



SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Standards of Academe

Effective January 2009

The faculty of the School of Education will review the Standards of Academe no less than every three years.

Standards of Academe Objective: The Standards of Academe define the performance expectations and the general description of levels or thresholds of employment performance for Nevada State College. It is intended to provide an ongoing review of performance with regular conferences between faculty member and the Dean (supervisor), prior to culminating in an annual review. It encourages open discussion of individual achievement, as defined by the faculty member's career development, School of Education goals and NSC's mission.

The performance expectations defined within the Standards of Academe are measurable objectives which will be supported by evidence of performance. This evidence will include artifacts, conference outcomes and documented evidence stemming from observations by the Dean, as well as artifacts and supporting information presented by the faculty member. The performance expectations are criteria that define the objectives of the faculty member's performance but are not limited to the listing of criteria within each threshold of employment. Faculty members are encouraged to provide supporting evidence for equivalent performance expectations.

The annual review process will utilize the Standards of Academe to review past year's accomplishments, as well as develop and define future performance goals of the faculty member. Specific performance deficiencies may also be addressed and specific goals may be developed to address the targeted deficiencies.

TEACHING

Overview

Nevada State College (NSC) believes, "... without exception that our most important endeavor is providing students with an exemplary education." (iTeach core values) and to this end requires a rating of "excellent" in the area of teaching (NSC Promotion and Tenure criteria (11/4/07)).

All programs offered by the School of Education (SOE) are standards-based. Since its inception, the SOE has used Dr. Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching as the benchmark by which student performance competencies and elementary and secondary pre-service teaching program effectiveness is assessed. This nationally accepted framework incorporates and is based upon the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). It has also been correlated with the Clark County and Washoe County School districts (the two largest school districts in Nevada) standards for teacher performance.

The SOE faculty has used this same framework to describe/develop the expectations for effective teaching in their courses. By following this framework, faculty has the opportunity to meet and exceed criteria outlined in the NSC promotion and tenure, annual review, annual merit, and post-tenure processes. Annual review and the P&T processes are aligned in that annual review must show progress towards meeting the requirements of promotion and tenure.

Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion shall provide a brief narrative description of excellence in teaching. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual's excellence in teaching. This narrative is critical to provide justification or evidence of appeals to annual review that do not meet the requirements set forth in these standards. The evaluator has some latitude to make exceptions to the requirements in the case of unusual circumstances as presented in the narrative.

Lines of Evidence of Effective Teaching in the Annual Review and Annual Merit Processes in the School of Education

For each course taught, the following are *required* lines of evidence:

- Syllabus
- Student evaluations
- Administrative observations (minimum one annually) using the SOE observational rubric
- Self evaluation
- Peer observation (minimum one annually)

- Grade distributions

Level One: Fails to meet expectations (unsatisfactory)

Performance at a level less than that specified in Level Two (2)

Level Two: Meets expectations (satisfactory)

- A clear, concise, and well developed syllabus that adheres to the SOE syllabus template.
- Demonstrate appropriate, whole group instruction more than 50% of the time with some variance in methods, strategies, materials and instructional formats to facilitate student learning.
- Exhibit command over subject matter in classroom discussions and/or lectures.
- Demonstrate clear understanding of the Frameworks of Teaching.
- Demonstrate clear understanding of content knowledge.
- Link content and pedagogical knowledge within the discipline.
- Foster higher order thinking and problem solving skills
- Display basic skills in differentiating instruction to enhance student learning.
- Instruction emphasizes and builds on pre-requisite relationships and relevant learning applications.
- Select and/or design, implement and analyze an effective assessment strategy which provides feedback to students regarding their growth and progress.
- Student evaluation items generally above 3.0 on a 5 point scale and the majority of written comments that are satisfactory.
- Integration of diversity into the curriculum at a surface level

Level Three: Exceeds expectations (Commendable)

Faculty are expected to meet Level two (2) performance as well as:

- Demonstrate appropriate, whole group instruction up to 50% of the time with increased variance in methods, strategies, materials and instructional formats to facilitate student learning.
- Demonstrate clear understanding of the Frameworks of Teaching and its relationship to subject/content and pedagogical knowledge within the discipline.
- Ask uniformly high level questions and promote discussion.
- Display wide range of effective pedagogical approaches (differentiation) that will anticipate student misconceptions and difficulties.
- Instruction represents the relevancy of material to real-world situations.
- Select and/or design, implement and analyze a variety of effective assessment strategies and utilize data to inform instruction and provide feedback to students regarding their growth and progress.
- Student evaluation items generally above a 3.7 on a 5 point scale and generally positive written comments.
- Evidence of integration of diversity into the curriculum at a deep level.

