preparation and presentation of significant new data or critical interpretation of existing research. This is usually accomplished by means of scholarly books and articles in national refereed journals as well as grants/ conferences and conference presentations. However, professors in TEEL may publish textbooks and technical documents aimed at training teachers and related human service professionals. Further, articles may be geared to practitioners.

In the Department of Teacher Education and Educational Leadership, the quality of one's scholarly activities takes precedence over quantity. A high quality article in a prestigious national journal may be more significant than several articles in state journals. Since the value of journals vary, a state journal may be more prestigious than a national one. Likewise, a highly competitive grant or prestigious peer-reviewed conference presentation would be judged more significant than a smaller less competitive more service-related grant or non-peer reviewed presentation.

While quality is the critical factor, quantity must also be considered. As a result, faculty is expected to provide evidence that the amount of their work reflects a consistent engagement in scholarly endeavors that is reflective of professional standards of growth and achievement. This may be troubling to those who desire that tenure and promotion decisions be based on a faculty member completing a specific number of articles or conference presentations. But, such a system would always fail to account for the real differences in the types or quality of articles, grants, presentations and a host of other scholarly products. Further, a numerical system fails to account for the rigor and form of scholarship that varies between disciplines. For example, some academic disciplines have very few journals and a tradition of the limited publishing of only empirically based articles. Other programs of study, however, may have a large number of journals and encourage the publication of articles that are not solely based on strict experimental design and data analysis. Such a system would also lack any academic integrity and validity and certainly would not match what we as faculty expect of students in their scholarly endeavors.

A critical criterion for tenure and promotion is the publication or presentation of the results of research, scholarship, and creative endeavors through appropriate scholarly vehicles. This may include articles in journals, books, book chapters, monographs, technical manuals, grants, and conference presentations and similar peer reviewed publication. Please note that the performance indicators listed below are intended to be illustrative not exhaustive, and the process of assessing productivity and the relative value of individual products/activities should be attentive to discipline specifics, emerging trends, and new technologies. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide sufficient context and/or explanation to clarify and justify the qualitative weight that should be afforded to a particular piece of evidence.

Criteria in Scholarship and Creative Projects

1. Publishes articles in peer-reviewed professional journals.
2. Publishes chapters and books related to the faculty member's discipline.
3. Publishes peer-reviewed internet-based scholarly products.
4. Presents peer-reviewed paper presentations at academic conferences related to the faculty member's discipline.
5. Delivers invited lectures, papers, speeches, or presentations at colleges or universities, professional meetings, conventions, and conferences.
5. Submits products of scholarship to colleagues.
6. Collaborates with colleagues in activities oriented toward making a contribution toward the advancement of knowledge, methodology, or development of a discipline.
7. Applies for and receives grants and awards.
8. Participates in institutes, short courses, seminars, and workshops that are related to the faculty member's discipline.
9. Holds membership in professional organizations relevant to substantive area of teaching, research and service.

10. Engages in specific self-study or a professional growth plan to enhance professional competency as outlined in annual goal statement.
11. Provides editorial review for papers for journal publication, chapters for books, or other scholarly activities.
12. Obtains broad recognition in a field of study.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE PROJECTS PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Distinguished Performance

Distinguished performance demonstrates unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creativity projects that have a broadly recognized national/international impact and are reflective of a consistent and significant performance over time as shown by the performance indicators below that build upon the performance indicators for excellence.

In general, the weight of evidence in this performance *exceeds* department criteria for excellence.

Performance indicators that may be used to support distinguished ratings:

a. Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed department expectations in excellence
b. Wide national or international audience
c. National or international recognition earned for quality
d. Awards received for scholarly or creative projects
e. Achievements in continuing professional training show unusual merit
f. Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, successful completion, and dissemination of results
g. Recognized national leadership in research and scholarly activities
h. Conducts ground-breaking research within a discipline or obtains grants that advance knowledge in the field or contribute to the mission of the Department of Teacher Education and Educational Leadership.

Excellent Performance

Excellent performance demonstrates well developed execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

a. Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context
b. Meets department production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship
c. Favorable review by and respect from majority of colleagues in the department for scholarly and creative works
d. Potential for wide recognition of quality outside of the University

e. Completes appropriate schedule of professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, etc.) in a timely fashion
f. External support captured to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda
g. Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly and creative projects
h. Skilled time management facilitates success of scholarly agenda or creative plan
i. Skilled use of collaboration as demonstrated by the commitments proposed, accepted, and fulfilled (e.g., group projects, creative activities, and grants)

Good Performance

Good performance demonstrates acceptable tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the performance indicators below but the weight of evidence suggests that work falls mildly below department standard of excellent.

Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

a. Specific scholarly agenda or creative plan identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination or display venues
b. Scholarly and creative projects completed but falls short of department criteria related to the rate of completion or quality of dissemination venue.
c. Appropriate professional educational opportunities pursued
d. Involvement with professional organizations that will support scholarly or creative goals
e. Grants developed and submitted to capture external support
f. Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly and creative projects
g. Reasonably effective time management strategies contribute to success
h. Commitments made and reasonably fulfilled in collaborative activity (e.g., group projects, creative performances, and grants)

Fair Performance

Fair performance demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that scholarly and creative projects are moderately below the department norms. This level of performance offers no immediate support for tenure or promotion decisions but provides evidence of some promise for future productivity. Remediation is recommended.

Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings:

a. General focus of interest identified, but falls short of rate of production required for promotion and tenure decisions.

b. Evidence of some completion of beginning stages of scholarly or artistic process, (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, artistic plan), but falls short of the production required for tenure and promotion decisions.
c. Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration or resource network to help with specific plan
d. Identification of professional organizations that will support scholarly and creative goals, but not actively involved at this time
e. Appropriate professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, special educational opportunities) identified
f. Sources of external support for scholarship or creative activities agenda identified and explored
g. Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic at times
h. Questionable time management strategies limit production
i. Erratic performance in collaborative activities (e.g., grants, research collaborations, creative performance) negatively influences project quality

Poor Performance

Poor performance demonstrates *serious* problems in developing a scholarship or creative agenda. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that scholarly and creative production is well below the department norms attributed to inactivity or avoidance, absence of planning, poor time management, problematic collaborative behavior, or ethical challenges. In such circumstances, major remediation efforts may be identified and pursued.

Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

a. Scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been identified (e.g., central focus of career interest has not materialized)
b. Minimal pursuit of scholarly and creative projects
c. Avoidance of professional organization involvement that could help disseminate or display faculty work
d. Failure to pursue expected professional enhancement activities (e.g., licensure, continuing education, technology training)
e. Avoidance of grant exploration or pursuit
f. Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly or artistic production
g. Poor time management strategies work output handicap
h. Unreliability and problematic collaborative skills harm project completion and quality

Statement on Service

The service aspect of a TEEL faculty member's responsibilities is multifaceted, encompassing the university, community, and professional discipline. First, university service embraces membership on departmental, college, and university committees, and involvement in interdisciplinary programs, projects, and task forces.

Also, the capable faculty member should seek to extend service to students through counseling, advisement or serving as a faculty advisor to student organizations.

Second, community service covers a range of activities, including but not limited to: serving on local or regional committees, conducting workshops and providing expert consultation, serving on school advising committees or working with state department personnel.

Third, professional service pertains to serving on editorial review boards of newsletters, journals, and monographs; serving as an expert consultant to other institutions, professional organizations outside the immediate community/region, and other external entities; and serving in leadership roles (e.g., elected officer, board member) for state, national, and international organizations. A professor in TEEL is expected to be active at the local, state, and national level in various professional organizations.

Please note that the performance indicators listed below are intended to be illustrative not exhaustive, and the process of assessing productivity and the relative value of individual products/activities should be attentive to discipline specifics, emerging trends, and new technologies. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide sufficient context and/or explanation to clarify and justify the qualitative weight that should be afforded to a particular piece of evidence.

Specific Criteria in Service

1. Provides career counseling to students.
2. Participates in noncredit continuing education programs both on and off campus.
3. Plans and leads noncredit workshops, institutes, and discussion groups.
4. Functions as an officer of local, regional, national, or international professional organizations.
5. Serves on departmental, school, and university committees.
6. Assumes a variety of administrative responsibilities relating to both the academic and support services of the university community.
7. Conducts institutional studies.
8. Contributes service to the community that is relevant to the faculty member's role at the university.
9. Consults as requested with government, business, and industry to provide a variety of applications of the faculty member's role at the university.
10. Participates in sponsoring activities of various student clubs, societies and organizations.

SERVICE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Distinguished Performance

Distinguished performance demonstrates a consistent and sustained high degree of skill and leadership in service contributions with a notable impact to the professor and recognized at a national or international level

as shown by the performance indicators below that build upon performance indicators for excellence. In general, the weight of evidence in the faculty service contributions *exceeds* the criteria for excellent.

Performance indicators that may be used to support distinguished ratings

   a. Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service
   b. Collaboration is skillful and innovative
   c. Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions
   d. Wide external recognition (local and national audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions
   e. Community service, if applicable, provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function.

Excellent Performance

Excellent performance demonstrates well developed execution of service contributions as shown by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

   a. Scope and effort level meet department criteria
   b. Colleagues view contributions to department as effective
   c. Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
   d. Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community
   e. Potential shown for wide recognition inside and outside of the university

Good Performance

Good performance demonstrates acceptable tangible progress in service contributions but may reflect some minor challenges that interfere with excellent performance. The weight of evidence suggests that work falls mildly below department criteria of excellent.

Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

   a. Emerging service agenda reflects reasonable expectation for rank
   b. Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service role in regional comprehensive university
   c. Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity
   d. Usually effective in service as citizen of department

e. Balance across service obligations may be a struggle
f. Community service, if applicable, provided reasonable synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function.

Fair Performance

Fair performance demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions that can be the result of many factors, including limited pursuit of service, passive participation, or inability to manage obligations. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that service is moderately below department norms. Remediation is recommended to assist the faculty member to come to terms with the service obligations and appropriate behaviors to achieve positive outcomes in the regional comprehensive university context.

Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings:

a. Appropriate arenas for service identified and explored
b. Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation)
c. Recognition of service obligation in faculty role shapes consideration
d. Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness

Poor Performance

Poor performance demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that service is well below the department norms. Remediation should be required to help the faculty member develop an appropriate orientation to service in a regional comprehensive university context and strategic plan to accomplish that objective.

Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

a. Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization
b. Significance of the obligation of service in the faculty role in a regional comprehensive university not apparent (e.g., faculty seems resistant or oblivious to service needs)
c. Community service, if applicable, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function.