

Procedures and Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Achievements:
Retention
Promotion
Tenure
Post-tenure Review
Annual Activity Reports

Department of Cherokee & Indigenous Studies
College of Liberal Arts
Northeastern State University
(Approved, April 10, 2020)

PREFACE

Purpose

According to Section 3.361 of the Faculty Handbook: “It is the responsibility of departments to establish clearly the expectations for promotion consistent with university expectations. Departments are also responsible for establishing clear requirements for documenting the quality and significance of faculty achievements.”

The NSU Faculty Handbook contains the general requirements for faculty evaluation as mandated by the Regents and as implemented by NSU. The model for faculty evaluation and annual activity reports is specified in Appendix C1 of the Faculty Handbook. However, Appendix C1 provides little guidance about how to assess faculty achievements. The purpose of this document is to satisfy the mandate in Section 3.361 and to provide faculty in the Department of Cherokee & Indigenous Studies (CIS) with guidelines for reviews of accomplishments for retention, promotion, tenure, post-tenure review, and annual activity reports.

Areas of Faculty Responsibility

These guidelines use the three traditional areas of teaching, scholarship, and service to categorize faculty accomplishments. The model in Appendix C1 uses “scholarship” or “scholarly activity” to indicate that teaching and service can and should be approached with the same intellectual rigor, professional effort, innovation, and peer-review that is assumed to be a required part of research. Collegiality and professionalism are expected of all faculty. A faculty member’s activities must result in accomplishments in all three areas, and those achievements must be documented in such a way that they can be readily assessed by the tenure committee, the department chair, and university administrators.

While all faculty members must be active in teaching, scholarship, and service, and maintain a high degree of professionalism, the CIS Department recognizes that because of specific abilities, academic training, opportunities, and interests, individuals may not excel in all areas of evaluation for each period of review. In addition, the department benefits from faculty who specialize, enabling them to meet particular needs within our programs, across campus on behalf of the department, and professional contributions to our disciplines of study. Because of this, for evaluation purposes, faculty may request that more emphasis be placed on either service or scholarship at the expense of the other. All faculty are expected to put the greatest emphasis on teaching.

Faculty should be familiar with the entire Faculty Handbook. Each year untenured tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty must complete a “Faculty Evaluation Report.” Tenured faculty are required to complete a post-tenure review every three years. Sections pertaining to retention, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review include:

- Section 3.3-Academic Rank and Promotion
- Section 3.4-Academic Freedom and Responsibility
- Section 3.5-Academic Tenure
- Section 3.6-Review Procedures and Rights of Tenured Faculty

PLEASE NOTE: “Providing that candidates possess the required educational and experience qualifications, the following are considered minimum criteria upon which promotion in rank is based:

- Effective classroom teaching
- Scholarly or creative achievement
- Contributions to the institution and profession

The Professional Portfolio of the faculty member who is applying for advancement in rank must provide tangible evidence of superior performance in the criteria listed above. Each advancement in rank requires increased levels of performance/achievement in each of these criteria, particularly evidence of involvement in professional and scholarly activities.” (Faculty Handbook, p. 21 section 3.361)

Faculty Specialization

Faculty members can apportion their commitment to teaching, research, and service. The allocation of their time must be clearly stated on the evaluation form, preferably on the first page. Collegiality and Professionalism are expected of all faculty in the department. Because these elements are essential to the effective functioning of the department, members must work cooperatively with each other and in a congenial manner.

Annual Faculty Activity Report

Each year at the end of the spring term faculty will submit to the chair a Faculty Activity Report. This report will encompass the period of the previous spring, summer, and fall terms. The format provided in Appendix C1 of the University Handbook will serve as the template for this report. This report should be a thorough yet concise record of accomplishments and submitted in digital format to the department chair.

Evaluation Format

The following pages contain the evaluation format used by the CIS Department chair to analyze and comment on information submitted by faculty for retention, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. All information submitted by faculty for these reasons must follow the guidelines described in the Faculty Handbook and Appendices C1 and C2. Please follow carefully those guidelines and the format prescribed in the handbook. Based on the criteria listed below the chair will assign to individual faculty members a ranking of Superior, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in the categories defined for evaluation. Faculty must endeavor to respond succinctly to all items that pertain to their performance.

INTRODUCTION THE PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO RETENTION, TENURE, PROMOTION (RTP), POST-TENURE REVIEW

Objective evaluation of the quality and significance of scholarly achievement in each scholarly area is the cornerstone of the CIS Department’s RTP process.