And quality contribution in any **one** of the following areas or equivalent:

- Expanding/revising current course and/or degree offerings
- Evidence of innovative teaching
- Significant student mentorship such as independent study, formal mentoring.
- Leads collaborative planning with colleagues of school curriculum, instruction, and assessment at the school and college levels
- Recipient of an iTeach award
- Development of and /or participation in new programs of study

Level Four: Meets expectations in a sustained manner (Excellent)

Faculty are expected to meet level three performances as well as:

- Demonstrate whole group instruction less than 50% of the time combined with a consistent variety of methods, strategies, materials and instructional formats to facilitate student learning
- Demonstrate clear understanding of the Frameworks of Teaching and its relationship to subject/content and pedagogical knowledge across the discipline.
- Students demonstrate modeled questioning strategies in discussions.
- Students demonstrate differentiation strategies appropriate to course content.
- Select and/or design, implement and analyze a variety of effective assessment strategies, utilizing data to inform instruction and provide feedback to students regarding their growth and progress and involve students in their own self reflection.
- Consistent integration of diversity into the curriculum at a deep level.
- Student evaluation items generally 4.0 or above on a 5 point scale with the majority written comments positive

And quality contribution in any **one** of the following areas or equivalent:

- Takes leadership in collaborative planning and implementation of projects related to curriculum, instruction, and/or assessment, with recognition at the state, regional, national, and international level
- Recipient of an iTeach award
- Development of new programs of study
- Expanding/revising current course and/or degree offerings
- Evidence of innovative teaching
- Significant student mentorship such as independent study, formal mentoring

SCHOLARSHIP

Overview

Boyer's (1990) definition of the scholarship of teaching as an activity that "both educates and entices future scholars" is the foundation for determination of tenure and post-tenure progress in scholarship in the School of Education at Nevada State College.

Tenure-track faculty members are expected to progress in scholarship as outlined in the following document. Full-time lecturers are required to complete section B in order to progress but may choose to follow tenure-track processes. Lecturers will be required to choose their preferred track at the beginning of each evaluative period and must follow that chosen track for the entire evaluative period.

Evidence of productive scholarship can be supported by published records as well as other original work of a professional nature. However, external validation (peer reviewed, juried, and editor-reviewed) of one's work resulting in a published product is requisite for promotion and tenure at NSC.

Scholarly activities should be systematic and show a contribution in areas such as pedagogy, models and methods of teaching, curriculum research, grants, etc. Evidence of scholarship in-progress (e.g., continuing work of funded projects, manuscripts under review, exhibitions under development, formal working papers) serves as an indicator of the candidate's intent to converge on products. Statements of scholarship in-progress, supported by evidence, are required.

Quality is the most important factor in judging scholarship. Quality refers to the effect that scholarship makes on advances in knowledge, the professional community, and the enrichment of teaching. This concept of quality places more importance on the *process* and *effect* than on *quantity* of products. To this end, faculty will provide a narrative description to the Dean of the School of Education, on an *annual* basis, of their scholarly activities to include timelines of completion and impact on their discipline. It is expected that tenure-track faculty will have a minimum of one work submitted for review by the third year review.

NOTE: A consistent rating of Satisfactory on Annual Review is not equivalent to a rating of Satisfactory on the Tenure Review. Tenure-seeking faculty members should plan out their scholarship agendas during their probationary period so they have time to complete the required expectations listed below. External validation (peer reviewed, juried, or editor-reviewed) of one's work in a published product is requisite for promotion and tenure at NSC.

