



VCU School of Education

Policies And Procedures

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section One	Vision, Mission, Values, Strategic Plan	3
Section Two	Organization of the School of Education	4
Section Three	An Overview of Faculty Workload	13
Section Four	Procedures for the Annual Faculty Evaluation	22
Section Five	School of Education Study Research Leave Policy	32
Section Six	Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure	35
Section Seven	Guidelines for Third Year Pre-Tenure Faculty Review	82
Section Eight	School of Education Committee Governance Policy	85
	- Appendix A – CARC Bylaws	91
Section Nine	The Faculty Organization	99
Section Ten	Emeriti Faculty Policies and Procedures	100
Section Eleven	Procedures for Screening School of Education Nominations for University Awards	102
Section Twelve	Procedures for Updating the Faculty Policies and Procedures	104

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION VISION, MISSION, VALUES AND STRATEGIC PLAN**Vision**

To be a leader in responsive, needs-driven and research-based educational practices that transform the lives of those we serve in our communities, especially those who have been historically marginalized.

Mission

We advance learning and knowledge through impactful research, teaching and engagement to provide our students, professionals and communities with the tools to create progressive change. We prepare and support professionals to lead change and inform social, economic, health and educational policy and practice.

Values

- Innovative – Cultivate discovery, creativity, originality, inventiveness and talent.
- Inclusive – Ensure a climate of mutual trust and respect where individuals of differing cultural backgrounds, identities, abilities and life experiences are embraced, engaged and empowered to drive excellence and success.
- Community-focused – Build deliberate/intentional relationships with the surrounding community and engage in actions that focus on the needs of its people.
- Collaborative – Foster collegiality and cooperation with internal and external partners to advance learning, research and service.

Strategic Plan: VCU SOE Recalibrated Strategic Plan, 2022-2025

<https://soe.vcu.edu/about-us/2019-2025-strategic-plan/>

ORGANIZATION OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Office of the Dean - The Dean of the School of Education serves as the chief academic officer for the school, and is directly responsible for all activities within the School of Education. Other administrators, assistant/associate deans, directors and coordinators may be appointed by the Dean and organized into appropriate offices and/or units to facilitate the administrative and programmatic functions of the school.

Dean's Cabinet – The Dean's cabinet is composed of the Dean, Assistant/Associate Deans, Department Chairs, the chair of Faculty Organization, the chair of Staff Council, and may include other Directors as appropriate to the business being conducted by the Cabinet. This Cabinet meets on a monthly basis.

Chairs' Council - The Chairs' Council is composed of the Dean, Assistant/Associate Deans, and Department chairs. This group meets on a monthly basis.

The Leadership Council is composed of the Dean, Assistant/Associate Deans, Department Chairs, Directors, Center Directors, the Chair of the School of Education Faculty Organization or their designee, and the Staff Council chair or their designee. This council meets on a regular basis and is advisory to the Dean.

Departments - The School of Education is organized into four academic departments:

Counseling and Special Education

Educational Leadership

Foundations of Education

Teaching and Learning

The department is the basic administrative unit for the School of Education. Each department is responsible for degree and certificate programs, coordination among several programs in its jurisdiction and initiating personnel actions, and is the basic budget and cost unit. Each department is expected to coordinate staffing across programs and among faculty and to engage in programs of research and scholarly activity and professional development. Departments consist of a department chair, faculty, and staff.

Department Chairs - Each department is administered by a department chair who also serves as a member of a program faculty, contributing to a specific program and curriculum. Department chairs serve as the chief administrative official for the four departments and report to the Dean. Department chairs and Deans meet monthly as part of the Dean's Cabinet, as described above.

Program Faculty - Program areas in large departments with multiple programs are established upon recommendation by the faculty to the Dean. The concept of program areas conveys two overlapping elements. The first represents professional specialization in which faculty interests and values are primary. The second represents an organizational scheme that focuses on program development,

student learning, and program outcomes. Each faculty member within a department shall have membership in at least one program area. Affiliate membership in other program areas is also encouraged. The Dean's Office shall keep the official core faculty roster of the School of Education.

Program Coordinators - Each faculty program group will select a person to act as coordinator in consultation with the department chair. The coordinator serves with the same status as any other school-wide committee chair, and no administrative responsibility or authority is implied. A program coordinator is responsible for working with the department chair in facilitating the necessary work of the program.

Faculty Affiliates - In accordance with university policy, individuals who are faculty in other departments or schools/colleges, or individuals who are in staff positions, may be granted affiliate faculty status with the appropriate credentials (i.e., terminal degree in relevant field, as well as meeting SACS-COC requirements for credentials related to any teaching assignments). Applications for affiliate status require approval of the primary position supervisor, a vote of the full-time department faculty, and support of the Department Chair, with final approval by the Dean. Faculty affiliates may teach classes, supervise dissertations or other student activities, engage in teaching-related committee service, and serve on SOE faculty committees with the approval of the Chair of the department of their affiliate status and their primary supervisor. Faculty affiliates in the SOE retain voting rights for their primary position (i.e., voting rights in their home department as a faculty member, or voting rights in their home unit as a staff member) where they should participate in shared governance. Faculty Affiliate status does not convey faculty governance rights within the SOE (e.g., to propose or modify curricula, to make admissions decisions, or to engage in faculty status decisions).

Centers - The School of Education houses 8 centers that have research and/or academic missions. Centers are primarily funded from external sources, such as grants and contracts, and are made up of faculty and staff members. Each center has a department home; this ensures that faculty and staff in the centers are connected to the SOE departmental structure.

Center Directors - Each center is administered by a center director who is also a faculty member. Center directors are the chief administrative official of their Centers and report to the dean or the associate dean. They meet monthly as a group of directors with the Associate Dean of Research & Faculty Development, and are members of the Leadership Council.

Faculty Governance and Shared Governance - Faculty in the School of Education are involved in decision-making processes related to curriculum, resources and matters which affect faculty and students through standing committees, personnel committees, and task forces, and by election or appointment to University bodies such as the University Council, Faculty Senate, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and Graduate Council. In addition, departments and SOE standing committees provide considerable faculty monitoring and control of critical functions and policies.

The multi-constituency forum for governance in the School is the faculty meeting called and chaired by the Dean, and planned in coordination with the Faculty Organization Chair. The School of Education also has standing committees. Each committee includes representatives from the departments, although not all departments are directly represented on all standing committees in a given year. In

addition, there is at least one ex officio member on each standing committee to represent the Dean and to convey the concerns of the Dean to the committee.

Faculty rights and responsibilities within the University are set forth in the VCU Faculty Handbook, <https://faculty.provost.vcu.edu/faculty-resources/faculty-handbook/>, and through subsequently adopted [policies and procedures](#). Faculty members who serve in positions identified by the School of Education to be non-tenure eligible positions will be designated as term faculty. Appointments may be either full or part-time, paid or unpaid, and do not lead to tenure. Renewal tenure-eligible and term (non-tenure) appointments shall be at the option of the university.

Tenure and Promotion of the faculty of the School of Education are governed by Section Six: Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure which are consistent with the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures of Virginia Commonwealth University. <https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

Evaluation - An evaluation of each faculty member of the School of Education is conducted annually. The procedures for this process are set forth in Section Four: Procedures for Developing the Annual Faculty Evaluation

The evaluation process for administrators (associate/assistant deans, directors, and department chairs) is conducted annually. The Dean's evaluations are forwarded directly to the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. Administrators have the responsibility to discuss evaluations annually with the Dean or the Dean's designee.

Salary - Recommendations for faculty salary originate with Department Chairs or Center Directors. The Dean and Associate Deans shall review the recommendations, and the Dean shall make final recommendations to the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Faculty Workload - Faculty workload in the School is governed by the policies of Section Three: An Overview of Faculty Workload. Teaching assignments typically originate with the program faculty and are recommended to the Department Chair, who, in turn, recommends assignments to the Dean.

Revised and approved by SOE Faculty and Dean, 04/02/2024

Revised and approve by SOE Faculty and Dean, 05/20/2024

ADMINISTRATIVE JOB DESCRIPTIONS

Dean, School of Education

The *Dean* serves as the chief executive officer of the School of Education. Responsibilities of the Dean include: oversight of the academic programs of the School, duties associated with the management of academic programs, fiscal, personnel and general administration, student personnel matters, and internal and external representation duties associated with the Office. The Dean chairs the faculty of the School, the School's Leadership Council and the Dean's Cabinet. As head of the unit responsible for the overall coordination of the teacher preparation programs at the University, the Dean serves as the chief teacher education certification officer and chairs the Professional Education Coordinating Council.

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies

The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies in the School of Education (SOE) is responsible for the oversight of all certificate, baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral level academic programs. While the primary responsibility is to ensure that SOE programs are in compliance with University policies, specific duties include leadership for academic program review; liaison with the VCU Graduate School, VCU Office of Academic Affairs, and State Council of Higher Education in Virginia; assistance with program proposal development, appeals, graduation requirements, and graduate student funding. Of particular importance is providing the Dean and Department Chairs with accurate and timely information to be used in decision making. Finally, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies represents the SOE on the Graduate Dean's Advisory Council and on other SOE and University committees as assigned, including the SOE Curriculum and Academic Resources Committee, the Assessment Committee and the Academic Appeals Committee.

Assistant Dean for Student Affairs and Inclusive Excellence

Leads efforts for the VCU School of Education Student Affairs unit including the Office for Student Success, Office for Strategic Recruitment, and the Student Services Center. Works with Student Services Center which primarily includes the functions of undergraduate and graduate clinical placements, student teaching, internships and externships in the metro school divisions. Works with Office for Student Success includes advising support for undergraduate and graduate students after formal admission to academic programs; processing of graduate program documents; initiating transactions associated with student academic progress. Works with the Office for Strategic Recruitment and recruitment and pipeline programs; meetings with public school counselors, high school students, prospective transfer students, and community partners for SOE recruitment. Engages with the VCU legal department, risk management, SAEO, and other VCU services to ensure that students access resources and receive due process in all matters. Leads efforts for the SOE to build and maintain a diverse and inclusive community in which people of all cultural backgrounds and life experiences are supported and valued. Provides education and training opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to advance the objectives of diversity and inclusion in the workplace. Oversees the SOE

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee and participates in university program planning and initiatives. Represents the SOE on VCU councils and committees to enhance the quality of academic, social, and community development of students. Contributes to the development and implementation of VCU student affairs policies, and leading policy development for the SOE. Supports and advocates for students throughout their educational experience, including orientation, degree certification, and commencement.

Associate Dean of Research and Faculty Development

The Associate Dean of Research and Faculty Development is an active member of the Dean's leadership team and works collaboratively with individual faculty members, departments and Centers of the School in facilitating the School's research and scholarship mission. The Associate Dean of Research and Faculty Development coordinates research activities within the School and with the University's Office of the Vice President for Research and assists in establishing effective collaborative networks with other University units, school divisions, and local, state, national and international groups. The Associate Dean of Research and Faculty Development represents the School of Education at meetings related to research activities within the institution. The Office of Research and Faculty Development provides support for School of Education faculty in: establishing an active School research and scholarship agenda; identifying collaborative research and scholarship opportunities among School of Education faculty, VCU faculty and staff and community partners; notifying faculty of research and external funding opportunities in specific interest areas; providing professional development opportunities that advance the research and scholarship mission of the School; and developing, submitting and implementing externally funded research and training grants and projects. The Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development maintains an up-to-date database regarding external funding secured by School of Education faculty. The Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development serves as an ex-officio member of the Research and Professional Development standing committee.

Department Chair

Department Chairs are expected to function both as program administrator and as faculty member. The administrative tasks and responsibilities will vary according to the number of faculty and complexity of programs within a department, but typically include faculty annual evaluation and workload, faculty mentoring and development, leadership of departmental meetings, committees, and initiatives, leadership of curriculum, recruitment and marketing, program initiatives, and responding to student issues.

Executive Director of Finance and Business Administration

The **Executive Director of Finance and Business Administration** is responsible for the administrative organizational structure for finances, personnel, IT, and space. Primary duties include managing the financial accounts and budgets in educational and general (E&G) programs, sponsored programs, facilities and administrative cost recoveries (FACR), university funds, and endowments; advising the Dean on multiple topics germane to strategic planning for the School of Education; assisting with revenue enhancement initiatives, including implementing EPT-A agreements. The Executive Director

is also responsible for human resources and provides direction for SOE facilities planning and space utilization.

Director of Ed.D. in Leadership

The Director of the Ed.D. in Leadership reports to the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership. The director is responsible for the implementation of all policies and procedures related to students in the Ed.D. program in the School of Education. These include, but are not limited to recruitment, admissions, advising, course scheduling, programming, retention, student progress reviews, formative assessment, program improvement, and capstone committees. The Director chairs the Ed.D. Admissions Committee.

Director of Ph.D. Studies

The Director of Ph.D. Studies reports to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies. The director is responsible for the implementation of all policies and procedures related to students in Ph.D. programs in the School of Education. These include, but are not limited to recruitment, admissions, retention, comprehensive examinations, externship placements, graduate assistant selection and funding and dissertation committees. In addition, the director chairs the Ph.D. Policy Board.

Director of Student Services Center

Reporting to the Assistant Dean of Student Affairs and inclusive Excellence, the Director of the SOE Student Services Center provides leadership, operational and managerial support for three classified staff, and student assistants who deliver the Center's services. Ensures excellence in the delivery of center services including academic advising, admission to teacher preparation, practica, internships, externships and other clinical placements, and state licensure; Also includes SVEA Student Organization, monitors monthly VCLA Report, oversees SOE Scholarships and annual Diversity Report. Plan and manage the School's Welcome Week activities, and other campus retention initiatives; Initiate MOUs and oversee payments of MOU to local school divisions for clinical supervisors in K-12 schools; as well as conduct yearly employee performance evaluations.

Director of Data Analytics

Leadership and oversight of a complex and diverse set of activities designed to provide accurate, timely, actionable data and analytics to support decision making in the School of Education and the education programs hosted by its partners in the College of Humanities and the School of Arts. Provide tactical and strategic leadership for 1) Data management, analysis, and reporting; 2) Training and education to enhance data literacy; 3) School-wide survey management; 4) Strategic planning; 5) Accreditation quality assurance systems; 6) Student learning assessment. Supervision of 2.5 FTE staff.

Specific duties include: Creating a data infrastructure that is responsive to the strategic needs of and critical questions posed by decision makers, including faculty, staff, and partners; Accessing, integrating, and leveraging data from multiple domains to support planning, decision making, internal and external reporting across student and academic affairs, SOE operations; Providing consultation on assessment, evaluation, and survey initiatives; Constructing and administering

surveys supporting the continuous improvement of programs, departments, offices and centers (e.g., program evaluations, unit operations, and administrative evaluations); Configuring and implementing the assessment system to facilitate student learning outcomes data collection for academic programs; Providing assessment system end-user training and support for faculty coordinators in academic programs; Configuring and maintaining an accurate completer database; Assessing and evaluating student and academic affairs, enrollment management, as well as operations, to ensure the success and learning of our students and enhanced school effectiveness; Applying a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion lens to our analytics work; Disseminating data and analytics that provide insight about strategic efforts, the success and learning of students, and SOE performance; Facilitating a website, web-based reports, and dashboards, in partnership with Communications, that provide internal and external stakeholders with access to timely, accurate and actionable data; Building data literacy across SOE to support data-informed decision making.

Director of Strategic Recruitment and Outreach

The Director of Strategic Recruitment and Outreach leads the development and implementation of a centralized short and long-range strategic graduate and undergraduate student recruitment plans that directly impact the operational goals of the VCU School of Education. Critical to recruitment, the Director continually identifies and establishes relationships with schools/partners to develop specialized initiatives in emerging markets that support the school's academic program growth. This role collects and analyzes necessary data to educate and inform critical stakeholders to support a culture of data driven decision making within the context of student centered best practice in strategic recruitment. The role supervises full-time staff and a large student employee team in the Office of Strategic Recruitment (OSR) team who are responsible for planning the programs and services for all prospective students to the School of Education. To meet the evolving market needs of undergraduate and graduate education programs, this role must continually research best practices in strategic recruitment and outreach and integrate this information into the School of Education strategic plans, policies, and practices in supporting equitable access to academic programs.

Director of Strategic Communications

Reporting to the dean, the Director of Strategic Communications continuously shapes and strengthens the narrative and reputation of the School of Education (SOE) through multifaceted communications. This person oversees the SOE unit website and social media channels, ensuring an engaging, informative and results-driven online presence measured by analytics and focused on cultivating new prospective students, belonging among the greater SOE community and the overall prominence of SOE. The position is responsible for content creation designed to elevate the accomplishments and insights of SOE students, faculty, staff, alums and community partners while bolstering the institution's national reputation and rankings. Additionally, the Director leads the branding of SOE by overseeing the design and production of innovative digital and print marketing materials, driving recruitment efforts, alumni engagement, and SOE work products and accomplishments. Collaboration with the SOE Office of Strategic Recruitment and Outreach office ensures alignment with marketing strategies that effectively communicate the SOE's program offerings and achievements to prospective SOE students.

Executive Director of Development

Reporting to the Senior Associate Vice President for Development, School, Colleges and Units (SAVP), the Executive Director of Development will serve as the Lead Development Officer (LDO) for the School of Education. The Executive Director of Development works directly with the dean, SAVP, and Development and Alumni Relations (DAR) colleagues assigned to the School of Education as well as those across the division, to achieve Virginia Commonwealth University's (VCU) fundraising goals by designing and measuring annual long-range fundraising plans tied to the strategic needs of the School of Education. The position is responsible for managing a portfolio of top prospects with a giving capacity of \$50,000 or greater, as well as working with other potential giving prospects and cultivating a culture of philanthropy among SOE alums and friends.

Director of Research Services

The Director of Research Services for the School of Education is responsible for all aspects of pre-award and programmatic post-award administration as it relates to grants and sponsored programs at the school. The Director of Research Services is involved in the school's research development, proposal preparation and submission, faculty and graduate student professional development programming, developing and facilitating collaborations with university and external partners, and serving as a key liaison with university central grants offices, as well as funding agency contacts as necessary. Occupying a key position in the development and management of external funding to support activities of the School of Education, the Director of Research Services is expected to have considerable experience and knowledge of the research enterprise in an academic and university setting, and more specifically at a Carnegie Classified Research 1 Institution, to include advanced knowledge of university grant submission systems and policies, agency specific systems and policies, university research leadership and structures, faculty demands and research development needs, and service and advocacy through committee service at the school, university, and national level. The Director of Research Services is expected to serve in a leadership capacity at the school and the university and works in conjunction with the Associate Dean for Research, Associate Dean for Faculty Development, and Research Staff in the office and the school to advance the research and knowledge creation and dissemination mission of the school.

UNIVERSITY POLICIES

Virginia Commonwealth University approved policies may be found at:
<https://president.vcu.edu/policies/>

AN OVERVIEW OF FACULTY WORKLOAD

VCU School of Education Faculty Workload Policy¹

General Information

Faculty are one of the most critical and important resources at any university. The aim of this policy is to articulate how faculty contribute to the success of the school through a combination of research/scholarship, teaching, and service while ensuring workload equity and efficient use of faculty resources. Specific attention has been given to enhancing the clarity of faculty activities to provide greater transparency while supporting flexibility and autonomy to enable faculty to make planful decisions about the nature of their work. This policy has been developed so that the areas where faculty are excelling are emphasized in their daily work.