Professional Portfolios make up the candidate-developed portion of the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) file. Faculty members scheduled for evaluation shall prepare a portfolio as described below. Verification of evidence in portfolios by RTP reviewers may occur at any level of the review process. If RTP reviewers find a discrepancy in the Portfolio, this will be documented in the recommendation. Portfolios may be submitted on CD, thumb drive, or other portable media.

The professional portfolio for tenure and promotion review will consist of a two-inch binder (or approximate equivalent number of pages if submitted using a CD, thumb drive, or other portable media) containing the following:

1. Current curriculum vitae.
2. A comprehensive reflective narrative: a three- to five-page narrative that synthesizes and interconnects the candidate's achievements in the three reviewed areas. The narrative unites all sections of the portfolio and ties achievements to NSU's mission, vision, and values. It should also provide an opportunity to reflect on professional growth and/or areas needing improvement.
3. SELECTED evidence supporting progress in teaching, scholarship, and professional service.
4. All applicable letters of review.
5. Portfolio sections that describe and document achievements in each of the three review areas. Documentation shall be limited to the period under review, which includes the years since the candidate was hired in a tenure-track or tenured position at NSU. If the candidate was hired with any number of years credited toward tenure or promotion documentation should be included from those years as well.
6. Additional supporting material, stored separately within the college, may be made available by the candidate for review.

Evidence shall consist of representative samples of the candidate's best work, not an exhaustive compilation of materials. Documentation within each of the portfolio sections shall focus on the quality and significance of the activity, using an appropriate combination of narrative and illustrative materials. It shall focus on documenting the activities of the individual faculty in Teaching, Scholarship, Professional/University Service, and Collegiality rather than on documenting the results of a project or a program. Similarly, in documenting collaborative work, faculty shall focus on their personal role and contribution to the collaborative process and outcomes. Candidates are encouraged to highlight activities which are integrative and collaborative and which serve NSU's mission, vision, and values.

Any material deemed by the faculty member as relevant to the evaluation or review may be contributed to the file within the limits of the two-inch binder's capacity. Those participating in the review process will house material not fitting the binder separately in the college for review.

EVIDENCE OF MEETING TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

To meet the criteria set forth by the Oklahoma Board of Regents as stated in the Faculty Handbook in section 3.361, all evaluation for tenure and/or promotion shall address whether each candidate has achieved excellence in:

- Effective Classroom Teaching
- Scholarly Activities
- Contribution to the Institution and Profession (university & professional service)
- Performance of Non-teaching Semi-administrative or Administrative Duties (if applicable)

The CIS Department is committed to the advancement of knowledge through Teaching, Scholarship, and Service that supports the academy and the community as well as Collegiality and Professionalism. The primary focus, however, is teaching, as stated in Strategic Plan Goal 1: "Provide a quality curricular and co-curricular education in a flexible student-centered environment."

The following list of activities is meant to provide examples of the kinds of evidence in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, Contribution to the Institution and Profession, Non-Teaching Duties, as well as Collegiality and Professionalism that may be considered for inclusion in a professional file for the CIS Department. The list is not meant to be exhaustive and examples may rise to the level of what constitutes scholarship. There may be other evidence, worthy of inclusion, which is not mentioned on the list. Also, the

evidence on the list should not be interpreted as requirements, but as examples of the kinds of evidence candidates, mentoring committees, chairs and deans may consider when evaluating a candidate's performance.

I. EFFECTIVE CLASSROOM TEACHING

Teaching includes all work that is intended to advance learning within an engaging, civil environment. The assessment of teaching should be evaluated as objectively as possible and consider quantitative indicators such as contact hours, number of preparations, number of students, number of advisees, student evaluation ratings, peer/observer ratings, etc.

1. Evidence of expected learning outcomes achieved by students and/or other outcomes achieved during the review period may be demonstrated through the following non-exclusive list of sample activities:

a. Range of Activities

Communication of knowledge and the development of appropriate skills and attitudes are the primary objectives of all faculty members. With the exception of i., the following list is not meant to be required of all faculty, but to indicate the possible activities that faculty members may use to achieve these objectives.

- i. Effective presentations, whether in lecture, laboratory, studio, or other venues.
- ii. "Active learning" pedagogy, such as use of active-learning techniques and tools to enhance student learning including, but not limited to, collaborative learning, problem-based learning, and student polling; integration of service learning and other community-based learning into courses; direction of laboratory-based student research, supervision of internships and co-op experiences; study-abroad activities.
- iii. Engaged teaching, course- or curriculum-related teaching/learning activities that involve students with the community in mutually beneficial ways. This includes, but is not limited to, service learning and other community-based learning experiences, internships and co-op experiences, and involvement in community-based research or other special projects.
- iv. Alternative delivery, such as team teaching or co-teaching; development and/or implementation of online courses; off-campus teaching; flexible scheduling and delivery models.
- v. Academic advising and mentoring, such as helping students plan their academic programs; presenting options for a career in the discipline or selection of a graduate or professional school; advising discipline-related student clubs or associations; sharing professional experience and expertise on an individual basis.
- vi. Involvement in special academic programs, such as development and/or implementation of special retention programs/efforts; participation in first-year programs and/or learning communities; development of courses for programs offered using alternative or innovative delivery models.
- vii. Other (as appropriate to the discipline, department, or college).