Lines of Evidence for Effective Scholarship in the Annual Review and Annual Merit Process In the School of Education

Level One: Fails to meet expectations (unsatisfactory)

Performance at a level less than that specified in Level Two

Level Two: Meets expectations (satisfactory)

Tenure-Track faculty **must** complete one (1) item, or equivalent, from section A and complete one (1) item, or equivalent, from Section B. Full-time lecturers **must** complete two (2) items from section B or **may** follow tenure-track standards.

Section A : Peer reviewed, juried or editor-reviewed to include but not limited to:

- Book chapters or books
- Peer reviewed or refereed Journal articles
- Monographs, and/or professional reports
- Practitioner manual
- Internal or external grant
- Films, videos, CD or other electronic media
- Website article
- Video Repository
- Action, qualitative, and/or qualitative research projects
- Scholarly works in-progress
- Conference proceedings

Section B (including but not limited to)

- Present professional works at local professional meetings, conventions, symposia, seminars, and conferences
- Attend/participate in lecture, symposia, presentation, and/or speech to the external community.
- Share new knowledge with external audiences
- Participate in the development of professional meetings, conventions, symposiums, and conferences
- Investigate creative application of new technology and share new knowledge with external audiences.
- Develop consulting materials
- Investigate research/literature on new teaching methods/strategies and share new knowledge with external audiences.
- Participate as a reviewer for journal article, book chapter, grant, and/or book
- Publication in non juried, peer or editor reviewed publications.

Level Three: Exceeds expectations (Commendable)

Tenure-Track faculty **must** complete one (1) item, or equivalent, from section A and complete two (2) items, or equivalent, from Section B. Full-time lecturers **may** follow tenure-track standards or **must** complete three (3) items from section B.

Section A: Peer reviewed, juried, or editor-reviewed:

- Book chapters or books
- Journal articles
- Monographs, and/or professional reports
- Practitioner manual
- Internal or external grant
- Films, videos, CD or other electronic media
- Website article
- Video Repository
- Action, qualitative, and/or qualitative research projects

Section B (including but not limited to)

- Present professional works at local, state, regional, national or international professional meetings, conventions, symposia, seminars, and conferences
- Present professional, symposia, presentation, and/or speech to the external community
- Participate in the development of professional meetings, conventions, symposiums, and conferences
- Investigate creative application of new technology and share new knowledge external audiences
- Develop teacher education consulting materials
- Investigate research/literature on new teaching methods/strategies and share new knowledge with external audiences
- Participate as a reviewer for journal article, book chapter, grant, and/or book

Level Four: Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner (Excellent)

Tenure-Track faculty **must** complete one (1) item, or equivalent, from section A and complete three (3) items, or equivalent, from Section B. Full-time lecturers **may** follow tenure-track standards or **must** complete four (4) items from section B.

Section A

Peer reviewed, juried, or editor-reviewed:

- Book chapters or books
- Journal articles
- Monographs, and/or professional reports
- Practitioner manual
- Internal or external grant
- Films, videos, CD or other electronic media
- Website article
- Video Repository
- Action, qualitative, and/or qualitative research projects
- Work in-progress in addition to previous publication(s).

Section B (including but not limited to)

- Present professional works at local, state, regional national or international professional meetings, conventions, symposia, seminars, and conferences
- Attend/participate in lecture, symposia, presentation, and/or speech to the external community.
- Share new knowledge with external audiences
- Participate in the development of professional meetings, conventions, symposiums, and conferences
- Investigate creative application of new technology and share new knowledge with external audiences
- Develop teacher education consulting materials
- Participate in school and/or college accreditation process
- Investigate research/literature on new teaching methods/strategies and share new knowledge with external audiences
- Participate as a reviewer for journal article, book chapter, grant, and/or book

SERVICE

Overview

Each tenure-track, tenured, and full-time lecturer is expected to demonstrate service. Service encompasses three areas: 1) School of Education (SOE), 2) Nevada State College (College), 3) professional and 4) community (local and national).

Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion shall provide a brief narrative description of performance in service. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual's contributions to the School of Education, college (NSC), professional and community areas. This narrative is critical to provide justification or evidence of appeals to annual reviews that do not meet the requirements set forth in these standards. The evaluator has some latitude to make exceptions to the requirements in the case of unusual circumstances as presented in the narrative.