This policy is designed to facilitate faculty contributions to the R1 mission of the university while maximizing and accounting for the instructional time faculty spend in direct contact with students within specific limits determined by research and service effort. As a result, the policy is designed to guide faculty effort allocation in ways that are flexible and accommodate differences in faculty activities across teaching, research and service activities.

In order to achieve these aims faculty workload is defined in terms of units, where 1% effort = .33 units and 10% effort = 3 units. Using a more incremental approach to defining faculty work affords greater flexibility and ensures the accounting of all activities where faculty expend effort. The allocation of units is individualized based on faculty appointment, commitments and goals. The specific activities within teaching, research, and service for a faculty member's evaluation are negotiated with the Department Chair. Any changes to a faculty member's Initial Work Plan must be approved by the Department Chair prior to implementation.

This policy will be re-evaluated periodically to ensure appropriate alignment with unit definitions and allocations and to maintain the school and departments' ability to meet short and long-term goals.

Workload Allocation by Faculty Appointment

This policy applies to all full-time faculty in the School of Education. The faculty in the school hold a variety of appointments that reflect different areas of focus and responsibility across teaching, research and service activities. These appointments include term, tenure-eligible and tenured faculty.

Specific to tenured faculty, this policy incorporates three different pathways - blended, teaching, and research focused – to guide faculty effort allocation. These pathways allow faculty to balance their efforts across teaching, research and service in ways that are commensurate with their goals,

¹ The November 2023 revisions to the School of Education faculty workload policy were based on the recommendations of a representative committee of faculty who piloted the unit-based approach to faculty workload allocation throughout the fall 2023 semester. This revised version is being piloted at the department level during 2024.

interests and strengths. Table 1 presents an overview of unit and effort allocation for each type of faculty appointment according to the dominant focal areas of their work and contract parameters.

Table 1

Overview of Workload Unit Allocation by Faculty Appointment

Academic Appointment	Focus	Teaching Units per calendar year	Research/Scholarship Units	Service Units
Term 9 months	Teaching	24 (80%)	0	6 (20%)
Term 12 months	Teaching	30 (80%)	0	7.5 (20%)
	Research	0	30 (80%)	7.5 (20%)
Tenured	Pathway 1: Blended Focus	15 (50%)	9 (30%)	6 (20%)
	Pathway 2: Research Focus	12 (40%)	12 (40%)	6 (20%)
	Pathway 3: Teaching Focus	18 (60%)	6 (20%)	6 (20%)
Tenure-Eligible ¹	Years 1-2	9 (30%)	18 (60%)	3 (10%)
	Years 3-4	12 (40%)	15 (50%)	3 (10%) ²
	Year 5	12 (40%)	12 (40%)	6 (20%)
	Year 6 (under P&T review)	12-15 (40-50%, determine pathway)	9-12 (30-40% determine pathway)	6 (20%)

1. Exact teaching, research, and service units may be negotiated with reference to their accomplishments documented in their FAR and IWP

2. Research/service units in years 3 and 4 may be flexible to ensure alignment with promotion and tenure guidelines and meet school and departmental needs.

Tenured Faculty Pathways

Tenured faculty have three possible pathways for distribution of their 30 units.

- The **Blended pathway** is intended for faculty who engage in teaching, research and scholarship activities and represents the base distribution of units, with 15 teaching, 9 research, and 6 service units. Tenured faculty on the blended pathway are expected to maintain a rating of *at least very good in teaching and research/scholarship* on the appropriate annual evaluation rubric.
- The **research-focused pathway** is intended for faculty with an emphasis in their activities on the pursuit of external funding (e.g., non-VCU funding, foundation funding, state & federal agency funding, etc.) with 12 teaching units, 12 research units, and 6 service units. This pathway requires a faculty member to have:
 - a) bought out at least 10% of their research time on external funds during the academic year (excludes summer) AND have achieved a rating of *at least very good in research/scholarship* on the appropriate rubric for the previous evaluation period.

OR

 - b) applied for external funding to cover at least 5% of their salary during the academic year (excludes summer) on at least one award per year AND have achieved a rating of *excellent in research/scholarship* on the appropriate rubric for the previous evaluation period.
- The **teaching-focused pathway** is intended for faculty with an emphasis in their activities on teaching, with 18 teaching units, 6 research units, and 6 service units. A faculty member may choose to move to this pathway in consultation with their chair. Alternatively, they may be assigned to this pathway if they achieve a rating of *less than very good in research/scholarship* on the appropriate rubric for two subsequent evaluation periods. Tenured faculty on the teaching-focused pathway must maintain a rating of *at least satisfactory in research and scholarship* on the appropriate rubric for the previous evaluation period or they may be assigned to a 80% teaching and 20% service load.
- **Pathway Assignments and Modifications: All initial pathway assignments and modifications require discussions between the department and faculty member and dean approval.**
 - Faculty Initiated:
 - Tenured faculty who would like to change their pathway (e.g., research to blended; blended to research) should consult with the chair of their department who will work with them on an appropriate plan and timeline for doing so, with approval from the dean.
 - Department Chair Initiated:
 - Research → Blended pathway: Department chairs can recommend that tenured faculty move from the research to the blended pathway based on:
 - Annual evaluation ratings in research/scholarship ratings of below “very good” and grant activity over a two-year period
 - Annual evaluation ratings in teaching of at least “very good”
 - Example: A faculty member has consistently received “very good” research/scholarship ratings for several years. They have a year when they receive a “satisfactory” rating. The faculty member would have one more year to improve their research/scholarship before moving to the blended or teaching focused pathway.

- Blended → Teaching pathway: Department chairs can recommend that tenured faculty move from the blended to the teaching-focus pathway based on:
 - Annual evaluation ratings in research/scholarship ratings of below “satisfactory” over a two-year period
 - Annual evaluation ratings in teaching of at least “very good”
 - In cases where faculty members have a combination of “very good” and “satisfactory ratings” in teaching, additional professional development in teaching will be planned.
- Blended → Research pathway: Department can recommend that faculty move from the blended to the research pathway based on grant submission activity and awards and/or research/scholarship evaluations of at least “very good” over a two-year period.

Term Faculty Effort Allocation

- **Term teaching faculty** have a standard work plan as follows: for 9-month faculty, 24 teaching units, 0 research units, and 6 service units; for 12-month faculty, 30 teaching units, 0 research units, and 7.5 service units. These unit allocations align with the 80% and 20% effort distribution for teaching and service.
- **Term research faculty** have a standard work plan as follows: for 9-month faculty, 0 teaching units, 24 research units, and service units; for 12-month faculty, 0 teaching units, 30 research units, and 7.5 service units. These unit allocations align with the 80% and 20% effort distribution for research and service.

TEACHING

Teaching effort includes a variety of activities that includes direct interaction and support of student learning, including assignment to a credit-bearing course, mentoring and supervision activities. As shown in Table 1, the number of teaching units expected of faculty is dependent on appointment (tenured, pre-tenure, term). Fewer teaching units for tenured and tenure-eligible faculty are balanced by greater accountability in the area of research/scholarship.

Minimum Expectations: All faculty, with the exception of department chairs, deans, and term research faculty, are responsible for – at a minimum – 6 teaching units in the School of Education per academic year, with at least 3 units based on course instruction. Teaching activity types and units are found in Table 2.

Maximum Expectations: Teaching units accumulated based on non-course related teaching (e.g., fractional) activities should not exceed 3 units per year.

Teaching Activities: Different types of teaching activities involving direct interactions with students and related units are shown in Table 2. An essential part of teaching is maintaining a balance across different types of courses and student audiences to the extent possible. Department Chairs will work with faculty to ensure there is a balance of types of courses/levels across a two-year period. Teaching activities may involve providing sustained support, guidance and mentoring to other full-time and part-time faculty. Department chairs may negotiate with faculty appropriate fractional teaching unit allocations or other support for this type of work, not to exceed 3 units per academic year.

Table 2*Summary of Teaching Activities and Unit Allocation*

Teaching Activities	Credits per semester	# of students	Teaching Units
Course Instruction*			
Undergraduate (e.g., EDUS 301)	3	~20-50	3
Masters (e.g., EDUS 607/617)	3	~12-25	3
Doctoral (e.g., EDUS712)	3	~8-15	3
Fractional Teaching Activities			
1. Course-based Supervision			
a. Undergraduate			
Independent Study (EDUS 400)	3	1 (max 4 per semester)	.25 per student
Practicum/Supervision	1-2		approximately .1-.2 per student depending on program
Internship/Student teaching	4-6		
b. Masters			
Independent Study (EDUS 641)	3	1 (max 4 per semester)	.25 per student
Practicum/Internship (e.g., SEDP 655/656)	1-3	8-12	approximately .1-.2 per student depending on program
Externship (e.g. SEDP 700, ECSE 700 student teaching)	2-3	1-8	
c. Doctoral			
Independent Study (EDUS 641)	3	1 (max 4 per semester)	.25 per student
Internships	3	1 (max 4 per semester)	.25 per student

Directed Research (e.g., EDUC 797)	1-3	1 (max 4 per semester)	.25 (per student, max 3 semesters)
PhD Dissertation Research (e.g., EDUC 899; dissertation committee chair)	1-9	1	.5 (per student, per semester)
EdD Capstone (e.g., EDLP 798; EDLP 799 capstone committee chair)	3	3-5 students per capstone; 2 capstones per section	3
2. PhD & EdD Committee Membership			
PhD Dissertation Chair – see above for EDUC 899	NA	NA	NA
EdD Capstone Chair – see above for EDLP 798 and EDLP 799	NA	NA	NA
Non-chair dissertation and capstone membership	NA	1-5	.25 (once per student/once per capstone)
3. Program Coordination**: number of units and allocation to teaching and/or service should be determined in consultation with the Department Chair with 1-3 unit range.			1-3 50% of units in teaching; 50% of units in service based on negotiated units

*Very small classes (defined as a class with enrollment *below* the minimum) can fulfill *a fraction* of the assigned teaching load. This constraint applies to all courses, all levels. Very small classes may be offered in exceptional circumstances if justified from an academic perspective and with chair approval; however, faculty can only earn proportional fractional teaching units.

**Program coordination varies widely across the SOE and credits for teaching and/or service will be determined in negotiation with the department chair in consultation with the dean's office to ensure equity across the SOE.

Variations in Teaching by Faculty Appointment

Term research faculty should not have teaching expectations that exceed 9 units per academic year.

Banking Teaching Unit Credits

In cases where faculty exceed the expected teaching units faculty will be able to bank, or carry over, units earned each academic year. Fractional unit credit earned through teaching activities will be reported each semester using the faculty activity reporting process. Banked credits need to be approved by Department Chairs during workload planning and annual evaluation meetings and are reviewed annually. Department Chairs will ensure that faculty are able to utilize banked credits once they have accumulated 3 units. Once faculty accumulate 3 units, they are expected to use the banked credits within the next academic year. Earned credits may be used to cover no more than two courses per academic year. Credits less than 3 do not expire.

RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

The time allocated for research and scholarship differs based on faculty appointment to address expectations specified in promotion and tenure guidelines. Tenured and tenure-eligible faculty have time devoted to research/ scholarship in alignment with their role. Tenure-eligible faculty effort may shift from the research-focused to the standard pathway as they approach the tenure and promotion review (see Table 1).

Faculty with salary support *from external funding sources* may receive reduction in teaching according to Table 3. The maximum number of courses faculty can buyout is 3 to 9 instructional units based on the minimum standard for teaching contributions of 6 units. On occasion, faculty may negotiate additional time (with reduced teaching or service effort) as part of their Individual Work Plan (IWP) for a specific scholarly assignment as resources allow (e.g., Study-Research Leave).

Required percent salary (9-month) support from external funding sources for course buy-out (% is cumulative for each additional course)

Table 3

Total Percent Salary Support Needed for Course Reductions

Total CY percentage external funding for salary support	Research Effort	Teaching Effort
10%	3 units	no reduction
15%	4.5 units	3 units = 1 course buyout
30%	6 units	6 units = 2 course buyout
45%	9 units	9 units = 3 course buyout
60% or higher*	12 units	9 units = 3 course buyout

**Faculty cannot reduce teaching loads below the minimum teaching load of 6 units per year, with a minimum of 3 units allocated to course instruction.*

Variations in Research by Faculty Appointment

Term teaching faculty are not typically expected to participate in research/scholarship. However, ***term teaching faculty*** who are awarded teaching-related external funding with salary support (e.g. training, professional development grants) may receive a reduction in teaching, with approval of their department chair and with a maximum of one course (3 units) per year.

SERVICE

Service is a fundamental component of the faculty role to complete the work required within an academic institution. All faculty members share in the service mission of the school. Service also extends to the university, community and profession. The level of engagement in service should be consistent with satisfactory to exemplary annual performance and with promotion guidelines; decisions about service should be made in consultation with the Department Chair or supervisor.

- **Service to the Department:** Examples of department-level service include, but are not limited to, serving on a department budget committee, academic program coordination, serving on the adjunct hiring committee or a department staff or faculty search committee, and participating in student recruitment activities.
- **Service to the School:** Examples of school-level service include, but are not limited to, serving on a School of Education standing committee, chairing a committee, serving on or leading a task force, participating on advisory councils, serving on a school staff, faculty or leadership search committee, and participating in student recruitment activities.
- **Service to the University:** Examples of service within the university include participating on University-level committees, initiatives or task-force committees.
- **Service to the Community:** Examples of community service include pro-bono service with schools, school divisions, educational or community organizations. Such as serving on advisory boards of local organizations; engagement in agencies; and organizations to build capacity, improve organizational functioning, or develop policy.
- **Service to the Profession:** Examples of professional service includes unpaid professional practice, service within a state, national or international professional organization, serving on a study section, reviewing manuscripts submitted to journals or grant applications, etc.

In rare cases, faculty may have dedicated service effort that may necessitate reduced effort in teaching or research and scholarship. Examples of such service may include serving in key leadership roles in the School of Education (such as Faculty Organization President or accreditation lead); key leadership positions in the university (such as President of Faculty Senate); key leadership at the professional level (such as journal editorship or president of a professional organization).

Service units cannot be banked or applied from one year to the next.

Decisions about service should be made in consultation with the Department Chair or supervisor as not all service activities may be listed. Service units for commitments outside of the university should be negotiated with the chair.

Variations in Service by Faculty Appointment

Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty: For all ***tenured faculty***, the expectation is a minimum 6 service units, with a minimum of 3 service units committed to the department, school, or university. ***Tenure-eligible faculty*** have variable service units depending on their pre-tenure year (see Table 1). For both tenured and tenure track faculty, the remaining service units may be allocated to commitments at the community, state, national, and professional levels.

Term Faculty: For all ***term faculty***, the expectation is a minimum of 3 of the 6 service units are committed to service to the department, school, or university. The remaining service units could be for commitments at the community, state, national, and professional levels or could be further distributed to the department, school, or university.

Service Units to the department, school, or university

Service units should be allocated based on the faculty-driven coding of department, school, university commitments by number of hours and intensity of the commitment using the following guidelines:

- Low Intensity = .25 service units
 - chair = +.10 service
- Medium Intensity = .50 service units
 - chair = +.25 service
- High Intensity = 1.0 service units
 - chair = +.50 service

Policy Revisions and Modifications

The effective and appropriate administration of this policy requires periodic review and evaluation to ensure the policy is working as intended and accurately aligns with the scope and variation in faculty work.

References

O'Meara, K., Culpepper, D., Misra, J., & Jaeger, A. (2021). *Equity-minded faculty workloads: What we can and should do now*. American Council on Education.
<https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Equity-Minded-Faculty-Workloads.pdf>

Adopted May, 2023

Revised November, 2023

Implemented January 1, 2024

PROCEDURES FOR THE ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION

Purpose of the Annual Evaluation Process

To provide the faculty member with an opportunity to take the initiative in determining the direction of their performance. As part of the Faculty Annual Evaluation, the Department Chair will provide feedback related to performance in areas of research, teaching, and service as well as progress toward promotion and/or tenure (as appropriate).

Work Plan and Annual Evaluation

Step 1 Formulation of the Initial Work Plan

For department faculty, from early February to mid-March as a part of the Annual Review process, department chairs will discuss with the faculty members proposed Initial Work Plans. Department chairs may suggest revisions to the submitted Work Plans. If there is disagreement with the proposed revisions, the faculty member may submit a rejoinder that will be attached to the department chair's suggested revisions of the Work Plan.

By mid- to late March, department chairs will submit to the Dean all Initial Work Plans with any proposed rejoinders by the faculty. The Dean will review all submitted documentation and will approve Initial Work Plans by mid April. Any changes made by the Dean will be discussed with the department chair and the faculty member.

Any requests by faculty for differentiated loads must be submitted to department chairs. Department chairs will discuss the load request with the faculty member in accordance with the Workload Policy. Department chairs may also recommend a differentiated load to a faculty member. If the faculty member disagrees with the proposed differentiated load, the faculty member may submit a written response to the chair's recommendation. The request for differentiated loads will be submitted by the department chair to the Dean and will include the initial request, the department chair's recommendation, and, if applicable, the faculty member's response to the department chair's recommendation. The Dean will review all requests and will assign differentiated load based upon how the differentiated load will assist in meeting Department and School goals.

Step 2 Re-Evaluation of the Approved Work Plan (As Needed)

1. By December 1, a conference will be held if either the faculty member or department chair desires one for the purpose of re-evaluating the approved Work Plan. The department chair, in consultation with the faculty member, will schedule the time for the meeting.
2. Any changes in Approved Work Plans will be submitted to the Dean for approval by December 15.

Step 3 Final Activity Report and Annual Review

1. Faculty will develop a Final Activity Report and Initial Work Plan for the next academic year for submission to the department chair by mid January of each academic year.
2. The department chair will meet with the faculty member from early February to early March regarding the Annual Review and in preparation for formulating the Annual Evaluation.

Following the conference, the department chair will develop a narrative that addresses the extent to which the faculty member met work plan goals and objectives. ; the department chair's narrative will be framed in the context of the faculty member's overall contribution, including the achievement of department, school and university goals.

The narrative will be a concise overview of the faculty member's performance for a single year.

3. By mid March, the department chair will submit the Annual Evaluation to the faculty member for a signature of acknowledgement. The faculty member, if desired, may comment in writing on the department chair's assessment. Such comments must be filed within one week of receipt of the department chair's evaluation. The Annual Evaluation and any written response by the faculty member will be included in the faculty member's professional file.
4. The Approved Work Plan (for the current year), the Final Activity Report, the department chair's Annual Evaluation, and any written comments by the faculty member will be submitted to the Dean by April 15.

Step 4 Recommendations for Merit Salary Increases and/or Bonus Pay

Merit raises and/or bonus pay, when authorized by the University, is awarded based on annual evaluation ratings using a formula developed by the Finance office in accordance with university-level merit.

Policy for Revising Faculty Annual Criteria and Rubrics

Updating Faculty Annual Review rubrics and evaluation criteria necessarily impacts faculty status decisions and faculty welfare. When a revision of the Faculty Annual Review rubrics is needed, faculty shall have meaningful input on the revision process and outcome. This shall include faculty involvement in the revision preparation, discussion at Faculty Organization meetings, and an advisory vote of the faculty. In the event that the Dean implements a rubric that the advisory vote did not support, the Dean shall provide written justification for that decision to the School of Education Faculty. Rubrics should not be changed mid-year, and changes may only be implemented on or before January 1st for the next evaluation cycle. Mid-year changes can be made in exceptional circumstances, but only if those changes will not result in any faculty being evaluated less favorably.