Documentary evidence of effective teaching and learning outcomes may include but is not limited to:

- a. Honors courses designed, taught, and evaluated.
- b. New courses introduced and evaluated.
- c. New courses designed, team-taught, and evaluated.

- d. On-line or ITV courses created, modified, and evaluated for impact on student learning.
- e. Seminars created and directed.
- f. Workshops created and directed.
- g. Webinars created and directed.
- h. Student projects directed that are not part of normal teaching duties.
 - i. Theses.
 - ii. Written and oral examination committees.
 - iii. Student service learning opportunities.
 - iv. Student clubs supervised.
- 2. Best practices reflecting contemporary methodologies.
- 3. Student course evaluations (summary sheet only), self-reflection, and modification of courses based upon those.
- 4. Peer evaluations incorporated into course improvement/modification.
- 5. Chair evaluations incorporated into course improvement/modification.
- 6. Original materials employed to create an innovative learning environment.
- 7. Evidence of effective advising.
 - i. Number of advisees.
 - ii. Time devoted to advising.
 - iii. Media employed in advising.
 - iv. Innovative advising approaches.
- 8. Methods employed accommodating student diversity
- 9. Peer observation of a faculty member in the classroom at the invitation of the instructor.

Evaluation of Faculty Achievements: Effective Classroom Teaching

Evaluation Period:

Name:

Date:

Unsatisfactory: Lack of organization; multiple, substantiated valid student complaints; student evaluations well below those customary in CIS courses; little evidence of efforts to improve; does not use classroom technology; does not update course readings/textbook; inadequate commitment to the criteria for evaluation of teaching.

Satisfactory: Evidence of effective classroom teaching, pedagogical innovation, student advisement and mentoring, promotion of student research, and a demonstrated commitment to a range of criteria, enumerated in the criteria above, identified by the university and department as indicators of teaching competence.

COMMENT AND ANALYSIS:

II. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Objective evaluation of the quality and significance of scholarly achievement in each scholarly area is the cornerstone of NSU's RTP process. For purposes of RTP, scholarship shall be construed to encompass all scholarly work that furthers the educational goals of students, faculty, academic units, the university as a whole, and the community. This definition allows for a greater recognition of diverse faculty activities. All faculty members have a responsibility to their students, their disciplines, the community, and the university to strive for excellence in intellectual, ethical, aesthetic, and creative achievement. Such achievement in at least one of the four scholarship areas identified in the Boyer Model (i.e., Teaching and Learning, Discovery, Integration, and Professional Application) is an indispensable qualification for retention, tenure, and promotion. Outcomes from the scholarship activities must be peer reviewed and professionally communicated as identified in Appendix C2. While the categorization of faculty roles into the three functional areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service serves to clarify a complex evaluation process, it is important to remember that these divisions function primarily as tools for the assessment of faculty work.

The four Boyer areas of scholarship as described below, underscore the fact that sharp distinctions between categories do not exist and that scholarly activities should emphasize collaborative and integrative relationships. It should also be emphasized that no faculty member shall be expected to commit an equal amount of time, make an equal contribution, or achieve equally in the four categories of scholarship described hereafter.

A. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Contributions to Teaching and Learning involve facilitating student learning, critical thought, and inquiry, as well as transmitting, integrating, interpreting, and extending knowledge. In addition, teaching should reveal and develop diverse perspectives, help to facilitate creativity and life-long learning, and work to integrate various principles central to the mission, vision, and values of Northeastern State University. The faculty member's contributions in Teaching and Learning may be evaluated for scholarly achievement if the criteria in Appendix C2 are met. Activities to consider in the evaluation of Teaching and Learning may include, but are not limited to, those listed in Appendix C1.

B. Scholarship of Discovery

Scholarly activity in this area constitutes academic work that confronts the unknown, seeks new understandings, and/or offers a new perspective on knowledge, through both individual and collaborative work both within and across disciplines. Activities to consider in the evaluation of Discovery may include, but are not limited to, those listed in Appendix C1.