Lines of Evidence of effective teaching in the Annual review and Annual Merit Processes in the School of Education

Level 1: Fails to meet expectations (Unsatisfactory)

Performance at a level less than that specified in Level 2

Level 2: Meets expectations (Satisfactory)

Faculty participates in conscientious, active, productive service in the *required* lines of evidence:

- Effective student advising as outlined in SOE by-laws
- Faculty mentoring

And any two (2) of the four areas, or equivalent, of service:

1. Professional
 - Committee membership in professional organization
 - Seeks out and participates in professional growth opportunities
 - Active participation as a mentee

2. School of Education (SOE).
 - Membership on standing SOE committees
 - Membership on Ad-Hoc SOE committees
 - Contributes to NCATE or appropriate accrediting body
 - Review critical SOE policy documents
 - Participate in SOE professional development implementation
 - Support student organization activities

3. Nevada State College (NSC)
 - Serves on college-level committees
 - Contributes to Accreditation process
 - Participate in NSC professional development implementation
 - Participates in recruitment activities
 - Participates in orientation activities
 - Provides input to Faculty Senate
 - Seeks out opportunities for collaboration across schools/department
 - Write SOE documents
 - Support student organization activities

4. Community
 - Consistently involved with one school at the classroom level
 - Beginning involvement with a community organization

Level 3: Exceeds expectations (Commendable)

Performance at level two (2) as well as productive service in three (3) of the four areas service (or equivalent)

1. Professional
 - Holding offices in professional organizations or chairing committees.
 - Organizing special projects and events.

2. School of Education (SOE).
 - Student organization advisor
 - Chairs SOE ad-hoc and/or standing committees demonstrating clear leadership behavior.
 - Chair SOE professional development initiatives

- Member search committee(s)
3. Nevada State College (NSC)
 - Active member on college committees
 - SOE Faculty Senate Representative
 - Member college-level committee
 - Member of search committee
 - Member of NSHE committee
 - Member of Accreditation committee
 - Membership on SOE Accreditation sub-committee
 - Invited speaker to a professional organization
 - Chair NSC professional development initiative
 - Student organization advisor
 - Consistently support college level activities
 4. Community
 - Member of community committee
 - Local service Award
 - Participation in state or federal task forces

Level 4; Meets expectations in a sustained manner (Excellent)

Effective performance at level three (3) as well as productive service in three (3) of the four areas service (or equivalent)

1. Professional
 - Leadership role of regional, national or international organization(s).
 - Organizing an academic conference at regional, national or international level
 - Invited speaker at a regional, national, or international level
2. School of Education (SOE).
 - Sustained advisement of student organizations
 - Leadership on SOE Accreditation sub-committee
 - Chair sustained professional development
 - Chair search committee(s)
3. Nevada State College (NSC)
 - Officer of Faculty Senate
 - Partner with colleagues across NSHE community as representative of NSC
 - Sustained recruitment efforts
 - Sustained marketing efforts
 - Chair college-level committee
 - Chair accreditation committee
 - Chair search committee(s)
5. Community

- a. Member of Board of Directors
- Recognition of partnership activities with organizations and school districts at regional, national, or international level
- Regional, national or international service award(s)
- Editor, evaluator, participant for regional, national, or international organizations.
- Recipient of external funding outside of grants.
- Participation in state or federal task forces

GENERAL EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION IN EDUCATION

OVERVIEW

The annual review criteria hold tenure-track faculty to view high standards of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. It is not the intent of the School of Education to expect or require consistent Excellent ratings on annual reviews in order to receive an overall Excellent rating in any of the three areas when applying for tenure. Therefore, annual review ratings must be contextualized to represent expectations for Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Commendable, and Excellent ratings in the tenure and promotion application process. These ratings will be based on the cumulative performance of faculty members during the time leading up to the tenure and promotion review.

Teaching and service operate on yearly cycles, so annual review ratings are used extensively in determining tenure and promotion ratings in these areas. However, scholarship does not operate on a yearly cycle, but is instead marked by projects that can take multiple years. Consequently, the tenure and promotion expectations for scholarship must be more independent of the annual review ratings and focus on the cumulative accomplishments of the faculty member in terms of both quality and quantity.