Revised and approved by SOE Faculty and Dean 09/20/2024

CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY**PURPOSE**

The overall purpose of annual evaluation of faculty is to assess the performance and advance the growth and development of each faculty member and the mission of the department, school, and university. The ultimate goal is to build and sustain a culture of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. To that end, the annual faculty evaluation provides two opportunities: 1) faculty self-assessment on the accomplishment of approved work plan goals; and 2) evaluation of the faculty member's work in the context of meeting the missions of the department, school, and university as well as the appropriate academic discipline. Evaluation of faculty is grounded in each individual's work plan (see Workload Policy) and based on the Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service Rubrics that align with the individual's effort across each area. The following more specific purposes provide direction for the annual evaluation of faculty:

- To enhance faculty development by promoting self-assessment that:
 - ◆ Assists faculty in understanding the contribution of their work to the achievement of personal and department goals
 - ◆ Provides opportunity for the faculty member to evaluate work and place a value on the work accomplished
 - ◆ Gives an opportunity for the faculty member to communicate goals to be accomplished over time and to determine the fit of work accomplished with longer-term goals
- To provide evaluation and feedback to enhance faculty development that:
 - ◆ Acknowledges and supports faculty work and contributions
 - ◆ Offers constructive feedback
 - ◆ Informs the faculty member of progress in meeting promotion and/or tenure guidelines
 - ◆ Gives narrative feedback on work accomplished
 - ◆ Provides an opportunity to review faculty work over time and to provide feedback on the continuity of the faculty member's work and progression
 - ◆ Offers opportunity for mutual understanding of faculty member's work from the evaluator's perspective and from the faculty member's perspective
 - ◆ Targets resources to support faculty improvement and progress toward promotion and/or tenure
- To place the faculty member's contributions in the context of the mission of the department, school, university, and the individual's academic discipline

- To assess and evaluate the faculty member's activities and performance
 - ◆ Provides a rating of the faculty member's annual performance
 - ◆ Informs salary merit determinations
 - ◆ Gives information concerning progress for advancing in rank and/or for obtaining tenure
 - ◆ Informs, when appropriate, post-tenure review
 - ◆ Offers information to shape the formation of subsequent year goals and professional activities

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

The general criteria established in each area of faculty responsibility are intended to guide the faculty member's annual activity and to clarify value placed on work products. The SOE criteria are grounded in standards of excellence that consider the difficulty of accomplishments, the quality and innovation of activities reported, and the scope and impact of those activities on the academic discipline, the department, and the school. The criteria in each area of responsibility are not intended to be an exclusive list of activities, nor are faculty expected to address every criteria. Instead, the criteria are intended to assist faculty members in defining effective ways to develop professionally, taking into consideration evolving interests, faculty rank, additional administrative responsibilities, and long-term goals. While the criteria below are intended to be illustrative, Department Chairs must use the approved and appropriately scaled rubrics for each category when engaging in evaluation.

CRITERIA FOR TEACHING

Four distinct categories as they contribute to teaching are presented: Delivery of Instruction; Advising; Program Development; and Externship, Thesis, and Dissertation Guidance. Each category may be assessed by considering preparation, implementation activities, and documentation. The descriptors under each heading are meant as exemplars.

General Principles: The following are valued highly.

- Instruction that reflects best practices
- Technology that is an integrated part of course delivery
- Instructors who are successful at meeting program and course objectives
- Advising that leads to the retention and graduation of students
- Involvement in student research activities
- Programs that are nationally accredited and state approved

Delivery of Instruction

- Course syllabi are current, systematic, and reflect best practices Expectations of students are clear, and appropriate assessments of student learning are utilized
- Text and reference materials provide both historical and contemporary perspectives where appropriate
- Technology is infused in course activities to enhance instruction
- Assignments enable students to apply new knowledge and skills and reflect on dispositions
- Course syllabi reflect curricular and program enhancements
- Narrative reflection indicates efforts to improve the quality of teaching and/or clinical supervision
- Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness and other documents and/or artifacts reflect a high level of satisfaction with the instructor's preparation, instructional delivery, and attention to student concerns
- Clinical supervision reflects successful efforts to improve the clinical competencies of students and to foster quality working arrangements with partnering schools and/or agencies
- Graduate student teaching assistants are mentored to enhance teaching effectiveness

Advising

- Advising is accurate, timely, and reflects current department, school, and university policies
- Advising is professional and sensitive to the unique needs of all students
- Advising assists students in the timely completion and submission of required forms
- Advising is available and accessible through office hours, e-mail, and telephone

Program Development

- Significant contributions are made to curricular and program development
- Meaningful participation in accreditation activities is demonstrated

Externship, Thesis, Dissertation, and Capstone Guidance

- Externship, thesis, and/or doctoral committee participation is demonstrated and discussed in terms of one's role in the process
- Significant support is provided for student research initiatives

Documentation

As with all evaluative processes, the evaluator will look at teaching holistically. Primary consideration is given to the narrative, student evaluations, and other documentation. Examples of documentation may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Syllabi
- Student evaluations
- Course assignment explanations
- Teaching narrative or section of narrative addressing recent innovations
- Sample student work products
- Faculty - peer observation letters of comment

CRITERIA FOR SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship includes activities and products that demonstrate the faculty member's contribution to an appropriate discipline, field of study, and/or practice. There are many appropriate types of scholarship, e.g., scholarship of discovery of new knowledge; applied and action empirical research (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed method); practice-based and integrative, theoretical; grant proposal writing, and policy analysis.

General Principles: The following are valued highly.

- Products that undergo peer review, the fundamental premise of scholarly endeavor
- Products that create or extend knowledge for the disciplines
- Products that are related to the writing and research agenda of the faculty member
- Products that provide scholarship to inform practice
- Products that attempt to capture monies for external funding
- Products that reflect individual and/or collaborative work
- Funded research projects

Scholarly Activities: Works in Progress

- Conducting empirical research
- Conducting theoretical analyses
- Researching literature
- Writing documents, books, book chapters, journal articles, grant proposals
- Documents submitted for publication

Scholarly Products (products disseminated to peers)

- Professional and discipline articles in press
- Published professional and discipline articles

- Books
- Book reviews
- Book chapters
- Monographs
- Electronic papers
- Research Reports
- Funded or highly rated grant proposals (research, training, service)
- Professional presentations and conference proceedings
- Journal issue(s) resulting from editorship
- Papers, reports and other manuscripts

CRITERIA FOR JUDGING QUALITY AND QUANTITY

- Nature, rigor, and results of peer review
- Prestige of publisher
- Citation of work by others
- Location of dissemination of product (university, local community, state/regional, national/international)
- Contribution of the faculty member to the product
- Contribution to the profession and/or discipline
- Originality, degree of innovation, complexity, and overall scope and importance
- Time and effort needed for different scholarly activities and products

Documentation

The narrative portion of the Final Activity Report provides the faculty member with the opportunity to describe and clarify the quality and quantity of scholarly products. Examples of documentation may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Published scholarly products
- Grant proposals
- Professional presentations (e.g. papers, PowerPoint notes, galley proofs of poster presentations)
- Keynote lectures
- Scholarly products submitted for peer review

- Letters of acceptance from book editors
- Chapter reviews from book editors
- Journal issues from editorship

CRITERIA FOR SERVICE

Performing service is an essential responsibility that provides for sustaining, improving and continuing positive development in three distinct categories: 1) university, school, department and program area contributions; 2) professional discipline contributions; and 3) community contributions. Each faculty member must clearly delineate whether a specific activity is considered service or scholarship.

General Principles: The following are valued highly.

- Leadership provided at any level
- Service related to one’s primary academic discipline
- Demonstrated depth of service contribution
- Faculty citizenship related to meeting department and school goals

University, School, Department, and Program Area

- Contributes

Examples:

- ◆ Advisor to student organization
- ◆ Provides requested reports
- ◆ Provides requested information for program area, department, school
- ◆ Active membership on committees

- Provides leadership

Examples:

- ◆ Committee chair
- ◆ Program area coordinator
- ◆ Presents university workshop
- ◆ Mentors new faculty

- Provides administrative duties

Examples:

- ◆ Department chair

- ◆ Grant administration

- Accreditation leadership

Professional Discipline

- Holds membership in professional organizations
- Holds committee membership in professional organizations
- Provides leadership to professional organizations
- Delivers service presentations and workshops to professional organizations
- Provides consultation to professional organizations

Community

- Contributes to community groups in areas related to the faculty member's discipline

Examples:

- ◆ Presentation to relevant agency or organization
- ◆ Membership on relevant community groups, councils, and agencies
- ◆ Involvement with other related agencies or groups
- ◆ Provides leadership to community groups and agencies

- Provides leadership

Examples:

- ◆ Chairs local council or committee
- ◆ Membership on community boards
- ◆ Delivers invited or keynote presentation

- Provides paid or unpaid consultation

Documentation

The narrative portion of the Final Activity Report provides the faculty member with the opportunity to clarify and relate the depth of service contributions and their relevance to the department, school, university, community, and/or academic discipline. Examples of documentation may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Service presentations and reports
- Keynote lectures
- Workshop proceedings or handbooks

- Committee reports
- Program area products such as accreditation reports
- Documents delineating the extent and/or significance of service contributions

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Professional development generally refers to the continued growth and vitality of the individual faculty member through participation in programs and opportunities that assist in meeting the performance expectations of the university and that advance the faculty member's personal and professional goals. The ultimate goal is to assist faculty members in continued learning and engagement that is mutually beneficial to both the faculty member and the institution. The most common focus of faculty development is the improvement and expansion of instructional skills and the advancement of expertise in the discipline.

Professional development activities may include but are not limited to:

- Membership in professional organizations
- Attendance at professional conferences
- Attendance at workshops, seminars, conferences
- Attendance at workshops related to continued development of probationary faculty
- Participation in specialized training programs
- Enrollment in courses related to advancement of discipline-related knowledge
- Participation in faculty mentoring opportunities
- Research leave

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STUDY-RESEARCH LEAVE POLICY**A. Purpose:**

The Virginia Commonwealth University School of Education's Study-Research Leave policy is intended to enrich faculty professional and scholarly development, critical elements in maintaining a vibrant and productive university. The Study-Research Leave is broadly designed to refresh, invigorate, and renew intellectual work and contributions of individual faculty. The leave is an opportunity for faculty to engage in projects that could not be accomplished under the typical workload. Ultimately, Study-Research Leave may result in a broad range of creative activities and/or products related to the faculty member's academic discipline and the goals of the Department, School, and University.

B. Duration:

Faculty members meeting the criteria are eligible to apply for a maximum of one contract year for leave at one-half of their regular full-time salary or one-half contract year at full salary. Departments and faculty members may support the remainder of the salary (up to but not exceeding full pay) from non-state or external sources including grant buyouts.

C. Procedures:**1. Eligibility for Study-Research Leave.**

The faculty member must be tenured with six years of prior continuous VCU service. If a previous Study-Research Leave was granted and utilized, faculty must complete an additional six years of continuous service before reapplying.

2. Return Commitments with Study-Research Leave.

There must be a written commitment to return to the University and the faculty member must serve a period of employment equal to one full academic year. If the return-to-work commitment is not honored, the individual must reimburse to the University the salary received during the leave period, plus interest, regardless of the source of funds (E&G, grant, external, etc.). The faculty member and the Dean must complete a Study-Research Leave Agreement and Promissory Note at least thirty days prior to the scheduled leave. The leave is not authorized until all signatures have been obtained on the promissory note.

3. Application for Study-Research Leave and Review.

3a. The faculty member must submit a 3 page single-spaced application (minimum 11-point Arial or Times New Roman font, margins of 1 inch on all sides) for a Study-Research Leave to the Department Chair by September 15 for a Study-Research Leave the following fall; February 15 for leave the following spring. The written request will describe the proposed leave activity/activities with respect to the following criteria:

3a i) purpose of the proposed leave, the nature of the work to be accomplished during leave, and the significance of the proposed project to research, policy, and/or practice.

3a ii) short- and long-term products and outcomes (e.g., publications, presentations, grant applications, fellowship applications, new collaborations or partnerships)

3a iii) the benefit to the department, School, and/or University from the proposed projects (e.g., enhancements to teaching, reputational impacts, international collaborations and visibility, new interdisciplinary relationships and collaborations for the department or School, potential new funding sources, community relationships for the department or School, enhanced opportunities for students).

3b. An explanation of how the leave period is necessary to accomplish these goals, which would not be possible to achieve with the faculty member's standard workload.

3c. A current CV must be attached to the application.

3d. The faculty member will submit the application to their Department Chair. The Department Chair will add their recommendation to the application and submit the application packet (including the faculty member's materials and the Chair recommendation) to the Chair of the School of Education Faculty Organization by October 1 for leave the following fall; March 1 for leave the following Spring. In evaluating the request, the Department Chair should also consider the effect of the faculty member's absence on the Department/School. If the request is endorsed, then the Chair must indicate how the faculty member's responsibilities (e.g., teaching, advising, administrative activities) will be covered by the Department, and if other resources are needed. If the department chair does not endorse the request, then they must explain why in writing and forward to the Dean and applicant.

3e. The Faculty Organization Chair and Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development will convene tenured faculty representatives selected from each department (the committee) to review the merits of the application. Each application will be scored independently using a rubric that reflects the application criteria listed on the application (see 3.a.). The committee will meet to discuss their evaluations, determine the final score of each application, and forward the entire list to the Dean. The committee will indicate which applications they deem meritorious.

3f. The Dean will review the applications and recommendations and will make their recommendation to the Provost by December 1 for leave the following fall; May 1 for leave the following Spring. The dean's recommendation will take into account the School's financial situation. In the event that multiple applications from the same department/program are deemed meritorious, the Dean will negotiate the timing of leave with faculty members. The Dean will notify applicants of the recommendation in writing.

D. Report upon Return:

Faculty members must submit a report detailing the results of their Study-Research Leave within 90 days of returning from leave. The report should be first submitted to the Dean, who will acknowledge receipt in writing. Additionally, the report may need to be submitted to the Provost.

A concise 2-3 page single-spaced report (minimum 11 Arial or Times New Roman font, margin of 1 inch) should include the following: 1) Detailed account of travel itineraries, institutions and locations visited, individuals consulted or collaborated with extensively, and/or any formal lectures delivered,

2) progress made relative to the original proposal, including any significant changes to the project, 3) an evaluation of the relationship between the anticipated results as stated in the Study-Research Leave application and the actual outcomes achieved, and 4) plans for the continuation of the project, including completion and publication plans.

E. Benefits While on Study-Research Leave:

1. Faculty members on Study-Research Leave are considered to be full-time permanent employees while on leave. They continue to be enrolled in the Virginia Retirement System or optional retirement program. Retirement contributions and group life insurance payments are based on regular full-time salary. Other deductions (social security, federal and state taxes) are based on the leave salary, including any private funds routed through University payroll.

2. Health care coverage will be continued while on leave in the same manner as prior to leave.

F. Extra Compensation during Study-Research Leave:

Faculty members on Study-Research Leave cannot render service for compensation at their own university or any other institution or business, ensuring the leave's purpose is focused on research or academic development. Faculty members are allowed to accept a fellowship, personal grant, or government-sponsored exchange lectureship during their leave if it promotes the leave's purpose. However, approval in advance by the Dean is required. This is to ensure that such activities align with the leave's goals and the institution's standards. A distinction is made between funds received in recognition of distinguished achievement without any work or service expectation (such as some fellowships or grants) and stipends or compensation for service performed. The former is encouraged as it aligns with the academic and professional enhancement objectives of the Study-Research Leave, while the latter must be scrutinized to ensure it does not conflict with the leave's purpose. The combined income from the Study-Research Leave salary and any fellowships or research assistance during the Study-Research Leave cannot exceed the faculty member's regular salary, maintaining the focus on professional development over financial gain.

Approved by School Education Faculty on 9/23/94

Modified on 3/5/2001

Approved by School of Education Faculty on 3/6/2001

Modified on 10/7/15

Approved by SOE Faculty 10/13/15

Revised and approved by SOE Faculty and Dean 04/19/2024

PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

FOR

PROMOTION AND TENURE

Approved in Final Form

August, 1997

Amended April 10, 2001

Amended November 30, 2005

Amended April 3, 2007 – Approved April 23, 2007

Amended February 1, 2008 – Approved May 17, 2008

Amended March 31, 2009 – Approved April 24, 2009

Amended December 10, 2013 – BOV Approved May 9, 2014

Amended April 12, 2016

Revised and approved by SOE Faculty and Dean 04/02/2024

Table of Contents

1.1	Goal	38
	1.2 Objectives	39
	1.3 Relationship of Schools and Departments to University Promotion and Tenure Policy	39
	1.4 Appointing Authority	40
2.0	Faculty Ranks and Appointments	40
	2.1 General Criteria	40
	2.2 School of Education Criteria	41
	2.3 Documentation	61
3.0	Defining Appointments	65
	3.1 Tenure Appointments	66
	3.2 Probationary (Tenure-Eligible) Appointments	67
	3.3 Transition between Tenure Track Positions and Term Appointments	69
	3.4 Continuing Review of Faculty	69
	3.5 Honorary Titles	69
	3.6 Administrative Titles	69
	3.7 Notice of Appointments	70
	3.8 Joint Appointments with Non-University Agencies	70
4.0	University Promotion and Tenure Policy Review Committee	70
5.0	School Promotion and Tenure Committee (SPTC)	70
	5.1 Committee Membership and Term of Office	70
6.0	University Appeal Committee	71
7.0	Academic Review Procedures for Promotion and Tenure	71
	7.1 Promotion and Tenure Initiated at the Department Level (PRC)	72
8.0	Administrative Review Procedures for Academic Personnel Actions	77
9.0	Appeal Process	77
10.0	The President and the Board of Visitors	77
11.0	Procedures for Termination of Employment of Tenured Faculty Members	77
12.0	Procedures of the Review and Amendment of this Document	78
Appendix A: Format for Committee Reports		79
Appendix C: Sample Email Correspondence for External Evaluation of Candidate		82

GOAL, OBJECTIVES, AND AUTHORITY

1.1 Goal

The School of Education policies and procedures for faculty promotion and tenure are contained in this document. Its content is consistent with the revised *University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures* adopted by The Board of Visitors on May 10, 2013.

According to the goals of the University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies:

Excellence is the original and continuing goal of Virginia Commonwealth University. A prerequisite of this goal is the recruitment and retention of a distinguished faculty. This requires the appointment, promotion and tenure of a faculty in a way that encourages excellence in the creation, dissemination and application of new knowledge ... and fosters an atmosphere of free inquiry and expression.

Appointment, promotion, and tenure are based on the merit of the individual, consideration of comparable achievement in the faculty member's particular field, and the faculty member's value to the mission, needs, and resources of the University.

Promotion in rank reflects quality of performance in appropriate teaching, scholarship and service. Tenure shows the University's continuing commitment to the faculty member, whose position shall not be terminated without adequate reason. The promotion and tenure system at Virginia Commonwealth University is designed to foster:

- Academic freedom of thought, teaching, learning, inquiry, and expression
- Fair and equitable treatment for all individuals
- Appropriate participation by the faculty, the student body, the administration, and the Board of Visitors
- A normal succession and infusion of new faculty

The School of Education procedures and guidelines present policy and procedural variations consistent with the mission of the School and required by the University procedures. This includes promotion and tenure criteria, term and adjunct faculty appointments and promotion in rank, and the peer review system intended to compliment the policies in the University document. Variations in procedure, amplification of criteria, and definitions applying to the School of Education are identified in this document in accordance with the appropriate sections and format of the University document. This document establishes School of Education expectations, in addition to the applicable University goals, policies and procedures.

