



NEVADA STATE  
COLLEGE



# School of Nursing

  

# Standards of Academe

**Effective January 2009**

The faculty of the School of Nursing will review the *Standards of Academe* no less than every three years

## **Overview**

Nevada State College is dedicated to providing quality educational, social, cultural, economic, and civic advancement for the citizens of Nevada. This is reflected through the college's core values of iTeach:

### **Innovation**

We are a community of educators bound by our passion for teaching and serving our students in an environment that fosters creative and effective approaches to learning.

### **Teaching Excellence**

We believe, without exception, that our most important endeavor is providing students with an exemplary education.

### **Economic Development**

We are committed to enhancing Nevada's economy by serving as an engine for growth and diversification and by providing students with opportunities for economic success.

### **Assessment**

We practice an approach to education that instills in ourselves and our students the value of reflection, continual improvement and accountability.

### **Customer Service**

We settle for nothing short of remarkable service and satisfaction for our students and other campus constituents.

### **Heritage**

We embrace the unique qualities and characteristics that make us who we are as individuals and as a community.

The School of Nursing believes that teaching should be the primary area of emphasis for faculty members, with scholarship and service as important but not as high priority. Because Nevada State College is a teaching institution, teaching is the most highly valued activity in the School of Nursing. Faculty members are expected to be accomplished teachers. Teaching is a highly complex activity and requires a variety of indicators as described in, but not limited to, the *Standards of Academe*.

# Teaching

## Annual Review

At each annual review, the faculty member and evaluator will develop an annual review plan for the following year. The annual progress plan will include specific goals for the faculty member to achieve in each of the three categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. At each annual review, the faculty member must provide a copy of the annual review plan agreed upon at the previous year's review and indicate which items from the plan were completed.

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

- Syllabus
- Student evaluations
- Administrative observations (minimum one annually) using the SON observational rubric
- Self Evaluation
- Current CV
- Peer observation (minimum one annually)
- Final grade distribution
- One example of theory, lab, *and* clinical feedback given to students at each performance level (A, B, C, D/F). If faculty members are unable to provide an example for one or more performance levels (e.g., there are no D's on a given assessment) they should explain why the example does not exist.

Tenure track faculty shall provide a narrative description of teaching activities. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual's teaching effectiveness. A narrative statement is optional in the annual full-time lecturer and post-tenure review process.

## Rating Teaching

When rating teaching, the evaluator will consider the faculty member's progress toward meeting the goals set forth in the annual review plan. In the Commendable and Excellent ratings, quality of contributions will be rated higher than quantity.

## **Lines of evidence of Effective Teaching in the annual review, annual merit, and post-tenure processes in the School of Nursing**

**Level 1:** Fails to meet expectations (unsatisfactory)

Pattern of performance at a level less than that specified in Level 2.

**Level 2:** Meets expectations (Satisfactory)

Faculty are expected to be competent teachers, as evidenced by the creation of a classroom, skills lab, and/or clinical climate which respects students and welcomes diversity, and by quality contributions in **all** of the following areas:

- A well developed syllabus that includes a course description, course learning outcomes, evaluation criteria/methods, course schedule, and office hours.
- Availability to students outside of class, lab, or clinical hours
- Course content which is relevant and current as evidenced by readings, texts, and updated course materials
- Evidence of application of theory (theoretical) or research (evidence-based) knowledge to teaching (e.g., syllabi, assignments)
- Exhibit command over subject matter in classroom discussions and/or lectures.
- Demonstrate clear understanding of content knowledge
- Foster higher order thinking and problem solving skills.
- Integration of multiple ways of knowing in teaching and learning. For example, demonstrate some variety of methods, strategies, materials and instructional formats to facilitate student learning.
- Select and/or design, implement and analyze an effective assessment strategy which provides feedback to students regarding their growth and progress.
- Basic integration of diversity into the course(s).
- Student evaluation items generally 3.0 or above on a 5 point scale, with 5 being the highest, and written comments that are generally satisfactory. In cases where faculty members do not meet these criteria, they may provide an explanation of mitigating circumstances they believe led to unreasonably low scores.
- Student advising as appropriate within School of Nursing assignment
- Evidence of student learning, which may include tests, papers, projects, clinical evaluations, number of students on learning contracts who have been successful