C. Scholarship of Professional Application

The diversity of internal and external needs, as well as faculty training and experience, leads to many different forms of Professional Application. However, Professional Application activities share all of the following distinguishing characteristics:

- They contribute to the public welfare or the common good;
- They call upon faculty members' academic and/or professional expertise;
- They directly address or respond to real-world needs; and
- They support NSU's vision, mission, and values.

Faculty members who are engaged in Professional Application use their academic training and experience to serve the public and contribute to NSU's mission, vision, and values. Professional Application includes internal service to the discipline, department, college, and university and contributing to the shared governance system and institutional development through a variety of activities including service on committees, task forces, policy advisory bodies, and the development and management of academic programs.

Externally, Professional Application addresses the core values associated with regional stewardship, which can be found by reading material defining 'Making Place Matter', AASCU's initiative that has been adopted by the Oklahoma System of Higher Education Board of Regents. Activities to consider in the evaluation of Professional Application may include, but are not limited to, those listed in Appendix C1. In order to be considered as a form of scholarship, both peer review and dissemination of results are expected.

D. Scholarship of Integration

Integration is a scholarly area that gives meaning to isolated facts, putting them into perspective and into context. Connections across the disciplines to solve problems, raise questions for research and examination, and involve others from various backgrounds to create and initiate new ways of thinking all reflect this area of scholarship. Integration can also involve fitting original research into larger intellectual patterns and work underway to lead new understandings. Key words often used to reflect the possibilities of scholarship inherent within this area include interdisciplinary, integrative, and interpretive. Activities to consider in the evaluation of integration may include, but are not limited to, those listed in Appendix C1.

Evidence of outcomes achieved during the review period in at least one of the four areas of the Boyer Model of the Scholarship of Teaching, the Scholarship of Discovery, the Scholarship of Integration, and the Scholarship of Application:

a. Range of Activities

There may be activities that qualify for more than one of the following categories. This list is not meant to be required of all faculty, but to indicate the broad range of scholarship and creative activity possible.

- i. Scholarship of Discovery, including basic and applied research; development and application of theory.
- ii. Scholarship of Integration, including interdisciplinary research; new interpretations of current knowledge; integration of knowledge from diverse sources.
- iii. Scholarship of Application/Engagement, including community-based research, technical assistance, demonstration projects, impact assessment, and policy analysis; scholarly work relating to the study or promotion of public engagement.
- iv. Scholarship of Teaching, including applied research regarding various pedagogies, student learning, and assessment practices; development and dissemination of materials for use in teaching beyond one's own classroom.

b. Documentary evidence of scholarly activities may include but is not limited to:

- 1. Articles published in refereed journals.
- 2. Chapters published in scholarly books.
- 3. Encyclopedia entries.

- 4. Scholarly books written or edited.
- 5. Monographs published.
- 6. Book reviews.
- 7. Textbooks published.
- 8. Study guides published.
- 9. Test banks published.
- 10. Educational research.
- 11. DVDs, You-tubes, and videos published.
- 12. Papers presented at professional meetings.
- 13. Sessions chaired at professional meetings.
- 14. Panel participation at professional meetings.
- 15. Papers reviewed for professional meetings.
- 16. Public presentations of scholarship.
- 17. Judge of student papers and presentations.
- 18. Radio and television presentations.
- 19. Editor of or referee for peer-reviewed journals.
- 20. Grants.
- 21. Awards.

Evaluation of Faculty Achievements: Scholarship

Evaluation Period:

Name:

Date:

Unsatisfactory: Lacks a research agenda; unable to document research progress; evidences little effort to make research results public; demonstrates insignificant scholarly and professional growth; inadequate commitment to the criteria for evaluation of research

Satisfactory: Demonstrates a specific research agenda as outlined by the Boyer model; documents annual research progress; exhibits professional activity and growth; and displays commitment to excelling in the list of activities outlined in the criteria column above.

COMMENT AND ANALYSIS:

III. SERVICE TO THE INSTITUTION, COMMUNITY AND PROFESSION

CIS recognizes a variety of forms of service.

a. Range of Activities

The range of activities listed below is not meant to be required of all faculty, but to indicate the broad range of service to which the NSU faculty can contribute.

i. Service to the university

- (1) Governance, such as involvement in program or departmental administration; active service or leadership on committees, task forces, councils, search committees, and Faculty Council.
- (2) Mentoring, advising, and sharing expertise, such as conducting workshops for other faculty; organizing colloquia and seminars; mentoring new faculty; supervising student activities or student groups.
- (3) Development/advancement, such as participation in student recruitment; participation in fund raising; public relations and marketing of program; retention activities that strengthen a program or program enrollment.
- (4) Other (to be added by the college or department).