1.2 Objectives

According to the *University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies*, the objectives of the [University] system are:

- Promotion of an engaged, learner-centered environment that fosters inquiry, discovery and innovation in a global setting
- Faculty achievement to the highest attainable degree within the context and resources of the university
- Support of university goals and support of the diverse missions and characteristics of its individual academic units
- Commitment to administrative management which provides for fair and reasonable allocation of time and resources
- Assurance of the financial integrity of the institution
- Sufficient flexibility to permit modifications of programs, curricula and academic organizational units to meet changing academic, institutional and societal needs (p. 4).

1.3 Relationship of Schools and Departments to University Promotion and Tenure Policy

According to the University guidelines, each school and each department of a school where recommendations for academic appointments are initiated shall establish written guidelines for promotion and tenure. The policies and procedures for granting expedited promotion and tenure shall also be established at the unit level. Unit guidelines shall be consistent with the university-wide policies in this document, but shall also specify the details involved in meeting the particular goals and objectives of those units.

Promotion in rank and tenure are considered initiated wherever the budgetary and signature authority for Personnel Actions Forms resides. If promotion and tenure are initiated only at the school level, guidelines shall be written only for the school. If promotion and tenure are initiated at the departmental level, guidelines shall be written for both the department and the school. The guidelines for the procedures and criteria for a given department of a school may be identical to the guidelines of that school.

Guidelines shall define tenured, tenure-eligible, and term (non-tenure) faculty positions and the relationship of the unit's promotion and tenure system to the unit's work plan and individual faculty member work plans. The guidelines of each school and each department must be consistent with university policy but shall include procedural variations, composition of committees and criteria for promotion and tenure relative to the unit's mission. The guidelines shall include specific measures for evaluating faculty member performance.

The guidelines for all departments and/or schools shall be formulated and reviewed periodically by a committee of the department and/or school. The faculty shall elect the committee members, and the committee members shall be open to faculty recommendations. A majority vote of the faculty shall be required for the approval of all unit guidelines (p. 4).

1.4 Appointing Authority

Promotion and tenure of the faculty are made under the ultimate authority and with the final approval of the Board of Visitors, upon recommendation by the President. School of Education authority is vested in the Dean, who recommends faculty promotions and tenure to the Provost.

2.0 Faculty Ranks and Appointments

This document applies to the university faculty appointments at the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor and instructor whose responsibilities are primarily teaching or research. All faculty appointments shall be either tenured, probationary (tenure-eligible), term (non-tenure), or adjunct (non-tenure). Section 3.0 defines these types of appointments.

2.1 General Criteria

The University general criteria for promotion includes appropriate credentials and experience, as described below, and demonstrated quality in teaching, scholarship, and service. The University criteria are included in each of the three areas in section 2.2.

Appropriate credentials and experience. Appropriate credentials and experience are expected. The candidate will be responsible for providing sufficient information for judging the adequacy of their professional background and experience for the particular requirements of their position

2.1.1 Application of Criteria and Criteria Ratings for Tenured and Tenure-eligible Faculty

Faculty member performance with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service shall be rated (in descending order) as excellent, very good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Credentials and experience shall be rated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. All written reports and evaluations of tenure and tenure-eligible faculty performance ratings shall use this terminology.

Appointment or promotion to assistant professor shall indicate the candidate can be expected to perform satisfactorily all required academic duties and holds promise for further professional development.

Appointment or promotion to associate professor requires a minimum rating of *excellent* in either scholarship or teaching and a rating of *very good* in the other of these two categories. Candidates also must achieve a minimum rating of *satisfactory* in service. Candidates must be effective researchers and teachers and show a pattern of accomplishment in scholarship that indicates progress toward a national or international reputation in their discipline.

Appointment or promotion to professor requires a minimum rating of *excellent* in either scholarship or teaching and a rating of *very good* in the other of these two categories. Candidates

also must achieve a minimum rating of *very good* in service. Candidates must be effective researchers and teachers and demonstrate a pattern of distinguished accomplishment in scholarship that indicates achievement of a national or international reputation in their discipline.

2.1.2 Application of Criteria and Criteria Ratings for Promotion for Term (Non-tenure) Faculty

The policies and procedures for promotion of term (non-tenure) faculty shall be the same as those used for promotion of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty with consideration given to the special mix of duties assigned to faculty members holding term (non-tenure) appointments. The Position Description for Teaching and Research Faculty along with the individual work plans that guide each term (non-tenure) faculty member's effort relative to teaching, scholarship, and service activities shall guide the evaluation for promotion of each term faculty member. The criteria and definitions of criteria as specified in section 2.2 of this document shall apply to term (non-tenure) faculty to the extent that the criteria and definitions are consistent with the term (non-tenure) faculty member's assigned duties for the specific position held.

Promotion to assistant professor (e.g., Teaching Assistant Professor, Research Assistant Professor) requires a minimum rating of *very good* in their primary area (i.e., teaching, research, or practice) and a minimum rating of *satisfactory* in credentials and professional experience and service. Candidates who have a secondary focal area must receive a minimum rating of *satisfactory* in this area. If the candidate does not have a secondary focal area a rating of Not Applicable (NA) will be used.

Appointment or promotion to associate professor (e.g., Teaching Associate Professor, Research Associate Professor) requires a rating of *excellent* in their primary area (i.e., teaching, research, or practice). Candidates who have a secondary focal area must receive a minimum rating of *very good* in this area. Candidates also must achieve a minimum rating of *satisfactory* in service and a rating of *satisfactory* in credentials and professional experience. If the candidate does not have a secondary focal area a rating of Not Applicable (NA) will be used.

Appointment or promotion to professor (e.g., Teaching Professor, Research Professor) requires a rating of *excellent* in their primary area (i.e., teaching, research, or practice), a rating of *very good* in service, and a *satisfactory* in credentials and professional experience. Candidates who have a secondary focal area must receive a minimum rating of *very good* in this area. If the candidate does not have a secondary focal area a rating of Not Applicable (NA) will be used.

2.2 School of Education Criteria

The general criteria for the School of Education are an amplification of the general criteria of the University. Their purpose is to assist in uniform and consistent evaluation within the School and to encourage excellence. The criteria also help direct faculty efforts for tenure and promotion and

provide organized and relevant documentation that reflects professional growth and contributions over time.

Performance criteria have evolved in the departments and School of Education and were developed to serve as identifiable evidence of performance, not as a set of binding contractual points. They are an explicit guide to all who plan to orient their performance toward successful tenure and promotion decisions. They serve as benchmarks for decision makers to reduce the bias of subjectivity. The criteria are intended to require the use of multiple sources of documentation and to be flexible enough to encourage diversity or uniqueness where it is warranted.

The criteria are intended to encourage faculty members to plan for their contributions and growth to exceed the minimum. Faculty who meet the minimum performance criteria shall be judged as *satisfactory*. Beyond the minimum, faculty are encouraged to pursue activities in areas where their talents will make the greatest contributions to the Program Area, Department, School, University, and their own professional development. Performances beyond the minimum level shall be awarded ratings of *very good* or *excellent*.

2.2.1 Evaluation Period

The evaluation period considered in the promotion process, identified as time in rank, is generally defined as the time since one's last promotion. Documentation should emphasize accomplishments during the evaluation period; however, it is recognized that, especially in the area of scholarly work, accomplishments may need to be reviewed in light of an entire career. For tenure considerations, the candidate's entire career will be evaluated. Although output during the evaluation period may be emphasized, the intrinsic nature of scholarly activities requires its assessment over time. Issues such as impact on the profession and continuity of productivity cannot be assessed in particular time-bound segments. Assessment of teaching and service activities will generally be pertinent to the evaluation period itself. If a candidate believes that a broader view of those activities is necessary, it is the candidate's responsibility to provide a rationale for that view.

2.2.2 Context for Evaluation

a. School Perspective

It is necessary in evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure to place performance in the context of school goals and structure. This is accomplished by the candidate in her or his narrative that establishes how the nature of activities and accomplishments are related to the mission and goals of the School.

b. Department Perspective

The activities and accomplishments of the candidate must be integrated with the requirements of the department and with the performance of other faculty in the department. The goals and expectations of the department may change over time. To ensure complete evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion, data are gathered to reflect the department expectations over the time period for which the candidate is reviewed. Using the

descriptive information provided by the candidate and the department information, the quality of a candidate's contributions and growth can be determined. This includes working collaboratively and responsibly with colleagues. From this perspective, merit is defined as the value of the candidate's contributions to the department.

c. Program Area Perspective

Each department will make a determination regarding the implementation of program areas within the unit, and candidates are expected to meet the expectation of the assigned program area, and with the performance of other faculty in the program area. The goals and expectations of the program area may change over time. To ensure complete evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion, data are gathered to reflect the program area expectations over the time period for which the candidate is reviewed. Using the descriptive information provided by the candidate and the program area data, the quality of the candidate's contributions and growth can be determined. From this perspective, merit is defined as the value of the candidate's contributions to the program area.

d. Candidate Perspective

While it is the responsibility of each faculty member to align personal expectations with the program area, department, School and University goals and expectations, it is nevertheless important that evaluators understand the candidate's individual goals and perspective for the specific time period under review, as well as over an entire career, particularly changes in focus during the period and effect of the candidate's perspective on individual performance. For example, a faculty member's focus on goals and activities in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service may have changed over the years. In such cases, the individual perspective should explain the rationale for these changes, and the documentation should reflect contributions to the different perspectives. It is the individual candidate's responsibility to organize documentation to highlight accomplishments and growth across the areas under review.

e. Time Perspective

Evaluation for tenure and promotion must take a broad time perspective. Growth over time is important to the interpretation of performance. Because faculty members begin their careers at different levels, there is no single standard for professional growth. By the same token, not all faculty members develop at the same rate. Likewise, some faculty members may focus their efforts on activities in one category for a concentrated period of time in order to apply later the findings or product toward significant contributions in more than one category. Failure to assess growth over time in these three situations could present a distorted view of professional contributions and growth. Evaluators shall review the documentation presented by the candidate and may seek other evidence to illuminate the individual's pattern of contributions over the period of time the evaluation covers, and over the candidate's entire career.

2.2.3 Appropriate Credentials and Experiences

Appropriate credentials and experience are expected of all faculty applying for promotion and tenure. Sufficient information for judging the adequacy of a candidate's professional background and experience for the particular requirements of their position is expected.

2.2.4 Demonstrated Quality in Teaching

According to the University *Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures*, "Teaching shall be evaluated based primarily upon the impact of the faculty member's teaching in programs relevant to the mission of their academic unit. Faculty members must demonstrate mastery of their subject matter and at communicating this understanding to student learners; most fundamentally, faculty members should demonstrate that their students learn. There should be evidence of the candidate's sustained commitment to classroom instruction, to inclusion of advising and availability to students as a component of teaching, to sustained effectiveness as a contributor to the intellectual development of students through devices such as course design, course material, curriculum development, and attention to other mechanisms of enhancing student learning. Mentoring, and other forms of beneficial interactions between the candidate and learners, may be given appropriate weight as a part of the teaching criteria as determined by the academic unit. Demonstrated quality of teaching may include community-engaged teaching that connects students and faculty members with activities that address community-identified needs through mutually beneficial partnerships that deepen students' academic and civic learning. Examples are service-learning courses or service-learning clinical practica."

Demonstrating quality as a teacher is the cornerstone upon which evaluation in the School of Education is based and is one of the major considerations in the evaluation for tenure and promotion. Teaching consists of continuous development of instruction reflective of best practice, innovative teaching skills and techniques (including collaborative efforts and integration of technology), student advising and mentoring, contributing to program improvement and accreditation including faculty mentoring, and when applicable clinical supervision and/community engaged teaching. The evaluation of teaching shall be determined according to the criteria shown in Table 1 as they relate to the candidate's position, including allocation of effort over time and length of time in rank and/or time at VCU. This table is to be used as a guide and candidates are expected to meet criteria or components that are relevant to their responsibilities in the department; this means that candidates do not necessarily need to meet all criteria or demonstrate all components.

Promotion to Associate Professor requires a minimum rating of excellent in either teaching or scholarship and a very good in the other of these two categories.

Promotion to Professor. The criteria for teaching for promotion to professor are the same as for promotion to associate professor.

**Table 1: Teaching Components and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion
from Assistant to Associate Professor/Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Instruction reflective of best practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regular or continuous efforts are made to improve the quality of teaching. - Efforts are made so that courses reflect current knowledge, research-based information, and rigor. - Evidence is shown of teaching competence over time. - Syllabi are current and complete - Program and course objectives are met - Expectations are clear - Assessments are appropriate - Historical and contemporary perspectives are used where appropriate - Assignment enable students to apply new knowledge, skills, and dispositions where appropriate - Technology is integrated where appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i> - Teaching demonstrates improvement. - Courses reflect current knowledge, research-based information, and rigor. - Evidence is shown to demonstrate teaching effectiveness over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i> - Consistent high quality teaching is evident over time. - Courses reflect current knowledge, research-based information, and rigor over time.

**Table 1: Teaching Components and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion
from Assistant to Associate Professor/Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Advising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advising is accurate, timely, and reflects current department, school, and university policies - Advising is professional and sensitive to the needs of students - Regular or continuous efforts are made to improve the quality of advising. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i> - Advising demonstrates improvement. - Concerted efforts are made to seek needed information and solve problems related to advising. - Advising adequacy is recognized by students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i> - Sustained efforts are made to improve the quality of advising or maintain its high standard. - Evidence is shown recognizing advising as excellent over time. - The candidate makes efforts to help find ways to improve the advising process.
Contributions to program improvement, evaluation, and accreditation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Curricular and program development - Evaluation and accreditation activities - Faculty mentoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Efforts are made to improve the quality of programs through development and revision. - Efforts are made to support accreditation activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i> - Substantive contributions are made to program development for improvement. - Substantive contributions are made to support accreditation activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i> - Initiative and leadership are shown in the improvement of programs. - Initiative and leadership are shown in the support of accreditation activities.

**Table 1: Teaching Components and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion
from Assistant to Associate Professor/Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
<p>Clinical supervision and/or community engaged teaching/learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clinical supervision - Internship and externship supervision - Community engaged teaching/learning (e.g., service learning, practica) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clinical supervision reflects successful efforts to improve the clinical competencies of students and to foster quality working arrangements with partnering schools and/or agencies - Work in clinical/community settings demonstrates regular or continuous efforts to improve effectiveness in working with students and agency needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i> - Work in clinical/ community settings demonstrates improvement for student needs and the needs of the corresponding community. - Clinical supervision and community engagement are recognized as effective over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i> - Sustained efforts are made to continue to improve the quality and effectiveness of clinical, field-based or other community-based activities. - Supervision of clinical experiences is recognized as excellent over time.

**Table 1: Teaching Components and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion
from Assistant to Associate Professor/Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
<p>Involvement in student research activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mentoring graduate students, including graduate assistants, doctoral students, etc. - Externship, thesis, and/or doctoral committee participation - Mentoring student research initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regular or continuous efforts are made to improve the quality of working with students on research activities. - Efforts are made so that courses that involve student research reflect current knowledge and research-based information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i> - Working with students on research activities demonstrates improvement. - Courses that involve student research reflect current knowledge and research-based information. - Evidence is shown of recognized effectiveness of working with students on research activities over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i> - Sustained efforts are made to improve the quality of working with students on research activities or maintain its high standard. - Sustained efforts are made to continue to keep knowledge in courses that involve student research current and reflective of research-based information. - Evidence is shown that working with students on research activities is recognized as excellent over time.

2.2.5 Demonstrated Quality in Scholarship and Professional Growth

According to the University *Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures*, “Faculty members should be continuously engaged in productive and creative scholarly activity in areas relevant to the goals and mission of their academic unit. They should make a substantive contribution to the body of knowledge in their discipline that reflects high standards of quality in creativity, scholarship and professional competence. They should demonstrate leadership and professional competence in independent scholarship and/or collaborative research that leads to the creation of new knowledge or creative expression. Scholarship can be in the form of research and discovery scholarship, the scholarship of teaching and learning, or community-engaged research. Research and discovery scholarship breaks new ground in the discipline and answers significant questions in the discipline. Scholarship of teaching and learning includes applied research regarding various pedagogies, student learning, and assessment practices; development and dissemination of materials for use in teaching beyond one’s own classroom. Community-engaged research is a collaborative process between the researcher and community partner at all stages of the research process. Examples are community-based participatory and action research.”

Several considerations are important in evaluating scholarship and professional growth:

- Scholarly activities may involve inquiry and research. Scholarly products can be empirical, theoretical, or philosophical.
- Scholarly accomplishments may focus on a single or a few areas, or may be more diverse, representing several different but related areas.
- Collaborative and individual scholarship is valued. Collaborations within and beyond discipline, department, or school are valued. In cases where there are multiple authors, first authorship is most highly valued and the amount of effort required to produce single authored works is recognized.
- Refereed products are more highly valued than non-refereed products.
- The quality and quantity of scholarly products shall be evaluated in relation to the impact of the product on the profession, on colleagues, on the field of study, and on the mission of the unit, School, and University. Quality is a professional judgment by peers, based on such factors as the rigor of the review process, the scope, and the recognized contribution to the field. Quantity is evaluated in relation to the volume of products, the time and effort required for completion and the candidate’s allocated effort over time
- Externally and internally funded grants are valued. The writing of the grant, irrespective of the nature of the grant, is considered scholarship. The evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship related to grant activity is based on the following factors:
 - the candidate’s role in developing and writing grant applications, and role on the project;

- the funding determination;
 - the grant competitiveness;
 - the amount and duration of the grant award.
- Professional growth is the development of scholarly expertise, and is demonstrated through activities such as involvement in agencies, schools, the community, continuing education, and other activities that maintain and keep current of important scholarly skills and knowledge in the field.

The evaluation of scholarship and professional growth shall be determined according to the criteria shown in Tables 2 and 3 as they relate to the candidate's position and length of time in rank and/or time at VCU. These tables are to be used as guides and candidates are expected to meet criteria or components that are relevant to their responsibilities in the department; this means that candidates do not necessarily need to meet all criteria or demonstrate all components.

**Table 2. Scholarship Components and Criteria for
Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scholarly products have been developed and submitted for peer review. - A record of continuous scholarship and professional growth has been established. - Evidence is presented that establishes the candidate's expertise in conducting scholarly inquiry appropriate to their discipline. - A record of favorable peer evaluations of scholarship has been established. - The potential for and likely continuation of scholarship and professional growth has been established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i> - Scholarly products, including research, have been recognized for impact at the state/regional and national/international level. - Scholarly products, including research, have resulted in some recognition of contribution of the work to the discipline, field, and/or practice. - Evidence shows a pattern of emerging accomplishment that indicates progress toward a national/international reputation in their discipline, field, and/or practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i> - Scholarly products have been recognized for impact at the national/international level. - Evidence shows a pattern of sustained accomplishment that indicates progress toward a national/ international reputation in their discipline, field, and/or practice.

**Table 2. Scholarship Components and Criteria for
Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Presentations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most or all presentations have been at the local, regional, or state level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i> - Presentations have been recognized by peer-review at the state/regional and national/international level. - Presentations have resulted in some recognition of contribution of the work to the discipline, field, and/or practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i> - Evidence shows a pattern of accomplishment, such as paper presentations, invited presentations, symposium and panel appearances, that indicates progress toward a national/international reputation in their discipline, field, and/or practice.
Grant Activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grant activities have been developed and submitted for peer review, but not necessarily funded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i> - Candidate has contributed significantly to grant activities (for example proposal writing, submission, co-PI, etc.) that have been developed, but not necessarily funded, and received favorable reviews. - Evidence shows a pattern of accomplishment that builds a trajectory toward a funded research or training program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i> - Candidate has contributed significantly to funded grant activities (e.g., proposal writing, submission, co-PI, etc.) especially external agencies.