**Level 3:** Exceeds expectations (Commendable)

Faculty are expected to meet Level 2 performance, as well as:

- Student evaluation items generally 3.7 or above (with 5 being highest) and generally positive written comments. In cases where faculty members do not meet these criteria, they may provide an explanation of mitigating circumstances they believe led to unreasonably low scores.
- Demonstrate *increased* variety of methods, strategies, materials and instructional formats to facilitate student learning.
- Increasing evidence of integration of diversity into the course(s)

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

- Significant level of curriculum development, as indicated by new course development, major revision of existing course, or teaching a course for the first time. Revisions may relate to evaluation tools, exams, resources (audiovisual supplements), new technologies, creative strategies and innovations.
- Significant contributions to curriculum development for the nursing program, such as leadership in curriculum mapping, course evaluation methods, NCLEX preparation
- Significant student mentorship as evidenced by activities such as: independent study, formal mentoring, honors activity
- Participation in faculty or student development activities related to teaching
- Leading a teaching workshop (college, School of Nursing, community) outside normal responsibilities
- Acceptance of an internal teaching grant
- Development or use of innovative course materials or technologies
- Demonstrates growth and competency in outcomes-based education and assessment.

**Level 4:** Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner (Excellent)

An Excellent rating is distinguished from the Commendable rating by the requirement of a significantly higher quantity and quality of contributions beyond the levels required for a Commendable rating.

Faculty are expected to meet Level 2 performance, as well as:

- Student evaluation items generally 4.0 or above (with 5 being highest) and generally positive written comments. In cases where faculty members do not meet these criteria, they may provide an explanation of mitigating circumstances they believe led to unreasonably low scores.
- Consistent, substantive integration of diversity into the course(s).

- Demonstrate a *consistent* variety of methods, strategies, materials and instructional formats to facilitate student learning.

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

- Completion of three or more level 3 activities
- Development and dissemination of innovative teaching materials at regional or national level
- Successful completion of a major teaching-related responsibility (e.g. curriculum revision, new approaches to deal with student diversity, program of institutional assessment)
- Development and delivery of a regional, national, or international teaching workshop
- Recipient of an iTEACH award related to teaching responsibilities
- Development of new programs of study
- Documentation of leadership in the design, redesign and assessment of NSC courses or programs.
- Acceptance of external funds through grants or contracts for teaching
- Publications related to innovations in teaching

## Scholarship

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.

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 faculty's intent to complete the scholarship and/or creative activity. Statements of scholarship in-progress, supported by evidence, are required.

In annual and post-tenure reviews, the school evaluator is responsible for judging the quality of scholarship done. In tenure reviews, school-level evaluators and the college-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee are responsible for judging the quality of scholarship. Quality can refer to the effect scholarship makes on advances in knowledge, the professional community, and especially, the enrichment of teaching. This concept of quality places more importance on the process and effect than on the quantity of products. It should be assessed, in accordance with college guidelines, both by peers within the school and those from other higher education institutions.

Tenure track faculty shall provide a narrative description of their scholarly activities including how those activities have affected their teaching and their discipline. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual's scholarship. It is expected that tenure-track faculty will have a minimum of one work submitted for review by the third year review. A narrative statement is optional in the annual and post-tenure review process.

### **Lines of evidence of Effective Scholarship in the annual review, annual merit, and post-tenure processes in the School of Nursing**

**Level 1:** Fails to meet expectations (unsatisfactory)

Performance at a level less than that specified in Level 2.

**Level 2:** Meets expectations (Satisfactory)

The faculty has a record of continuing professional growth in nursing, which contributes to the development of the nursing program and nursing profession.

Tenure-track faculty **must** complete **two** of the activities or equivalent from Section B *or* one from Section A and one from Section B.

Full-time lecturers **must** complete **one** of the activities or equivalent from either Section A or B.