Third Year Review

The purpose of the third year review is to give faculty direction regarding their progress toward tenure, by evaluating their cumulative performance after three years in rank. All untenured faculty on tenure-track will meet with the Dean at the end of the third year for this evaluation.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

As stated in the NSC Promotion and Tenure Policy, “all full time tenure track faculty must apply for tenure no later than the beginning of their sixth academic year.” The expectations for performance at that time are outlined below. Typically, promotion to associate professor and tenure decisions occurs simultaneously.

Promotion to Professor

Promotion to professor rank typically occurs later in a faculty member’s career. As outlined in the NSC Promotion and Tenure Policy, criteria for promotion to the rank of

professor include a rating of “excellent” in the area of teaching as well as “commendable” in either scholarship or service. Faculty members should demonstrate evidence of continued effective performance in teaching, scholarship, and service that includes and exceeds the criteria listed below.

TEACHING: GENERAL EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion shall provide a brief narrative description of excellence in teaching. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual’s excellence in teaching. This narrative is critical to provide justification or evidence of appeals to annual reviews that do not meet the requirements set forth in these standards. The evaluator has some latitude to make exceptions to the requirements in the case of unusual circumstances as presented in the narrative.

As outlined in the NSC Promotion and Tenure Policy, criteria for tenure include a rating of “excellent” in the area of teaching as well as a minimum rating of “satisfactory” in the areas of scholarship and service.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet expectations

Fails to produce evidence of Satisfactory performance (see below).

Satisfactory: Meets expectations

Annual review ratings of Satisfactory or above in the last three years.

Commendable: Exceeds expectations

No annual review ratings of Unsatisfactory in the last three years

and

At least two annual review ratings of Commendable or higher in the last three years, one of which must be in the last year before tenure review.

Excellent: Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner

No annual review ratings of Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory in the last three years

and

At least one annual review ratings of Excellent in the last three years.

SCHOLARSHIP: GENERAL EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

External validation (peer reviewed, juried, or editor-reviewed) of one's work in a published product is requisite for promotion and tenure at NSC. Tenure-seeking faculty members should plan out their scholarship agendas during their probationary period so they have time to complete the required expectations listed below. A consistent rating of Satisfactory on Annual Review is not equivalent to a rating of Satisfactory on the Tenure Review.

The School of Education has set the following benchmarks for rating scholarship in the tenure review process. These benchmarks serve solely as a guide. Evaluators can be flexible in those cases where faculty members have undertaken exemplary forms of scholarship or scholarly leadership not listed here.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet expectations

Fails to produce evidence of a Satisfactory performance (see below).

Satisfactory: Meets expectations

Active program of quality research or creative activity as exemplified by sustained involvement in the scholarly activities listed under annual review and at least:

One published peer-reviewed article

or peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalent.

Commendable: Exceeds expectations

Evidence of quality peer-reviewed research accomplishment as evidenced by at least:

Two published peer-reviewed articles. Note: A single article in a journal consensually defined in the field of study as a preeminent publication also may be considered; it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence that the journal meets this standard.

and

Two conference presentations

or peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalent.

Excellent: Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner

Distinguished by the quality and quantity of contributions which advance knowledge, as indicated by at least:

Three published peer-reviewed articles

and

Two conference presentations

OR

Two published peer-reviewed articles

OR

One peer-reviewed, discipline-specific book

or peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalent.

SERVICE: GENERAL EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion shall provide a brief narrative description of performance in service. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual's contributions to the School of Education, college (NSC), professional, and community areas. This narrative is critical to provide justification or evidence of appeals to annual reviews that do not meet the requirements set forth in these standards. The evaluator has some latitude to make exceptions to the requirements in the case of unusual circumstances as presented in the narrative.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet expectations

Fails to produce evidence of Satisfactory performance (see below).

Satisfactory: Meets expectations

No annual review ratings of Unsatisfactory in the last three years.

Commendable: Exceeds expectations

Three annual review ratings of Commendable or above in any years preceding tenure review.

Excellent: Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner

At least one annual review rating of Excellent *and* three annual review ratings of Commendable (or better) in any years preceding tenure review.