**Table 2. Scholarship Components and Criteria for
Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Community Engaged Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is evidence that the scholar has engaged in this work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i> - The scholar is actively pursuing community engaged projects and there is systematic evidence of its potential impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i> - There is systematic evidence of the impact of the scholars' community engaged research on the collaborating institutions and/or through published work.
Other Forms of Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is evidence that the candidate has engaged in other forms of scholarship. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i> - The candidate's other forms of scholarship have been recognized for some impact at the state/regional and national/international level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i> - The candidate's other forms of scholarship have been recognized for impact and a pattern of accomplishment at the state/regional and national/international level.

Table 3. Scholarship Components and Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met. - The candidate's publications have resulted in national/international recognition of the contribution to the discipline, field, and/or practice. - The candidate's publication evidence suggests national/international recognition over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standards for <i>Very Good</i> have been met. - The candidate's publication evidence establishes a national/international recognition of significant contributions to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice.

Table 3. Scholarship Components and Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Presentations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met. - The candidate's presentations have resulted in national/international recognition of the contribution to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice. - The candidate's presentation evidence suggests national/international recognition over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standards for <i>Very Good</i> have been met. - The candidate's presentation evidence establishes a national/international recognition of significant contributions to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice.
Grant Activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met. - The candidate's funded grant activities have resulted in national/international recognition to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice. - The candidate's funded grant activity evidence suggests national/international recognition over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standards for <i>Very Good</i> have been met. - The candidate's funded grant activity evidence demonstrates national/international recognition of significant e contributions to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice.

Table 3. Scholarship Components and Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Community-engaged Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have met. - The candidate's evidence suggests impact of community engaged research over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standards for <i>Very Good</i> have been met. - The candidate's evidence suggests strong impact and significant contribution of community-engaged research over time.
Other Forms of Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met. - The candidate's other forms of scholarship have resulted in national/international recognition to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice. - The candidate's other forms of evidence suggest national recognition over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standards for <i>Very Good</i> have been met. - The candidate's other forms of evidence establish a national/international recognition of exemplary and/or outstanding contributions to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice.

2.2.6 Demonstrated Quality in Service

According to the University *Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures*, “Faculty members are expected to give of their time and expertise for the betterment of their department, School and University, their profession and/or the broader community. Service includes engaging in the application of learning and discovery to improve the human condition and support the public good at home and abroad. Demonstrated performance in service may include community-engaged service, which is the application of one’s professional expertise to address a community-identified need and to support the goals and mission of the university and the community partner.”

In the spirit of good citizenship, shared governance and active engagement, faculty provide service to their program area, department, School, University, profession and community. It is expected that the quality of service will reflect increasing leadership and contribution over time.

When evaluating service, the balance between quantity and quality should be considered. Quantity involves service time required by activities and number of activities. Quality of service involves effort and contribution. For example, if a candidate serves on numerous committees, the cumulative activity should be taken into account when determining rating. Similarly, when a candidate demonstrates significant commitment to a particular service activity over time, this should also be considered when determining a rating. However, it is also expected that the candidate will serve in diverse ways and engage in a range of activities.

The quality of service is on a continuum of impact, which generally starts with membership and progresses to active participation and leadership. Leadership is not restricted to formal leadership roles on committees (e.g., Chair) or in organizations (e.g., President); rather leadership is measured by degree of engagement and impact.

The evaluation of service shall be determined according to the standards shown in Tables 4 and 5 as they relate to the candidate’s position and length of time in rank and/or time at VCU. The examples are meant to serve an illustrative purpose only, and it is up to the candidates to explain the impact of a particular activity in which they are engaged. These tables are to be used as guides and candidates are expected to meet criteria or components that are relevant to their responsibilities in the department; this means that candidates do not necessarily need to meet all criteria or demonstrate all components.

Table 4. Service Components, Example Activities, and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

COMPONENTS	EXAMPLE SERVICE ACTIVITIES (not exhaustive)	CRITERIA		
		Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Department Service	Search committee member/chair, admissions committee, active involvement in department activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contribution in the program area, department, School and University. - Membership in professional organizations at the local, state or national levels. - Service and professional activity at the community level and/or community engaged service that reflects favorably on the School and University. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i> - Demonstrated contribution and leadership in the program area, department, School and/or University. An important distinction between ratings of very good and satisfactory level performance is demonstrated leadership - Contribution to professional organizations at the local, state, or national level. - Service and professional activity at the community level and/or community engaged service reflects recognition of leadership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i> - Record of recognized leadership and service in the program area, department, and School. University-level service is demonstrated. - Record of recognized leadership and service to local, state, or national professional organizations over time. - Service and professional activity at the community level and/or community engaged service that reflects established leadership.
School Service	School committee member/chair, active member of committee			
University Service	University committee member			
Community Service	Member of community organization, advisory board/advisory role			
Professional Service	Conference proposal reviewer, active member in professional organization at state and national level, chair/program chair of AERA SIG or division Ad hoc reviewer, editorial board member, associate			

	editor of a journal, guest editor of a special issue			
--	--	--	--	--

Table 5. Service Components, Example Activities, and Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

COMPONENTS	EXAMPLE SERVICE ACTIVITIES (not exhaustive)	CRITERIA		
		Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Department Service	Active member/leadership role in department activities, search committee chair, PRC member/chair	The <i>Very Good</i> criteria for promotion to Associate Professor have been met.	The <i>Excellent</i> criteria for promotion to Associate Professor have been met. Record of recognized leadership to professional organizations over time with emphasis at the national level and/or community-engaged service.	Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i> Recognition of quality and effective leadership to the program area, department, School and University, sustained over the time in rank. Involvement with local, state, and national level professional organizations, with the emphasis at the national level has been recognized for quality and leadership effectiveness. This
School Service	Committee/task force membership, leadership roles on committees over time			
University Service	Active member of University committees (e.g., Task Force, IRB, University Appeals), leadership role on University committees over time			
Community Service	Member of community organizations, active involvement in organization activities (e.g., organize events			

	initiatives), advisory board service			involvement should be demonstrated over time.
Professional Service	Active member and demonstrated leadership in professional organization at national level Editorial board service, Associate Editor/Editor service			Quality service and sustained professional activity at the community level and/or community engaged service has brought recognition to the School and University, and demonstrates a record of quality and impact over time.

2.3 Documentation

Documentation includes evidence presented by the candidate to support the case for promotion and/or tenure. Documentation must include a narrative, curriculum vitae, Final Activity Reports and yearly evaluations from the department chair, external evaluations (secured by the Peer Review Committee), documents related to teaching, documents related to scholarship including samples of publications, and documents related to service. The candidate shall supply all documents in electronic form to the Dean's office.

The School of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee has the option, if necessary, to request additional information from a candidate, the Peer Review Committee, and/or the department chair(s) to further clarify the candidate's portfolio. This request will be made one time and by the SPTC chair with information requested provided by a designated date.

Documentation should:

- Describe major assigned duties and responsibilities for the evaluation period;
- Be selected for relevance between service and scholarly activities, with justification for placing an activity or product in one of these categories;
- Include only materials and activities directly related to one's professional role. Activities accomplished as a citizen rather than as a professional educator are not generally appropriate for inclusion.

2.3.1 Narrative

Most activities to be evaluated fall into the three major categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. Minimally, the narrative should specifically address each of these three major areas. The activities in the three categories are usually interrelated; therefore, the view of evaluators may be limited if the activities in a category are viewed in isolation. A more realistic evaluation may be achieved when the individual's professional contributions are viewed over time and across evaluation categories and within perspectives listed in Section 2.2.1. It is the candidate's responsibility to address the perspectives as part of the narrative.

The narrative should be used to clarify or explain the curriculum vita and the documentation to show change in direction or emphasis. It should help the evaluators distinguish among teaching, service, or scholarly activities at different levels of the profession. The narrative affords candidates an opportunity to clarify for evaluators their accomplishments, professional growth, and changing patterns. The candidate should not rely entirely on the curriculum vitae.

Whatever organizational decisions are made by the candidate, the narrative is vital in making a case for tenure and/or promotion. Explanations that may be appropriate could include, but are not limited to, the following examples: improvements in teaching; the candidate's role and contribution when not a first author; distinguishing service activities that involved more than cursory committee membership.

2.3.2 Curriculum Vitae

It is the responsibility of the candidate to present a clear, updated, and standard curriculum vitae covering one's entire professional career (see Appendix A).

2.3.3 Final Activity Reports and Yearly Evaluations by the Department Chair

The candidate should submit the Final Activity Reports and yearly evaluations by the Department Chair for time in rank.

2.3.4 Documentation for Background and Professional Experience

The candidate's curriculum vitae provides the necessary documentation for this area, along with a specific statement in the narrative addressing this criterion. Transcripts that indicate the candidate's credentials should be on file in the Human Resources Office.

2.3.5 Documentation for Teaching

The candidate's opening statement in the narrative should present an individual perspective about teaching in their faculty assignment. This should include an explanation of personal goals, an analysis of their approach to teaching and/or advising, a discussion of focus and contributions over time, an explanation of how one's teaching has contributed to the department and School, how technology has been utilized, how student learning has been documented, an explanation of the documentation covering the evaluation period, and explanations of course loads (e.g., number of courses, number of different courses, new preparations, numbers of students).

a. Instruction

Required:

- A table showing the candidate's teaching schedule for the entire review period. Including the course number, title, enrollment, semester taught, level (undergraduate, masters, doctoral).
- *Selected* course syllabi. These materials should include a syllabus for each course taught and at least two syllabi, showing change over time, for each course taught multiple times.
- List of new courses or curricula developed.
- Student evaluations. The University student course evaluation form and results must be presented for every course and indicate response rates. A table showing *median* scores on each item should be prepared for each course for candidates seeking promotion to associate professor. Candidates seeking promotion to professor should include sufficient student evaluations to support the candidate's conclusions regarding their demonstrated quality in teaching. All student comments from the University course evaluations must be submitted.

- Evidence that establishes the appropriate level of rigor in the selected course.

Optional:

- Evidence of student learning for selected courses.
- Any relevant evaluations other than the University course/instructor evaluations included above.
- Faculty/peer observation letters of comment

b. Advising

Required:

- Number of advisees by degree program and year.
- Listing of dissertation and capstone committees, include student names, dates, and your role on the committee.
- Listing of Masters theses and/or externship proposals, include student names, dates, and your role.

c. Contributions to program improvement, evaluation, and accreditation

Required:

- Listing of program improvement, evaluation, and/or accreditations activities by year, indicating your role and contribution.

Optional:

- Faculty/peer observation letters of comment

d. Clinical supervision and/or community engaged teaching/learning

Required:

- Listing of all field-based instructional activities include: supervision of student teaching, practicum, supervision of clinical or career-oriented places. Listings should be organized in a useful manner and indicate the number of students involved and load assignments.
- Evaluations by students involved in the placements, as appropriate to the Department.

e. Involvement in student research activities

Required:

- Listing of the number and nature of student research activities each year not associated with course requirements.
- Sample student products

2.3.6 Documentation for Scholarship and Professional Growth

An explanation of the documentation should be included in the narrative to facilitate understanding of how scholarship and professional growth have developed and contributed to the missions of the Department, School, and University. In the narrative, the candidate could describe how scholarly activities have contributed to the discipline, community and practice.

a. Publications

Required:

- Table of all journal publications for candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure, in chronological order by publication date, and including , author(s), title, name of journal, whether refereed, type of article (e.g., empirical research or conceptual analysis), and target audience.
- Five refereed products (e.g., journal articles, books, book chapters, non-print media materials, curriculum materials, and electronic media).
- Explanation of role in co-authored publications.
- Information about the journals in which the candidate has published, including, for example, impact factor, acceptance rate, number of citations, and circulation.

b. Presentations

Required:

- Table listing all professional presentations, indicating audience, whether refereed or invited, and whether accompanied by a paper.

c. Grants and Contracts

Required:

- Examples of up to two grant submissions and/or contracts for which the candidate was PI or Co-PI.
- Explanation of the nature and status of the grant (e.g., training, research or consultation; internal or external, funding agency, whether it is an original application or a continuation grant; and, whether or not it was funded).
- Grant and/or contract application abstracts and an explanation of the candidate's role in the development of grant or contract applications, when the candidate's role is other than PI or Co-PI.

d. Awards and Recognition

Required:

- Documentation of the nature of the award or recognition.

2.3.7 Documentation for Service

Required:

- Table listing all service activities for candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure, indicating level (e.g., department, program area, school, university, profession, community), duration, role, including leadership responsibilities.

3.0 Defining Appointments

According to the University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures, all faculty appointments shall be either tenured, probationary (tenure-eligible), term (non-tenure), or adjunct (non-tenure). Adjunct (non-tenure) appointments are part-time. All other appointments shall be full-time and either tenured, probationary (tenure-eligible), or term (non-tenure).

A tenured appointment is an appointment that continues until the faculty member either voluntarily leaves the university or is dismissed for cause as specified in Section 11 of the University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures. Tenure is conferred in accordance with the criteria and procedures established by this document and supplemented by appropriate school and department guidelines. Tenure is granted only at the rank of associate professor or professor.

A term (non-tenure) appointment is a full-time appointment to the faculty for a specified mix of duties and does not lead to tenure. Term (non-tenure) appointments shall always be at the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor. Term (non-tenure) faculty members shall hold the same rights and responsibilities specified in the Faculty Handbook as tenured or tenure-eligible faculty except they shall not be afforded tenure or tenure eligibility. When appropriate to the duties assigned to the faculty member holding a term appointment, modifiers as defined by the unit (e.g., Clinical Professor, Visiting Professor, Research Professor or Teaching Professor) should be used. A term (non-tenure) appointment may be for a period of one to five years and may be renewable. Conditions and notifications for non-renewal are to be specified in the letter of appointment for term (non-tenure) faculty.

Faculty members who serve in positions identified by the School of Education to be non-tenure track positions will be designated as term faculty. Term appointments are reviewed annually by the Dean of the School of Education and are subject to different terms of notification of non-renewal than those of tenured appointments. Such terms shall be specified in the letter of appointment. A term faculty member is eligible to apply for a tenured or probationary appointment upon termination of an existing term appointment.

Term faculty in the School of Education include:

- a. affiliate appointments between the School of Education and other departments, schools, or agencies
- b. individuals who are full time coordinators of a center in the School of Education
- c. one hundred percent grant-funded positions
- d. faculty positions receiving salary reimbursement from the Virginia Department of Education.
- e. any position designated at the time of appointment as term faculty by the Dean of the School of Education.

The minimum academic preparation for term faculty is a Master's degree in the appropriate discipline. Term faculty with duties in areas other than teaching are evaluated consistent with their responsibilities. When appropriate to the duties assigned to the faculty member holding a term appointment, designations of teaching, research, and practice should be used such as clinical professor of practice, assistant professor of teaching, visiting professor of research. Ranks include professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor.

Adjunct faculty (non-tenure) appointments are granted to faculty members who serve the university part-time and are employed for specific activities. The rights and privileges of adjunct faculty shall be specified in the guidelines of the unit making the appointment, but they shall not participate in the evaluation of full-time faculty members for promotion or tenure. Recommendations for appointments or rank of part-time, non-tenured faculty shall not require academic review outside the school. These personnel actions shall be reviewed using guidelines established by the school and department and recommended by a letter from the department and/or school with the concurrence of the Dean.

3.1 Tenure Appointments

According to the University guidelines, tenure is conferred based on the faculty member's demonstrated capabilities, academic achievement and the university's anticipated long-term academic needs.

A recommendation for a tenured appointment is initiated only by an academic unit of a degree-granting school or college. Typically, recommendations for tenured appointments are initiated in the department of a school, but in schools where recommendations for academic personnel actions are initiated at the school level, the recommendations for tenured appointments are also initiated at the school level. The guidelines for each academic unit where recommendations for tenured appointments are initiated shall specify written criteria and standards for recommending tenure in that unit. These criteria shall assure that recommendations are based on a record of effectiveness in teaching, scholarship appropriate to the discipline, professional growth and service to the university, the profession, and/or the public. These guidelines shall also specify each unit's procedures for consultation with external evaluators and how the use of external evaluators

is reported to the candidate. External evaluators shall be at a rank equal to or higher than the rank for which the candidate is being reviewed.

Faculty in the School of Education who are appointed to a tenure-track position are considered to be tenure-track faculty members and are eligible to be considered for tenure under these guidelines. Tenure-track faculty may be appointed at the Assistant, Associate, or Professor level.

3.2 Probationary (Tenure-Eligible) Appointments

According to University guidelines, probationary appointments are granted to faculty members with suitable preparation and experience and are appointed in positions identified by the department and/or school as appropriate for tenured faculty.

The maximum period of probationary service for an assistant professor is typically six academic years. An initial appointment at the rank of professor or associate professor may also be probationary appointments. The maximum period of probationary service is typically two years as a professor and three years as an associate professor.

3.2.1 Alterations of the Typical Probationary Period

According to the University guidelines, there are some situations where alterations of the typical probationary period are warranted and may be established at the time of the initial appointment by the mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department chair and/or Dean. Following are situations where an altered probationary period is warranted and can be established:

1. Prior service at an academic institution at the rank of assistant professor or above warrants a reduced probationary period.
2. Prior service in a discipline unrelated to the present appointment, with the approval of the provost warrants a reduced probationary period.
3. Prior service while a candidate for a doctoral or equivalent terminal degree at any institution warrants a reduced probationary period.
4. In exceptional cases, when the special nature of a faculty member's scholarship or special mix of duties warrants an extended probationary period of time to meet the general criteria for tenure.

The agreed upon period of probationary service must be so noted in the notice of appointment. Faculty members reviewed for tenure before the end of their full probationary period shall not be subject to any extraordinary requirements and shall be required to meet the same standards required of them at the end of the full probationary period.

In no case shall such an altered probationary period exceed 10 years for an assistant professor, five years for an associate professor and three years for a full professor. Any altered probationary period must receive approval from the provost for faculty on the Monroe Park campus or from the vice president for health sciences for faculty from the medical campus.

At the end of this agreed upon probationary period, the faculty member must be given an appointment with tenure or a one-year terminal appointment.

3.2.2 Extensions of the Initially Agreed Upon Probationary Period

According to University guidelines, a tenure-eligible faculty member may request an extension of the agreed upon probationary period when extenuating circumstances are projected to impede significantly normal progress. Such circumstances might include but are not limited to childbirth, adoption, care of terminally ill immediate relative, personal trauma, short-term disability as defined by the Virginia Sickness and Disability Program, natural disaster, major accidents, or other circumstances beyond the control of the candidate. Extensions may also be granted for public or appointed university service. Application for extensions must be made through the unit within one year of the onset of the extenuating circumstances. The faculty member's prior annual reviews shall be considered in making the decision about the extension of the initial probationary period. In no case shall an extended probationary period be granted based solely on lack of progress toward work plan goals.

Written approval of the extension by the Dean and the provost on the Monroe Park campus or the vice president for health sciences is required. All extensions of the initial probationary period shall be entered in writing in the faculty member's personnel file. In no case shall such an extension of probationary period exceed 10 years for an assistant professor, five years for an associate professor and three years for a full professor exclusive of extensions for leave or extenuating circumstances described above.