Section A:

- Completes scholarly products (e.g., guidelines, handbook, book review)
- Participate/Assist at a basic level in conducting a research project, data collection, grant writing, etc.
- Successfully completes 3 or more credits of coursework that promotes scholarship
- Passes nursing board certification/recertification exam
- Review book chapter(s)
- Submits a professional and/or health article for community media publication (e.g., website article, newspaper article)
- Develops professional practitioner manual

Section B:

- Develops cross-disciplinary collaboration in scholarship of teaching projects
- Submits paper, book chapter, or manuscript for publication
- Submits internal or external research or development grant
- Submits book prospectus
- Provides expert consultation or development of a scholarly project, such as a WebCast, PodCast, or new simulations.
- Reviews occasional article(s) for professional journal.

NOTE: If faculty member does not have the specified number of activity(ies) in Level 2, but has completed activities listed under Levels 3 and 4, then these activities can be used to establish evidence that the faculty member has met the expectations of Level 2. However, there is no double counting of the lines of evidence.

Level 3: Exceeds expectations (Commendable)

Faculty are expected to meet Level 2 performance plus tenure-track faculty must **also** provide evidence of the quality of scholarship accomplishment as evidenced by **two** of the following or equivalent from Section B *or* one from Section A and one from Section B.

Full-time lecturers must **also** provide evidence by **one** of the following or equivalent from either Section A or Section B.

#### Section A:

- Receives acceptance of professional journal article as secondary author.
- Presents in lecture, symposia, presentation, and/or speech to external audience.
- Participates in clinical/technology based research that facilitates changes in nursing practice.
- Participates/assists at a substantial level in conducting a research project, data collection, grant writing etc.
- Participates in nursing practice consultation and program development
- Develops items for NCLEX or certification test (AACN/NLN)

#### Section B:

- Serves as peer reviewer for scholarly journals, books or conferences
- Receives acceptance of professional journal article as primary author
- Receives acceptance for internal research or development grant
- Receives acceptance of book prospectus
- Presents scholarly paper or poster at regional, national, or international professional conference
- Provides leadership for clinical/technology based research that facilitates changes in nursing practice
- Develop or provide leadership in conducting a research project, data collection, grant writing, etc.
- Receive local award for scholarly achievement
- Investigate research/literature on new teaching methods/strategies and share new knowledge with external agencies

#### **Level 4:** Meets expectations in a sustained manner (Excellent)

Tenure-track faculty are expected to meet Level 2 performance, and, in addition, are evaluated by the quality and quantity of contributions which advance knowledge, as indicated by **two** of the following or equivalent from Section B or one from Section A and one from Section B..

Full-time lecturers are expected to meet Level 2 performance, and, in addition, are evaluated by the quality and quantity of contributions which advance knowledge, as indicated by **one** of the following or equivalent from either Section A or Section B.

#### Section A:

- Participates as a team member in grants or contracts that are funded for scholarship or innovative nursing practice program

- Reviews research submissions for a scholarly nursing conference.
- Receives regional award for scholarly achievement.
- Participates in development of a scholarly program such as a local or regional evidence-based guideline project.
- Publishes professional handbook, or guideline

Section B:

- Publishes a journal article or book chapter
- Publishes a book
- Participates in sustained consultation or development of a scholarly program, such as participation in a regional or national evidence-based guideline project
- Accepts external funds as a Primary Investigator (PI) through grants or contracts for scholarship or innovative nursing practice programs
- Demonstrates leadership in scholarly activity that informs current and future practices in the discipline of nursing.
- Serves as editorial board member for scholarly journals, books or conferences.
- Receive national or international award for scholarly achievement

## Service

Each tenure-track, tenured, and full-time lecturer is expected to demonstrate service. Service encompasses the following areas: (a) School of Nursing (SON), (b) Nevada State College, (c) professional, and (d) community (local and national).

Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion shall provide a brief narrative description of service activities. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual's service. A personal statement is optional in the annual and post-tenure review processes.

### **Lines of evidence of Effective Service in the annual review, annual merit, and post-tenure processes in the School of Nursing**

**Level 1:** Fails to meet expectations (unsatisfactory)

Performance at a level less than that specified in Level 2.