ii. Service to the discipline/profession

- (1) Governance, such as taking on a leadership role in a professional association; participating in the organizing, convening, or presiding for an association meeting or function.
- (2) Scholarly Activity such as acting as a member of journal's editorial board or journal editor; reviewing books for publication, grant proposals for funding agency, conference submissions for possible acceptance, and articles for journal publication.
- (3) Sharing expertise, such as serving on an accrediting team; writing questions for licensure or certification exams; participating in a program review for a university.
- (4) Other (to be added by the college or department).

iii. Service to the community

- (1) Providing service to a local, regional, or global community or governmental agency, such as the PreK-12 community, non-profit agencies, economic development groups.
- (2) Facilitating or improving organizational development in the community.
- (3) Providing services to support or enhance economic development in the region.
- (4) Providing clinical services related to physical health, mental health, and wellness.
- (5) Providing consulting services or technical assistance.
- (6) Planning and/or implementing public events, such as teaching non-credit classes or workshops; providing public lectures, arts performances, art displays; participating on panels or symposia for public presentation.
- (7) Serving on boards, committees, commissions utilizing one's disciplinary expertise.
- (8) Providing public writing services, including grant proposals and grant awards for an organization or community.
- (9) Other (to be added by the college or department).

b. Documentary Evidence of Professional/University Service and outcomes achieved during the review period may include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Creation of multidisciplinary courses and programs.
 2. Regional work integrated into programmatic design.
 3. Facilitation of cross-campus activities and experiences.
 4. Delivery of professional expertise to colleagues across campus.
 5. Service on university-wide task forces, work groups, and committees.
 6. Service learning involvement.
 7. Supervision of field activities.
 8. Committee assignments. (State duties and positions held.)
 9. Involvement in Faculty Council, task forces, etc. (State duties/positions held.)
 10. Assessment duties (Including but not limited to program review, prioritization, strategic planning, etc.).
 11. Professional organizations. (Membership, offices held, duties, etc.)
 12. Community involvement. (Explain value to the community/university.)
 13. Consulting.
 14. Administrative positions held.
 15. Duties and time devoted to administrative duties.
 16. Number of persons supervised.
 17. Evidence of effective advising.
 - i. Number of advisees.
 - ii. Time devoted to advising.
 - iii. Media employed in advising.
 - iv. Innovative advising approaches.
 - v. Methods employed accommodating student diversity.
 18. Reports, recommendations, or other written documents generated by the activity.
 19. Letters from chairs or colleagues (including external professional colleagues) with whom faculty worked.
 20. Other written records documenting the faculty member's quantity/quality of service.
 21. Letters from community partners or those who benefited from the outreach activity.
 22. Letters from external agencies or organizations attesting to the quality and value of the work.
 23. Completed evaluation forms from those who participated in the activity.
 24. Evidence that the work has served as a model for others.
 - i. Committee service (university, college, department, nature and time spent on these)
 - ii. Service on Faculty or Graduate Council
 - iii. Participation in student recruitment
 - iv. Committee assignments in professional organizations (nature of work, dates and time required)
 - v. Student advising/counseling load (could be here or in IV, A 6 above)
 - vi. Special university, college or departmental coordinator or other service foundations
 - vii. Other activities which enhance the image of the university, represent the university to the public, further the goals and direction of the university, or exercise one's professional competence for the benefit of the public.
- c. Performance of non-teaching, semi-administrative, or administrative duties (if applicable) For example, serving as Department Head or Program Coordinator.

Evaluation of Faculty Achievements: Contributions to Profession, University, Community
Evaluation Period:

Name:

Date:

Unsatisfactory: Evidences little or no professional, university, or community service; inadequate commitment to the criteria for evaluation of service to the profession and the university community.

Satisfactory: Demonstrates a willingness to assist in forwarding the mission and goals of the department, college, and university, as well as the greater community beyond Northeastern's boundaries and displays a commitment to the objectives enumerated in the criteria listed above.

COMMENT AND ANALYSIS:



NORTHEASTERN
STATE UNIVERSITY

**Review of Departmental
Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Guidelines**

Name of Department:

Cherokee and Indigenous Studies

College or Unit:

Liberal Arts

Semester / Year of Current Review:

Spring 2020

Semester / Year of Next Review:

Spring 2022

Department Faculty Vote Date:

April 10, 2020

Department Approval Signatures



Department Senior Faculty Member

7-9-20
Date


Department Chair

7-9-20
Date

Approval Signatures


College Dean

7/15/2020
Date


Provost / Vice President of Academic Affairs

7-27-2020
Date


Northeastern State University, President

9/10/2020
Date