3.2.3 Evaluation of Probation for Tenure-Eligible Faculty

According to University guidelines, probationary appointments at the rank of assistant professor shall be reviewed periodically by the academic unit where personnel actions are initiated. The guidelines for each such unit shall specify how this review shall be conducted and the criteria to be used to evaluate progress toward tenure. The guidelines shall specify the frequency of the review(s), how the individual work plan developed in accordance with the Faculty Roles and Rewards Policy shall be incorporated into the review process, and how the candidate shall be informed regarding progress toward meeting the standards and criteria for tenure in that unit. The guidelines shall specify the voting rights of the faculty regarding continued probation, terminal reappointment, or a recommendation to grant tenure.

The departmental chair, the reviewing faculty of the department or the candidate may request a review for a recommendation to grant tenure. A faculty member may be reviewed for tenure once

before the normal review occurring at the end of the probationary period. Faculty members reviewed for tenure before the end of their maximum probationary period shall not be subject to any extraordinary requirements and shall be required to meet the same standards required of them at the end of the maximum probationary period.

A decision to terminate a probationary appointment may be made during any year of the probationary period and need not wait until the end of the normal probationary period.

3.2.4 Linkage

Tenure-eligible assistant professors shall be reviewed in one process, with both promotion and tenure awarded or denied in a single decision.

Tenure-eligible associate professors may be reviewed for tenure alone or for promotion and tenure simultaneously. A decision to deny a promotion does not preclude a decision to award tenure.

3.3 Transition between Tenure Track Positions and Term Appointments

A tenure-eligible faculty member on a probationary appointment may transfer to a term appointment with the concurrence of the provost or the vice president for health sciences, Dean, departmental chair where the academic personnel action is initiated, and the individual concerned. This transfer suspends the period of probationary service, but the faculty member retains rights consistent with other term appointment guidelines.

Transfers from term appointment to tenure track position must follow the VCU Guidelines for Faculty Transfers (see VCU Guidelines for Faculty Track Transfers). All policies outlined in the University document apply to tenure track positions that transfer from term appointments.

3.4 Continuing Review of Faculty - Refer to Section 3.4 of the University document:

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

3.5 Honorary Titles - Refer to Section 3.5 of the University document:

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

3.6 Administrative Titles

Administrative titles and responsibilities are held for specific terms or at the discretion of the Dean.

Individuals serve in the capacity of administrators at the discretion of the Dean of the School of Education and often return to full-time faculty status. Therefore, faculty members serving as administrators need to maintain a balance between administrative competence and academic credentials. A reasonable congruence should exist between the academic credentials of administrators and teaching faculty, and that congruence should be maintained throughout an

administrator's years of service. It is important that faculty serving as administrators adhere to the same criteria as faculty in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarly activity for promotion and tenure. Administrators applying for promotion and/or tenure must be able to demonstrate that they possess the same qualities and have achieved similar accomplishments as other faculty members within their division of origin. It is in the area of quantity, not quality, that the expectations for administrators and faculty differ.

3.7 Notice of Appointments - Refer to Section 3.7 of the University document:

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

3.8 Joint Appointments with Non-University Agencies - Refer to Section 3.8 of the University document:

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

4.0 University Promotion and Tenure Policy Review Committee - Refer to Section 4.0 of the University document

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

5.0 School Promotion and Tenure Committee (SPTC)

5.1 Committee Election and Term of Office

a. Committee Membership

The SPTC shall be composed of at least 7 tenured faculty members from the School, two of whom must be at the rank of full professor; for promotion of a term faculty member, there shall be at least 1 promoted (associate or full) term faculty member added to the committee. No faculty member is eligible to serve on both the PRC and SPTC. Each member shall have voting rights and is required to vote on each candidate under review, with the exception of the circumstances described in section 5.1(b). Each department shall elect annually in the spring, one faculty member to the pool from which the Dean will select two faculty to serve 3-year terms. No member of the committee shall serve for their own review.

At the time of the committee selection, the Dean shall give consideration to the balance and representativeness of the committee. In unusual circumstances, the Dean may select a committee member from outside the elected pool to ensure balance. The Dean, or designee, shall keep the official list and terms of committee members. None of the committee members shall hold an administrative title at the level of departmental chair or above.

c. Terms of Appointment

Faculty from the School of Education appointed to the SPTC shall serve for three years. No member of the faculty may serve two consecutive terms. The committee serves from July 1st to June 30th of the following academic year. A candidate may challenge, in writing to the Dean, any member of the committee for cause within five working days of the date on which the candidate is notified of the composition of the committee. If a candidate does challenge

the right of a member to serve on the committee and the challenge is upheld, the Dean, with the advice of the committee, shall appoint an alternate member from the elected pool. In the event that the challenge is upheld, but also has implications for the review of other candidates, the challenged SPTC member will be replaced by another tenured faculty member from the same department. If it is not possible for another faculty member from the department to serve on the SPTC, the challenged faculty member will not participate in the review, meetings, or vote for the candidate who initiated the challenge. Another faculty from outside the challenged-faculty member's department will be appointed to the committee, with consideration given to the STPC composition. If a member of the committee is unable to serve a complete term, the Dean shall appoint a person from the pool elected most recently to complete the expired term.

c. **Committee Chair**

The Committee shall elect a Chair annually. The Committee Chair is responsible for seeing that the Committee follows all University and School policies and procedures. The Chair cannot serve more than two consecutive years during their three-year term. The SPTC Chair convenes the committee for the review of any new faculty who are seeking tenure and/or promotion as a condition of hiring (see section 7.1.4).

6.0 University Appeal Committee - Refer to Section 6.0 of the University document:

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

7.0 Academic Review Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

- a. The candidate notifies the department chair of intent to submit for promotion and/or tenure by **April 1** in the year prior to the year of promotion and tenure review.
- b. In accordance with section 7.1 of the University Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures, the department chair, in consultation with the Dean or their designee, shall form the Peer Review Committee(s) PRC(s) within five working days following the April 1 notification.
- c. The candidate may challenge the composition of the PRC within five working days of the announcement of the committee structure.
- d. The Dean appoints the School Promotion and Tenure Committee by **July 1**, and that committee serves until June 30th of the next year.
 - i. This committee will review all tenure and promotion candidates and issues during these dates.

- ii. In the event a member(s) of the Tenure and Promotion Committee cannot serve during the summer, the Dean will appoint a member(s) from a pool of candidates provided by the department chairs.
- e. The candidate, with the department chair, shall develop a file to be submitted by August 20. Candidates for promotion and tenure are invited to meet with representatives of the SPTC in the spring preceding submission of tenure related documentation to clarify any questions regarding what is to be submitted or how it is to be organized. This is at the election of the candidate. It is not a candidate interview.

7.1 Promotion and Tenure Initiated at the Department Level (PRC)

For tenured and tenure-eligible faculty, the PRC shall be composed of no fewer than five tenured faculty members and one student. Make-up should include at least four faculty members from within the Department, at least one faculty member from outside the School, and one student. The student will be a non-voting member of the committee. If there is not a sufficient number of faculty members from the Department who can serve on the PRC, faculty from within the School will be selected. Each candidate may submit a recommended list of five faculty members who best know the work of the faculty member and its relevance to department and School goals. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, will formulate all PRCs taking into consideration the request of the candidate. At least one committee member will be selected from the candidate's recommended list. Committees should be appointed with consideration for balance regarding race, rank, and gender. At least two people on the committee must be at a rank aspired to by the candidate(s). In instances where there are multiple candidates from one department, the tenured department faculty will determine if there will be individual peer review committees or if a single committee will be formulated to review all candidates from the department. The department chair will notify candidates of the structure of the Peer Review Committee(s).

For term (non-tenure) faculty, the formation of the PRC will follow the procedures described for tenured and tenure-eligible faculty. The PRC shall be composed of no fewer than five faculty members, and may include one term faculty member at the rank aspired to by the candidate(s) and a minimum of three tenured faculty members, and one student (non-voting).

a. Terms of Appointment

Members of the committee shall serve for one year. No member of the committee shall serve for their own review. None of the committee members shall hold an administrative title at the level of department chair or above. Tenured and term faculty in the School of Education may serve on more than one PRC during the academic year. The chair shall notify the candidate of the proposed PRC, and the candidate shall have the right to challenge any member of the committee for cause. (This should be done within five working days of the announcement of the committee structure.) The candidate's concerns will be shared with the Dean. If the candidate's challenge is upheld, the department chair, in consultation with the Dean, shall appoint a replacement for that person.

b. **Committee Chair**

The committee shall elect a chair from its members and is responsible for seeing that the committee follows all University and School policies and procedures.

7.1.1 Peer Review Committee (PRC)

a. **Duties and Responsibilities**

It shall be the duty of the committee to review for tenure and/or promotion persons holding primary faculty, term faculty or administrative appointments in the department and who have assignments of 50% or more with the department. The committee shall carry out its duties and responsibilities consistent with the University's *Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures* and the procedures and criteria contained in this document. The final vote of the committee shall be by secret ballot. All information shall be considered confidential and handled accordingly. The report of the PRC, following the same format used by the School committee and specified in the Appendix, will be forwarded to the department chair.

The PRC will receive the credentials and supporting materials of the candidate(s) for promotion and tenure **by August 20**. The committee shall examine the evidence presented according to its published criteria and send a decision, along with a narrative report, to recommend or not recommend to the department chair by **October 1**.

b. **External Review Solicitation**

The PRC meets by **May 15** to select external reviewers, using information provided by the candidate about reviewers. Only the PRC shall solicit and receive external evaluations. External reviewers must be individuals with expertise in the candidate's field or a related scholarly field, be from outside of VCU, and be an individual who can provide an independent review of the candidate's work. Persons who have co-authored publications, collaborated on research, or been institutional colleagues, or academic mentors/advisors of the applicant normally should be excluded from consideration as outside evaluators. Reviewers for external evaluations must be solicited both from persons suggested by the candidate and persons suggested by the committee. The file shall list all persons solicited for external review letters, identify each reviewer as either named by the candidate or named by the committee, and identify the relationship of the external reviewer to the candidate. The external evaluator must describe the nature of their relationship with the candidate in the review letter. The candidate shall develop a list of five potential reviewers who hold a rank at their institutions of Associate Professor or Professor, and provide the name, position, address, phone number, a rationale for the selection of each and a brief description of their relationship to each reviewer. This list will be submitted by the candidate to the department chair by **May 1**; the department chair then submits the list to the Chair of the PRC.

A minimum of three external letters must be received for review. For individuals hired after January 1, 2023, a minimum of five external letters are required. The committee shall select a minimum of one reviewer from the candidate's list and solicit a minimum of one reviewer from persons suggested by the PRC. All letters from external evaluators will be confidential unless disclosure is required by law. This policy will be conveyed to external reviewers when letters are solicited (see Appendix C for a sample correspondence to external reviewers).

Each external reviewer shall provide the PRC with a curriculum vitae. The reviewers shall be asked to review the candidate's scholarly work, and shall be provided a copy of the Virginia Commonwealth University School of Education criteria by which to evaluate it. Reviewers should be strongly encouraged to submit their reviews no later than **August 1** in order to be available for committee review. If the candidate is being reviewed as a full professor, the PRC should request that the reviewer address the issue of national reputation.

c. Variations in Review Procedures Specific to the Faculty Serving as Administrators

- **Variations for Administrators other than the Dean**

Any faculty member who is serving as an administrator in any capacity other than as the Dean of the School will follow exactly the same procedures and guidelines as regular faculty. These administrators will initiate their review with the Chair of the Department where they hold faculty status.

- **Variations for Department Chairs**

Department Chairs seeking promotion will initiate this process following the same procedures as in section 7.0 with the role of the Chair taken by the Dean. That is, the Chair will notify the Dean of their intent to submit for review and the Dean will appoint the PRC. The PRC appointed by the Dean will review only the Chair. Members of this committee may, however, also be members of a review committee for another candidate. The candidate (Chair) may challenge the composition of the PRC and the Dean of the School of Education will respond to this challenge.

The PRC will operate in the same manner as for other candidates. It will submit its report directly to the SPTC rather than to the Chair.

The SPTC will submit its review of any Chair to the Dean, and the procedure continues from that point the same as for regular faculty.

- **Variations for the Associate Dean**

If an Associate Dean seeks promotion, the Dean of the School Education will assume responsibilities for this promotion process.

- **Variations for the Dean**

If the Dean is seeking tenure and/or promotion, they will initiate the process with the Chair of the department of origin as specified in 7.0, Section A to C.

In any year that the Dean is seeking review, the PRC will be appointed by a committee consisting of all Department Chairs. In a similar manner as prescribed in section 7.1 (A), the Dean may challenge the membership of the PRC to the appointing committee.

The review procedure or the Dean proceeds from PRC to SPTC as prescribed for regular faculty. The SPTC will submit its review of the Dean to the Vice President for Academic Affairs along with the reviews that preceded it.

7.1.2 Department Chair

The department chair will not attend meetings of the PRC. The department chair will make a written analysis based on the candidate's credentials, the PRC report, and the chair's independent assessment of the candidate's performance. The chair's report together with the entire candidate's file (excluding copies of the confidential external review letters) and the PRC report will be shared with the candidate. The candidate shall have the option of attaching a written response. The file shall then be sent to the School Promotion and Tenure Committee by **October 15**. The department chair will communicate the need for expedited review of new hires with the chair of the SPTC.

7.1.3 School Promotion and Tenure Committee Evaluation

The duty of the SPTC shall be to review for tenure and promotion all persons holding primary faculty, term faculty or administrative appointments in the School of Education and who have assignments of 50% or more with the school.

The SPTC will receive the candidate's credentials and supporting materials and reports from the PRC and department chair by **October 15**. The committee shall carry out its duties and responsibilities consistent with the University's *Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures* and the procedures and criteria contained in this document. Using the candidate's file and reports from the PRC and department chair, the committee shall conduct a substantive evaluation of the candidate's record and performance. The committee:

- will ensure that the peer level review is in good order from the standpoint of evidence presented, conclusions drawn and administratively the file is complete and in compliance with the University promotion and tenure committee guidelines;
- will ensure that the candidate's review illustrates that promotion and/or tenure is based upon academic accomplishments that contribute to University, School, and department level considerations, including perspectives, strategic goals, and interests.
- may require additional information from the candidate, the PRC, or the department chair.

The final vote of the committee shall be by secret ballot. All information shall be considered confidential and handled accordingly. The written recommendation of the school committee, including the vote, will be forwarded to the Dean by **December 1**.

By **February 1**, the SPTC will, as part of its duties, study the process and make suggestions to the Dean for revision. (Refer to section 12.0)

7.1.4 Review of Potential Hires

Anyone hired as an assistant professor is not eligible for consideration for tenure and/or promotion as a condition of being hired.

Only candidates tenured at another institution of higher education can be considered for tenure and/or promotion as a condition of being hired.

Candidates who are hired at the rank of associate or full professor, who have not been tenured at another institution of higher education can negotiate with the Dean for early review during the normal fall review process as a condition of being hired.

Whenever possible, the search committee for positions advertised at the associate, full, or open level should be composed of faculty who would be eligible to serve on the Peer Review Committee.

Candidates hired at the rank of associate or full professor who have held tenure at another institution of higher education and wish to be considered for tenure as a condition of employment should make this request to the department chair. If the department chair recommends to the Dean that the person be reviewed and the Dean concurs, tenured members of the search committee will be constituted as a Peer Review Committee as soon as possible after the completion of the search process. At this time the department chair will provide the candidate with a copy of the *School of Education Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure* and notify the Chair of the SPTC that the PRC has been constituted.

The PRC is responsible for the peer-level review process and for obtaining the materials and documentation necessary to complete the review in accordance with the *School of Education Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure* and University guidelines. The documentation submitted for expedited review should be as similar as possible to those normally submitted as part of the promotion and/or tenure review, including: (1) a complete and detailed curriculum vitae, (2) letters from at least three external reviewers, (3) documentation of teaching practice and performance (e.g., teaching evaluations and select syllabi), (4) a statement describing the candidate's research interests, scholarly accomplishments, and service activities. The letters from the external reviewers may be the same as the reference letters used as part of the hiring decision process provided the letters address the candidate's suitability for the faculty rank and tenure.

If there are fewer than four tenured members on the search committee, additional members may be selected by the Dean from the pool of candidates for the School Promotion and Tenure

Committee that has been provided by the department chairs (see Section 7.0, d). The Peer Review Committee submits its report and recommendation, and the normal review procedures/steps are followed. The timeline for the expedited tenure review of candidates as a condition of hiring is as follows: The PRC submits their report by **April 15**; the department chair submits their report by **April 30**; the SPTC submits their report to the Dean by **June 1**; the Dean submits their recommendation to the provost. Whenever possible, all expedited reviews of new hires will occur during this timeframe. Exceptions may be granted by the Dean under unusual circumstances. Otherwise the standard timeline for tenure and/or promotion review is followed.

8.0 Administrative Review Procedures for Academic Personnel Actions

8.1 The Dean of the School of Education shall:

Convene and charge the School Promotion and Tenure Committee each year. The SPTC committee should be convened no later than **October 1**. The Dean will not attend meetings of SPTC except to convene and charge the committee.

Verify that the recommendations of the PRC, the SPTC, and department chair are consistent with the candidate's file. If the Dean determines that there is some inconsistency with the candidate's file, the Dean may refer the file back to any or all of the appropriate levels by **December 15**, for further consideration, specifically identifying the inconsistency that should be addressed. All correspondence reflecting a referral back to a previous level of review for any review for any reason shall be maintained as a permanent part of the candidate's file.

Make a written analysis with a recommendation which, together with the entire file (excluding copies of the confidential external review letters), shall be made available to the candidate by **January 7**. The candidate shall have the option of attaching a written response.

The candidate has the option of withdrawing their name from consideration at any time up to **January 15**.

The file shall then be sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by **January 15**.

9.0 Appeal Process - Refer to Section 9 of the University document

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

10.0 The President and the Board of Visitors -Refer to section 10 of the University document.

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

11.0 Procedures for Termination of Employment of Tenured Faculty Members -- refer to Section 11 of the University document

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

12.0 Procedures of the Review and Amendment of this Document

The SPTC will, as part of its duties, study the process and make suggestions to the Dean for revision. In the event that there are suggestions and/or specific recommendations for revision. Revisions suggested by the SPTC will follow the process outlined in Section Twelve to gain approval from the Faculty Organization, SOE Faculty, and the Dean. With regard to approved suggestions, the Dean must take necessary steps to see that the revisions are made as quickly as possible but no longer than one year later.

Appendices

A. Format for Committee Reports	45
B. Example External Review Invitation Letter	49

Appendix A: Format for Committee Reports

School of Education Tenure and Promotion Committee Report/Peer Review Committee Report
(Candidate's Name Here)
Date

Using the criteria established in the School of Education's *Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure*, members of the School of Education's (Year) Tenure and Promotion Committee evaluated (Name) candidacy for (*tenure and promotion, or promotion*) to (Rank). The committee examined (Name) curriculum vitae and supporting documentation, as well as reports of the Peer Review Committee and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. A table summarizing the results of this Committee's votes is set forth below, followed by the Committee's recommendations. The attached report includes a narrative for each of the four-evaluation areas.