**Level 2:** Meets expectations (Satisfactory)

The faculty participates in conscientious, active, productive service in any **two** of the four areas of service: (1) School of Nursing, (2) NSC (college), (3) professional, and (4) community and governmental. Examples are listed below:

#### 1. School of Nursing (SON)

- Serves as member on standing SON Committee
- Serves as member of ad-hoc SON Committee
- Serves as member of SON search committee
- Provides effective student advising and counseling
- Contributes to SON Accreditation Self Study
- Creates and fosters a caring environment
  - Attends Caring Circle meetings
  - Attends Healing Presence Ceremony

#### 2. College (NSC)

- Serve as member of college-level committee, including search committee
- Contributes to NSC Accreditation Self Study
- Participates in recruitment activities
- Provides professional development workshops on campus
- Seeks out opportunities for collaboration across schools

### 3. Professional

- Serves as an active member of professional organization
- Participates in activities that provide an opportunity for professional growth
- Serves as committee member of professional organization

### 4. Community/ Governmental

- Volunteers for community organization
- Provides professional development workshops in the community

## **Level 3: Exceeds expectations (Commendable)**

The faculty achieves conscientious, active, productive service in **three** of the four areas of service, which can include items in Level 2. In addition, a notable achievement in quality or quantity of service in one of the areas is required. Notable achievements are those involving significant work intensity, time expenditure, quality, or impact, such as, but not limited to:

#### 1. School of Nursing (SON)

- Serves as chair of standing SON committee
- Serves as semester or program coordinator
- Serves as advisor to SNA or other student organization
- Provides major contribution to SON Accreditation Self Study
- Serves as a mentor for teaching to other SON faculty

#### 2. College (NSC)

- Serves as SON Representative on Faculty Senate
- Serves as chair of college-level committee, including search committee
- Serves as an active member of 2 or more college committees
- Serves as member of NSHE committee
- Represents the School of Nursing or NSC on local health-related planning committees, boards, or organizations
- Serves as committee Chair for NSC Accreditation Self-Study
- Serves as a mentor to other NSC faculty
- Demonstrates effective performance in advising with a broader impact college wide.
- Provides active involvement in administrative aspects of program development

### 3. Professional

- Assumes a leadership role (e.g., officer or committee chair) of local professional organization
- Assumes leadership of a significant organizational project
- Serves as workshop leader or coordinator for a local symposium
- Speaks at a local professional organization
- Provides expert witness testimony
- Engages in clinical practice

### 4. Community/ Governmental

- Consults for a local organization
- Speaks at a local community organization
- Holds membership of a Board of Directors
- Evaluates proposals for local projects
- Receives award for local service

**Level 4:** Meets expectations in a sustained manner (Excellent)

Meets Level 3, plus a significant/outstanding contribution in **one** of the four areas of service, as evidenced by sustained leadership or external recognition of the faculty member's service. Examples are listed below:

#### 1. School of Nursing

- Serves as chair of SON Accreditation Self Study
- Provides sustained leadership on SON committee or faculty development
- Mentors other SON faculty into leadership roles

#### 2. College (NSC)

- Serves as officer of Faculty Senate
- Serves as Chair of NSHE committee
- Participates in activities that have the potential to further the mission of the college within the NSHE, the larger higher education community, or the community at large.

#### 3. Professional

- Serves as officer or committee chair of regional, national, or international professional organization ( assumes a leadership role)
- Coordinates a regional, national, or international conference

- Receives award for professional services
- Speaks at a regional, national or international meeting or conference

#### 4. Community/ Governmental

- Serves as consultant or proposal evaluator for a regional, national, or international organization
- Receives award for regional/national/international service
- Provides sustained participation and leadership in a community organization or Board of Directors
- Receives external funds through grants or contracts for service.

## **GENERAL EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION IN NURSING**

### **OVERVIEW**

The annual review criteria hold tenure-track faculty to very high standards of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. It is not the intent of the School of Nursing 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 rating 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 Nursing 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

*and*

Five conference presentations

**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 School of Nursing, 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.