Area	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory		
Credentials and Experience				
Area	Excellent	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Teaching				
Scholarship				
Service				

FINAL VOTE

RECOMMEND [*tenure with promotion to (rank) or promotion to (rank)*] _____

DO NOT RECOMMEND [*tenure with promotion (rank) or promotion to (rank)*] _____

 Name Chair

 Name

 Name

 Name

 Name

 Name

Name

Name

Running head with candidates name here

Page 2 of 3

CREDENTIALS AND EXPERIENCE

Evidence

Conclusion and Evaluation

Based on the School of Education criteria for Credentials and Experience, the Committee members voted as follows:

Satisfactory _____
Unsatisfactory _____

TEACHING

Evidence

Conclusion and Evaluation

Based on the School of Education criteria for teaching, the Committee voted as follows:

Excellent _____
Very Good _____
Satisfactory _____
Unsatisfactory _____

SCHOLARSHIP

Evidence

Conclusion and Evaluation

Based on the School of Education criteria for Scholarship, the Committee members voted as follows:

Excellent	_____
Very Good	_____
Satisfactory	_____
Unsatisfactory	_____

SERVICE

Evidence

Conclusion and Evaluation

Based on the School of Education criteria for service, the Committee voted as follows:

Excellent	_____
Very Good	_____
Satisfactory	_____
Unsatisfactory	_____

Appendix B: Sample Email Correspondence for External Evaluation of Candidate

DRAFT

Dear Dr. XXXX:

I am writing to inquire about your availability to review the research dossier of Dr. XXXX, Assistant Professor of XXXX, as part of their candidacy for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure at Virginia Commonwealth University. In our review of potential evaluators, your name was advanced as someone who would be well-qualified to review Dr. XXXX's research record. I have attached a current CV to this email.

If you accept this request, the research dossier will be sent to you from Virginia Commonwealth University on XXXX. The dossier will include examples of Dr. XXXX's published research for your review and evaluation. You will be provided a copy of the relevant portion of the School of Education P&T policy. In soliciting your evaluation, we are particularly interested in your views on the quality of the research and its impact or potential impact on the field(s) of XXX and XXXX.

Should you agree to review Dr. XXXX's work, we will ask that you return your review by XXXX to the Department of XXXX (address). In your review, please describe the nature of your relationship with the candidate and provide an updated Curriculum Vitae or bio-sketch. Your evaluation will be distributed to the internal review committees including the chair and Dean, if applicable; however, all letters will be confidential unless disclosure is required by law. Following the conclusion of the review, all copies of your letter will be kept in a sealed file in the Dean's office and will not be used again.

I appreciate the time and energy necessary to prepare these important reviews. Accordingly, I appreciate your consideration of this request. Please respond by email: XXXX@vcu.edu (XXX-XXX-XXXX).

Sincerely,

PRC Chair

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION GUIDELINES FOR THIRD YEAR REVIEW

a. **Purpose**

The purpose of the third year review is to provide feedback to tenure-eligible and promotion-eligible assistant professors prior to review for promotion in rank or promotion in rank with tenure. The intent of the third-year review is to give faculty members early feedback from experienced faculty peers and the department chair to allow them to address areas in need of attention before they submit their materials to the Peer and School Promotion and Tenure committees.

a.1 An effort is made in the third-year review to strike a reasonable balance between the depth and comprehensiveness of the evaluation and the time and effort that faculty members are expected to invest in preparing for and carrying out the review.

b. **Participation**

Faculty will be asked to submit their materials to their department chair by March 1st of their third year. The review process shall be completed and submitted to the candidate by May 1st. For tenure-track assistant professors, this review is required and shall occur once they have completed two and a half years of probationary service. Individuals who bring prior faculty experience with them to the School of Education shall negotiate the timing of the review in consultation with the Dean and Department Chair. For non-tenure eligible assistant professors, this review is optional, and is recommended to occur at least 2 years prior to being reviewed for promotion in rank.

c. **Third Year Review Committee**

The third year assessment will be carried out by a committee composed of four associate or full professors representing at least two departments. For tenure track faculty, the committee will be composed of tenured faculty members. For term faculty, the committee will be composed of associate or full professors, at least one of whom is a term faculty member. The committee will be appointed by the Dean or Dean's designee from a list of individuals who volunteer to serve by January 15th. At least one member of the committee must be from the candidate's department. The Dean may appoint more than one review committee to accommodate a number of candidates, if needed.

d. **Review Materials**

Faculty members being reviewed must submit up-to-date curriculum vitae. Other materials that should be included in the candidate's file, if applicable are:

1. Course syllabi for all courses taught
2. Student course evaluations for all courses taught (for faculty with teaching apportionment)
3. Faculty activity reports (or equivalent) from the previous two years
4. Annual Evaluations from Department Chair/supervisor from the previous two years.

5. Up to 5 representative scholarly/research products for faculty with a research/scholarship apportionment
6. Up to 5 representative teaching artifacts for faculty with teaching as the primary area of responsibility
7. Documentation of service activities (may include faculty activity reports or equivalent).
8. A narrative statement describing the accomplishments, professional growth, and/or changing interests over time, consistent with the School of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The narrative should not exceed 5 single spaced pages.

d.1 Individuals should consult with their department chair/supervisor or with faculty colleagues before preparing materials for the review committee.

d.2 Faculty should submit materials that are carefully organized and presented.

d.3 Faculty are encouraged to refer to the School of Education Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines, the University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures, Faculty Roles and Rewards document, and the School of Education and individual department/center mission statements for discussions of promotion and tenure review and descriptions of the expectations held for faculty.

e. **Review**

Each committee member will be responsible for reviewing and assessing individuals in the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and service. The committee may ask the candidate to submit additional materials or to clarify information provided. Term faculty will be reviewed and assessed in accordance with their assigned responsibilities.

e.1 The criteria in the School of Education Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines will be used as the basis for the third year review, with appropriate allowance made for the shorter length of time in rank.

e.2 The committee will prepare a narrative assessment for each area to be evaluated, using criteria specified in the School's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and including one of the following evaluative ratings of the candidate's progress toward promotion or promotion & tenure: "Making excellent progress," "Making very good progress," "Making satisfactory progress," or "Making unsatisfactory progress."

e.3 The written report will be submitted to the candidate's department chair who will also provide a review. In addition, the dean will provide a review of the candidate's file at the candidate's request. The department chair will share the reports with the candidate and Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development; the chair may also share the reports with the dean with the candidate's permission. The written reports may be used as part of the documentation for a future promotion and/or promotion & tenure review.

Original 8-1-97

Revised 1-6-99

Revised 3-22-99

Approved by SOE Faculty on 10/9/01

Revised 12/15/03

Revised 10/15/10

Revised and approved by SOE Faculty and Dean on 10/31/2022

Revised and approved by SOE Faculty and Dean on 04/02/2024

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION COMMITTEE GOVERNANCE POLICY

Faculty in the School of Education are involved in governance through decision-making processes related to curriculum, resources, and matters which affect faculty and students through standing committees, personnel committees, task forces, and by election or appointment to University bodies such as the University Council, Faculty Senate, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and University Graduate Council. Within the School of Education, the multi-constituency forum for governance are faculty meetings called and chaired by the Dean approximately twice per Fall and Spring semester. Membership and appointments to SOE committees are based on a staggered rotation for membership on the different committees that will allow for continuity in standing committee deliberations over time.

The School of Education Committee Governance Policy reflects the departmental structure, the number of faculty members available to serve, and the functions of existing committees. While departments have the right to determine representation, any full-time program faculty member (tenured, tenure-track, term, in-residence) is eligible to serve.

The School of Education has standing committees whose membership includes representatives from the departments. In addition, there is at least one ex-officio member on each committee appointed by the Dean as a Dean's office representative. Unless otherwise noted, ex-officio members of committees are non-voting.

School of Education committees whose members are elected follow this process: The need for committee representatives (whether school-wide, departmental, or center-based) is announced publicly either at a faculty meeting or via email, to those eligible to serve. If only one eligible person volunteers to serve in the open position, they are considered elected to the role. If more than one eligible person volunteers to serve in the open position, there will be an election to determine who serves via secret ballot.

Each committee elects a chairperson for the year and designates an individual to take notes for each meeting. The chairperson calls the meeting, arranges the agenda, and is responsible for moderating the meetings. The secretary keeps a brief set of minutes to report members present and absent, actions taken by the committee, and other information pertinent to the role of the committee. A list of the members of each committee is distributed annually by the Dean. Committees also place copies of meeting notes or minutes in a folder accessible to all SOE Faculty.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Professional Education Coordinating Council (PECC): The PECC engages Educator Preparation Program (EPP) faculty and staff with stakeholders across VCU and our area school divisions to discuss programs, trends, and issues affecting educator preparation. Member roles include reviewing and making recommendations for programs, making sure programs are relevant, and providing information reflecting changes in the labor market. Additionally, members assist SOE in evaluating

program effectiveness. Outcomes data and P12 partner needs are reviewed collaboratively and used to guide recommendations for continuous improvement for licensure programs and support for beginning educators. This committee convenes in the spring only. However, representatives from school divisions and areas in VCU may be invited to subcommittee meetings of the CIC throughout the year to support continuous improvement efforts, as the agenda requires. Further, minutes of the CIC will be shared with the PECC to report progress on PECC recommendations. The committee is chaired by the Dean of the School of Education and membership includes: Deans of the School of the Arts and the College of Humanities and Sciences or their designees; SOE Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, SOE Assistant Dean for Student Affairs, Faculty Director of Educator Preparation, 3 faculty members from the College of Humanities and Sciences, one or more representatives of the Departments of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Special Education, Teaching and Learning, and Foundations of Education, representatives from the School of the Arts: Art Education (1), Music Education (1), a student representative from the Student Virginia Education Association, membership from the P-12 community consists of four administrators (building and central office) and four teachers or counselors. Members are identified by the Faculty Director of Educator Preparation, in partnership with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and department chairs. Membership is reviewed by the Dean who is head of the committee, and individuals are invited for a renewable one-year term of service. Because membership is generally role-based, there is not a term limit to service.

Continuous Improvement Committee: The Continuous Improvement Committee is designed to convene a broad representation of faculty and staff to ensure continuous improvement of educator preparation and related professional programs. Benchmarks are informed by licensure, accreditation, and accountability expectations, as well as best practices. Membership for this committee is role based and includes representation from each licensure program. Specifically, those persons in the School of Education, School of the Arts, and College of Humanities and Sciences currently working in the following positions serve on CIC:

- Faculty program and/or clinical coordinator
- Staff engaged in licensure and accreditation.

Members of the committee self-select membership to one of three subcommittees: assessment, clinical experiences, and curriculum. Each subcommittee convenes once in the fall and in the spring with additional asynchronous activities. The full CIC group convenes in the fall and spring to hear progress reports of the functional area subcommittees and collaboratively discusses progress, related outcomes data, and necessary action for continuous improvement. Recommendations and information is shared with academic departments and leadership when necessary.

- **Assessment Subcommittee:** The Assessment Subcommittee of the Continuous Improvement Committee (CIC) reviews policies and procedures related to the quality assurance system of the VCU educator preparation program. The educator preparation program includes all initial and advanced licensure programs in the School of Education, School of the Arts, and College of Humanities and Sciences. This assessment subcommittee provides feedback and oversight for all assessment activities related to the EPP and its licensure programs. The committee may make

recommendations to the dean and/or department chairs, by way of the Continuous Improvement Committee, relative to the interpretation and use of data in support of accreditation and for program review/improvement. The Assessment Subcommittee of the Continuous Improvement Committee will be composed of self-identified faculty representatives from the EPP licensure programs. Representation is for a renewable one-year term on the subcommittee. The subcommittee is chaired by the Director of Data Analytics. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies, the Faculty Director for Educator Preparation, and the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs and Inclusive Excellence, as well as select staff positions, serve the subcommittee on an as needed basis.

- **Clinical Experiences Subcommittee:** This subcommittee ensures quality field experiences by cooperatively working with educational stakeholders to address program, practice, research, and policy issues relevant to the preparation of teachers, leaders, school counselors, and other educational specialists. The subcommittee is chaired by the Faculty Director of Educator Preparation. The subcommittee convenes in the fall and spring and is charged with review of clinical experiences outcomes data, clinical experiences structure and schedule, candidate issues and development in placements, and Birth through grade 12 partners needs to ensure mutually beneficial experiences that prepare completers for practice. Representatives include Student Services Center staff, self-selected initial and advanced licensure program faculty, and Birth through grade 12 partners. The Clinical Experiences Subcommittee of the Continuous Improvement Committee will be composed of self-identified faculty representatives from the EPP licensure programs. Representation is for a renewable one-year term on the subcommittee. The subcommittee is chaired by the Faculty Director for Educator Preparation. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies, the Director of Data Analytics and the Director of the Student Services Center, as well as select staff positions, serve the subcommittee on an as needed basis.
- **Educator Preparation Curriculum Subcommittee:** The curriculum subcommittee provides feedback and recommendations for curricular continuous improvement including academic licensure programs in the EPP, informed by outcomes data from student learning measures, student, completer, employer feedback, partner feedback, and current pressing needs of the fields represented by educator programs. The focus is distinct from CARC and emphasizes continuous improvement in academic programs. Recommendations from this subcommittee go to the departments for consideration. The subcommittee, chaired by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs convenes in the fall and spring with membership of self-selected faculty program coordinators, Faculty Director of Educator Preparation and with representation from SOE Student Success, Birth-12 partners, and the VCU College of Humanities and Sciences as the agenda requires.

Committee on Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging

The Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, & Belonging Committee (DEIB committee), is a joint faculty, staff and student-led committee consisting of representatives from various School of Education (SOE) departments and centers. Our school-wide goal of a Whole School Transformation is intentionally focused on influencing the curriculum, engaging in impactful dialogue, and providing resources for our SOE stakeholders. Collectively, we believe that we can transform our learning environments to sustain an equitable and inclusive learning environment for faculty, staff, and students. The committee has representation from all academic departments, with staff and students from various departments and centers. All SOE faculty, staff, and students are invited to join the DEIB Committee or any subcommittees at any time during the academic year. The Assistant Dean for Student Affairs and Inclusive Excellence serves as the ex-officio member. The Associate Dean for Student Affairs and Inclusive Excellence serves as an ex-officio member.

Curriculum and Academic Resources Committee

The **Curriculum and Academic Resources Committee (CARC)** reviews and approves all new or revised course proposals, academic rules, regulations, new degree proposals, reports regarding program approval, accreditation, and internal program audits. In addition, the committee reviews, develops, and recommends policies and procedures governing academic programs. There are four members on the committee, one from each department. The committee also includes two ex-officio members: the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Academic Affairs Coordinator. (Please see Appendix A for Curriculum and Academic Resources Committee By-Laws.)

Research and Professional Development Committee

The **Research and Professional Development Committee (RPDC)** supports the research goals of the School of Education and faculty research activities. This includes providing internal reviews and recommendations for VCU internal awards and research-related support from the Office of Research and Faculty Development. The RPDC also promotes research, development and assists in the dissemination of research findings generated by the School of Education faculty. The committee organizes research-related events and professional development activities, including the annual School of Education Research Colloquium. The committee consists of six members: one per department, an SOE Center representative, and the Director of Research Services. Each department and center representative is elected for a two-year term. The Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development serves as an ex-officio member.

Scholarship and Awards Committee

The **Scholarship and Awards Committee** promotes the availability of scholarships for students in teacher preparation and other professional educational programs. It also serves as a screening committee for most School of Education scholarships in accordance with the specified criteria for each scholarship. The SOE Scholarship Committee is made up of one representative from each of the school's academic programs, in addition to one representative each from the Development, Finance and Student Services offices. This assures that the distribution of scholarships with criteria specific to a program area is informed by someone within that program, and also assures that we will always have

a committee member familiar with the students in those programs and their individual activities and performances. All representatives are approved by the Dean of the School of Education prior to the start of each academic year. The Assistant Dean for Student Affairs and Inclusive Excellence serves as an ex-officio member.

School of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee

The **SPTC** shall be composed of at least 7 members including 6 tenured faculty members from the School, and one tenured senior faculty member from outside the School (appointed annually). No faculty member is eligible to serve on both the PRC and SPTC. Each member shall have voting rights. Each department shall elect annually in the fall one faculty member to the pool from which the Dean will select two faculty to serve 3-year terms. Recommendations to the Dean concerning possible faculty members from outside the School may be made by any faculty member. No member of the committee shall serve for their own review.

At the time of the committee selection, the Dean shall give consideration to balance and representativeness. The Dean shall ensure each year that at least two members of the committee hold the rank of full professor. In unusual circumstances, the Dean may select a committee member from outside the elected pool to ensure balance. The Dean shall keep the official list and terms of committee members. None of the committee members shall hold an administrative title at the level of departmental chair or above. (See Section Six: Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure).

School of Education Budget Committee

The **Budget Committee** provides input and transparency to the SOE budget and budgeting processes. The committee reviews all aspects of the SOE budget to enhance the transparency of SOE finances and provides recommendations. The committee includes at least four faculty members, representing at least three different departments, with at least one member from a center, and at least four staff representatives. The committee also includes one ex-officio member: the Director of Finance and Business Administration. This committee should meet every Fall and Spring semester, but must meet a minimum of once every Fall and Spring semester, and may meet as often as the committee deems necessary.

AD HOC COMMITTEES

Academic Status and Admissions Appeals Committee

The **Academic Status and Admissions Appeals Committee** reviews petitions related to admissions, terminations and exceptions to academic rules. Three faculty members, one representative from the department where the appeal originates and two faculty members from other departments are appointed on a case by case basis. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Student Affairs and Inclusive Excellence serve as ex-officio members. Meetings are called by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs on an as needed basis.

Students who have been accepted provisionally and feel that they should have been full admits or those who have been rejected can appeal in writing to the committee. Students who have been

terminated from a program may also appeal in writing to have their status reconsidered. In addition, students may petition for exceptions to academic rules and regulations.

The committee only considers issues relating to admission, termination, and academic rules but does not deal with matters relating to course grades.

Peer Review Committees

The **Peer Review Committee** reviews credentials and supporting materials of all candidates for promotion and tenure who hold primary faculty, collateral faculty, or administrative appointments of fifty percent or more with the School of Education. Each Peer Review Committee carries out its responsibilities consistent with the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures of Virginia Commonwealth University and the Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure for the School of Education. Procedures for appointment of the committees are included in the Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure in the School of Education. (Please see Section Six).

Third Year Review Committee

The pretenure assessment will be carried out by a committee composed of four senior tenured faculty representing at least two departments. The committee will be appointed by the Dean from a list of individuals who volunteer to serve. The Dean may appoint more than one review committee if the number of candidates justifies doing so. Each committee will receive and review materials in accordance with the Guidelines for Third Year Pretenure Faculty Review (see Section 7)

Revised 10/13/2003

Revised 09/20/2006

Revised and approved by SOE Faculty and Dean 04/02/2024

Revised and approved by SOE Faculty and Dean 09/20/2024

CURRICULUM AND ACADEMIC
RESOURCES COMMITTEE BY-LAWS
School of Education

I. Composition

A. Committee members and Term of Membership

There are four members on the committee, one from each department. Ex-officio members include the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies and representative(s) from the Office of the Academic Affairs..

B. Election to the Committee

Each department works with their faculty to identify potential CARC committee members and holds an election to elect their department's representative. The election process within departments is determined by the department. Departments should also identify an alternate for their CARC member in the case that the CARC member cannot attend a committee meeting. The alternate will serve the same three year term as the member.

C. Membership Terms

Each elected member of CARC will serve a term of three years. Rotation off and on the committee will follow a staggered pattern so that incoming new members will not begin all at once.

D. Absences

Members who will be absent are expected to arrange for their department CARC alternate to attend in their place. Alternates have full voting privileges. In the event that the CARC Chair is absent, an alternate from their department will serve as their proxy for voting purposes, but another CARC member who has served for at least one year will serve as the Acting Chair.

II. Charge/Function/Goals

A. Context

The primary responsibility for the development, evaluation and revision of curricula rests with the faculty of the appropriate school and its subunits. Campus-wide review of new or revised undergraduate programs and courses is the responsibility of the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUC). For graduate curricula, the responsibility lies with the University Graduate Council (UGC). New degree programs and modifications in terms of number of required credits also require the approval of the University Council, the VCU Board of Visitors, and the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV). The curricula for programs are presumed to be consistent with the mission, values, and goals of

the School of Education. Thus, the current School of Education Mission Statement, which is revised periodically, provides helpful guidance for the work of the committee.

The Curriculum Committee is the final School of Education faculty body for recommending curriculum development and modifications to the Dean and the School of Education and to other curricular bodies within the University.

B. Charge

The committee is charged with assuring that course or program proposals, revisions, or deletions meet the spirit of the School mission and goals, and also that such proposals or modifications meet University, professional association, and accrediting guidelines identified by applicable University bodies. A further charge is to initiate, develop, and recommend policies and procedures governing the School's academic programs.

As a standing committee of the School of Education, the Dean of the School, or designee delineates the committee's charge formally. The charge to the Committee is thus one of overseeing and facilitating. Committee members are responsible for reviewing curriculum proposals in light of School and University concerns, as well as from the perspective of the department that they represent. It is expected that before programs and/or courses are submitted to the committee, they will have been approved by the appropriate program group and department (following department procedures and protocol) and will have been discussed with any other unit within the School of Education or across campus who have programs, and or courses, that may be impacted by the request.

C. Functions

1. To receive all new or revised course proposals and/or academic rules and regulations for review, and transmit recommendations to the Office of the Dean.
2. To receive all new or revised degree pre-proposals and proposals for review and transmit recommendations to the Office of the Dean.
3. To receive all curricular changes to programs and/or courses related to admission criteria, prerequisite coursework, application deadlines, modality changes, admissions holds, and program or course deletions, for review and transmit recommendations to the Office of the Dean.
4. To review, develop, and recommend policies and procedures governing academic dimensions of admission, retention, clinical practice, and related policies and procedures.
5. To review and comment on academic policies and procedures received from the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the University Graduate Council.

D. Goals

The goals of the Committee are to carry out the designated charges and functions, to facilitate needed changes, to ensure a School perspective in the review of proposals, and to ensure that proposals recommended for approval are fully and accurately prepared to meet the requirements of the University approval process and encourage prompt acceptance.

III. Meetings

A. Frequency

The committee meets the fourth Tuesday of each month during the academic year, with the exception of November's meeting, which is scheduled earlier in the month due to Thanksgiving break. The chairperson may call special meetings, which will be announced to Committee members and other faculty at least two weeks in advance.

B. Attendance

All meetings shall be open to faculty, administrators, and staff. The Committee encourages attendance by all interested persons; however, only Committee members have voting privileges.

C. Agenda

With the exception of unusual circumstances, only actions items received by the Academic Affairs Office one week prior to a scheduled meeting shall be acted upon at a given meeting. A representative from the Academic Affairs Office is responsible for creating the agenda and sending it out to the CARC committee. New business may be introduced for discussion, but without action. In unique situations, these requirements can be waived by a majority vote of the Committee members present.

D. Voting

Committee votes shall occur at the end of the meeting after all guests and proposal sponsors have left. Proposal sponsors will be notified of the outcome of the vote via email after the meeting has concluded.

E. Proposal Sponsors

Proposal sponsors should be prepared to attend any meetings related to their proposals. They are also encouraged to attend a meeting prior to developing and/or submitting a proposal for consideration in order to facilitate the preparation of well-developed and carefully prepared materials for consideration by the Committee.

IV. Responsibilities of Members

A. The most senior member of the CARC committee will serve as the chairperson, if possible. The chairperson will serve a one year term as chair, which is a part of their three year CARC term. The chair position will rotate between members/departments. The chairperson shall:

1. Chair meetings according to parliamentary procedures.
2. Ensure that minutes are taken of the business of each meeting.
3. Count all votes, either by voice, raised hands, or written ballot, or appoint a subcommittee to count votes.
4. Appoint all AD Hoc or subcommittees of the committee.

5. Serve as a resource to faculty in the preparation of proposals.
6. Approve proposals in the academic management system (CIM) after approval by the full committee.

Note: In the event that the Chair cannot attend a CARC meeting, another CARC representative who has served for at least one year will serve as Acting Chair for the meeting that the Chair cannot attend.

- B. A representative from the Office of Academic Affairs serves as the recorder for all CARC committee meetings. The recorder shall:
1. Use a standard format for minutes that includes notation of those in attendance and indication of formal motions that are a part of the meetings.
 2. Be responsible for having minutes prepared and sent by e-mail to the members of the committee prior to the next meeting.
- C. The Elected Members shall:
1. Serve as a resource to department faculty in developing proposals.
 2. Share CARC agendas prior to the meeting, and minutes promptly after the meeting, with their department faculty. Communicate any concerns raised by their departments to the Committee.
 3. Read minutes and proposals prior to attending meetings.
 4. Ensure, to the best of their ability, that approved proposals are accurate, contain needed information, are clearly presented, and are prepared in a way that represents the School well and encourages approval by the appropriate University body.
 5. Communicate to the Committee suggestions, concerns, and support from the department faculty they represent concerning proposals and other items under Committee consideration.
 6. Communicate the actions of the Committee to the department faculty whom they represent.
 7. When proposal writers cannot attend a meeting, Committee members from the appropriate department are responsible for providing information about needed modifications or reasons for denial to the proposal sponsor(s).
- D. The Ex-officio Members shall:
1. Review all minutes, proposals, and action items sent to Committee members.
 2. Attend all meetings of the Committee.
 3. Be prepared to speak concerning any business of the Committee but not vote.
 4. Prepare an agenda that includes all action items to be considered at meetings and distribute by either e-mail to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies and Committee members one week prior to meetings.
 5. Immediately after approval, distribute minutes by e-mail to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies, Committee members, others designated by the Chair or Committee.
 6. Upload proposals to the CARC Google Drive at least one week prior to meetings.

7. Submit and approve all approved proposals in the University's Curriculum Inventory Management (CIM) system for further approval by University curriculum committees.
 8. Upload the meeting minutes to the CARC Google Drive.
 9. Maintain all archival CARC documents on the CARC Google Drive.
- E. The Observers shall:
1. Include proposal writers, who are specifically encouraged to attend meetings prior to developing a proposal and meetings at which their proposals are scheduled for discussion and/or action. If unable to attend, the proposal writers should appoint another department member to attend on their behalf and be prepared to answer any questions about the proposal that the committee has.
 2. Include faculty, administrators and other interested persons, all of whom are encouraged to attend Committee meetings.
 3. Be permitted to attend and observe any meetings of the Committee.

V. Subcommittees

Subcommittees are appointed by the Chairperson if needed. An effort should be made to have representation from each department in the School on each subcommittee.

VI. Receiving Proposals

A. Proposal Templates

Templates for all curricular changes are held by the SOE Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty should reach out to Academic Affairs for templates and assistance on completing proposal forms.

B. Approval Process

1. New course or course modification - Proposals originate, within program groups or departments, or the Dean's Office, are then reviewed and approved by departments and signed by Department Chairs, and are finally forwarded to the Committee for discussion and action. Proposals approved by the Committee are transmitted to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies with the Committee's recommendation that they be approved and submitted to the appropriate University body for consideration.
2. New program or program modification – Program modifications that do not alter the core curriculum of a program and the total number of required credits will follow the same approval process as new courses and course modifications. New programs (including concentrations), and any program change that alters the core curriculum or requires a small change in credit hours is considered a “simple modification” and requires SCHEV notification or approval, require that the proposal writer have a meeting with the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies, or an assigned delegate, before the proposal process begins. At this meeting, the proposal writer will be provided with the appropriate information.

3. New programs or program modifications that are considered to be “substantial modifications” by SCHEV (State Council of Higher Education for Virginia), must first go through the pre-proposal process. (See Appendix A for SCHEV definitions.)

VII. Suggestions for preparing and Writing Proposals

A. Examples of Written Proposals

Recent examples of written proposals are available from the Academic Affairs Office.

B. Proposal Details

Proposed course numbers should reflect logical sequence in taking courses, following existing number conventions, and not duplicate a course number already in use. Course titles should be short and clearly reflect the specific content. Terms such as introductory, seminar, laboratory, advanced, field experience, and similar terms should be used cautiously and conform to commonly accepted academic meanings. Pre-requisites, if appropriate, should be included prior to the description.

Course descriptions should focus on course content and student outcomes, but not incorporate a justification. Sentence fragments, rather than full sentences are acceptable in course descriptions. Gender neutral language should be used.

C. Proposal Editing

Since course or program changes will appear in the bulletin as official information, it is important that forms be prepared accurately. At least three people share responsibility for the editing of a proposal. The first is the author or sponsor of the proposal, who must see that it is completely and correctly prepared. The second person sharing responsibility is a department representative to the Committee, who should ensure that the requirements of format and needed attachments are fully met. Since the new changed material will appear within a department section of the bulletin, the Department Chair must bear the final editing responsibility.

It should be noted that the Committee as a whole is not responsible for editing. Forms that are incomplete, incorrectly presented, lacking clarity, or otherwise unacceptable will be returned. When appropriately revised, forms can be returned to the Committee for consideration.

D. Communications with Colleagues

1. Faculty within Departments. Department Chairs and proposal sponsors are responsible for providing verification that the Department has approved of the proposal to the academic affairs coordinator prior to CARC’s vote. Department Chair sign-off in CIM after CARC has voted to approve will provide additional verification.
2. Faculty within the School of Education and across the University. It is essential that the author of each proposal address the question of duplication. It must be shown, through a letter of memorandum, that the proposer has communicated with representatives of all programs, departments, and/or schools where such duplication

or similar conflict is likely or may occur. Proposal sponsors should be prepared to present such evidence as an integral and critical part of the approval process. If proposal sponsors are not aware of duplication issues prior to the CARC, it is the responsibility of departmental CARC members to bring up the duplication issues in the CARC meeting. Any instances of duplication must be addressed and resolved prior to the next scheduled CARC meeting.

E. Proposal Copies and Lead Time

The proposal sponsor should email a complete copy of the proposal to a representative of the Academic Affairs Office at least one week prior to the curriculum meeting in which the proposal will be reviewed. Once approved by CARC, a representative from the Academic Affairs Office Will enter the proposal information into the Curriculum Inventory Management (CIM) system.

VIII. Topics Courses

Since a course can only be offered as a topics course twice, such a course must be submitted to the Committee for approval as a new course before the course can be offered a third time.

VIII. Revisions of Bylaws

Substantial revisions (i.e. revisions that go beyond edits for clarification) to CARC bylaws follow the procedure for revising SOE Policies and Procedures.

CARC Bylaws Approved by SOE Faculty and Dean on April 2nd, 2024.

Appendix A: SCHEV Classification of Substantial Modification

NOTE: Please consult the SOE Academic Affairs Office, VCU SCHEV Liaison, and SCHEV policy for the most up to date and accurate guidance. SCHEV policy can be found [here](#).

Some proposals submitted to Council seek approval for programs that have modified program requirements from the original program approved by SCHEV. Modified curriculum requirements may seek to address evolution in the discipline/field, respond to the needs of business and industry, or address changes mandated by discipline specific accrediting agencies. Council expects that institutions engage in continual processes of improvement that may result in a variety of modifications to existing programs. SCHEV approval of program modifications is limited to instances that involve fundamental aspects of the original program as approved by Council. Modifications that require SCHEV approval include:

1. Altering program requirements in a way that results in a fundamental change to the curriculum, purpose, focus or identity of the program as approved by Council or that alters the requirements for the common core as determined by Council.
2. Adding a new delivery format to an existing program or ceasing to offer the program in the format in which it was approved by Council.
3. Increasing or decreasing the total credit hours by more than three (3) credits from what was originally approved by Council. In the case of a bachelor degree, any change to more than 124 credits will require SCHEV approval.

1. NOTE:

1. three (3) is the maximum aggregate change in total credits that may be made without submitting a modification proposal to SCHEV; i.e., approval must be sought if/when the total increase or decrease—even if by smaller increments over time—exceeds three (3) credits. Institutions should maintain an official record of credit increases or decreases to the total credit hours of degree and certificate programs;
2. if/when the total aggregate change in credits exceeds 12, it may be necessary to submit a proposal for a new degree and certificate program proposal.

Changing the licensure-qualifying status of a degree program as approved by Council, i.e., adding or removing a licensure-qualifying option.

Council has delegated approval of program modification proposals to SCHEV staff. Final authority for degree and certificate program modifications remains with the Council. Institutions considering a modification to a program that fits one of the above criteria should consult SCHEV staff for guidance.

FACULTY ORGANIZATION

The Faculty Organization of the School of Education of Virginia Commonwealth University is organized as an entity independent of the Administration, with primary concern for the agenda of the Faculty, but includes administrators as members.

This organization receives, reviews, and recommends matters relating directly to faculty welfare, rights, and survival; provides a forum for discussion of issues; serves in an advocacy role on the part of the faculty members; and appoints members to the Dean's Faculty Advisory Committee which is composed of other elected members as well.

The entire faculty, including chairpersons and other administrators, comprise the membership, with officers elected from the membership by the members. Standing and ad hoc committees may be established by the membership. The officers are responsible to the membership and report to the members and to the Dean's Faculty Advisory Committee. Issues generated are discussed in open membership meetings called by the appropriate officer of the Faculty Organization.

BY-LAWS OF THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

<https://soe.vcu.edu/media/school-of-education/pdfs/faculty-amp-staff/SOEFacultyOrganizationByLawsApprovedAugust2023-ada.pdf>

**VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY
AND
THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
EMERITI FACULTY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

The title emeritus/emerita is available as an award for exceptional service and outstanding dedication to the university. Normally, eligibility is limited to full-time faculty members who have retired at the rank of professor or associate professor and who have given long-time consecutive service to the university for a period of not less than ten consecutive years prior to retirement.

To be eligible for an emeritus/emerita appointment, a faculty member shall be nominated by the department chair or applicable unit head; the nomination then requires approval by the appropriate dean, Provost, President, and/or Board of Visitors, as applicable.

Emeriti appointments carry the following lifetime privileges: (1) use of the library and gymnasium on the same basis as other faculty; (2) listing in university publications; (3) participation in university processions; (4) ability to serve on dissertation committees, and (5) are eligible for many other discounts, which can be found on the Office the Provost website.

. (VCU Faculty Handbook, 2023-2024)

Retiring faculty who have a record of exceptional service and outstanding dedication to the School of Education and the University may be recommended for emeriti status. The procedures to be used to recommend retiring School of Education faculty for emeriti status follow:

1. Tenured School of Education faculty with the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with a ten-year record of exceptional service and outstanding dedication at Virginia Commonwealth University are eligible for recommendation to emerita/us status at their retirement.
2. Recommendations for nominations for emeriti status shall originate in the School of Education department in which the faculty member was assigned, normally from one or more members of the appropriate faculty core and transmitted to the department chair. Faculty holding administrative positions within the School of Education shall be nominated in the same manner.
3. The department chair will forward the nominations to a departmental personnel committee composed of three senior faculty members elected annually to review nominees for emeriti status. Following its deliberations, the recommendations of the personnel committee shall be transmitted to the appropriate department chair.
4. The department chair shall transmit the department's recommendations with their separate nomination/recommendation to the Dean of the School of Education.

5. The Dean shall prepare a letter of recommendation for each candidate for emeriti status and transmit this with the department and department chairs recommendations to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.
6. Cases that do not fall within the guidelines outlined above will be decided by the Administrative Council within the established policies of Virginia Commonwealth University.

Revised and approved by SOE Faculty and Dean 04/02/2024

**PROCEDURE FOR SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
NOMINATIONS FOR SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND UNIVERSITY AWARDS**

Purpose:

The procedure for nominations for SOE, VCU, and other Awards is designed to provide a fair and effective means for identifying and supporting faculty prospects for awards in a variety of areas. This procedure is designed to select nominees for awards on an ongoing basis.

School of Education Awards:

Distinguished Teaching
Distinguished Scholarship
Distinguished Service
Award of Excellence (i.e., a combination of distinguished teaching, scholarship, and service)
Outstanding Term Faculty
Outstanding Adjunct Faculty
Outstanding Professional Faculty
Outstanding Mentor
Outstanding Community Engagement

SOE Alumni Council awards,

Exemplary Applications of Technology in the Classroom
Distinguished Junior Faculty

SOE Development Award

McLeod Faculty Development Award

Procedure:***For SOE Awards***

All faculty are encouraged to make nominations (self-nominations are also accepted). In the spring semester, nominations should be forwarded to the President of the Faculty Organization. Nominations should include a nomination letter (with award specified) that addresses the criteria in the Award Descriptions (Appendix A). Nominations for SOE Distinguished Scholarship and the SOE Award of Excellence must include the nominee's curriculum vitae.

The Faculty Organization Chair will solicit nominations for the committee from department chairs and center directors as needed, convene the awards committee, and serve as ex officio. The committee shall consist of one representative from each department and two representatives from the SOE centers. Members from the departments can be those serving on the Faculty Organization Executive Committee, or another representative nominated from the department. The committee will meet throughout the spring semester to review and discuss all nominations, and will select winners for each award. If consensus cannot be reached on an award, the committee will select winners by a secret ballot. If committee members are nominated, they will recuse themselves for the discussion of that award.

For VCU Awards

It is important to recognize and reward faculty work at the SOE level as at the University level. To that end, faculty nominations for VCU university awards are highly encouraged. As part of the University-award nomination process, SOE award recipients from a previous year(s) may be nominated for VCU awards. Nominees for VCU awards are not restricted to those who have received SOE awards.

Similar to the SOE awards process, nominations for University awards should be forwarded to the President of the Faculty Organization. Nominations should include a nomination letter (with award specified) that addresses the award criteria. The selection process will be the same as for the SOE awards with the Faculty Organization president convening the awards committee. A list of VCU awards is included as Appendix B to this document.

For SCHEV Awards and Other Awards (e.g, VCU President's awards for Staff and AP Faculty, PACME awards)

For other awards such as the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) awards or other awards where the nomination process may extend into the summer months, the President of the Faculty Organization along with members of the awards committee should ensure a timeline to accomplish the work before the end of Spring semester.

All questions about this procedure should be addressed to the Chair of the SOE Faculty Organization. This procedure shall apply to new and emerging awards not specifically referenced in this document and as they are made available to faculty at SOE and VCU.

Adopted December 6, 2016

Revised March 14, 2023

Revised and approved by SOE Faculty and Dean 04/02/2024

PROCEDURE FOR REVISING SOE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The SOE Faculty Policies and Procedures require regular updates to ensure they are accurate, up-to-date, and consistent. The primary responsibility for updating this document lies with SOE Faculty, and is executed via the SOE Faculty Organization. However, these policies are also administrative in nature, and final approval of revisions lies with the Dean. Additionally, some policies in this document are subject to control and revision by specific faculty committees, and thus can only be revised by the relevant committees. These include the Promotion and Tenure policies and procedures, which are controlled and revised by the School of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Faculty Org Bylaws, which contain their own revision procedure.

In all other cases, unless a policy or procedure includes a specific process for its own revision, the procedure for revisions shall be as outlined below.

The Faculty Org Officers, or a Faculty Org committee organized for this purpose, shall review and update the SOE Faculty Policies and Procedures as the need for revisions arises, but at least every five years. The officer or designated committee shall create a tracked changes document showing all proposed substantive revisions. Those proposed revisions must be discussed at a Faculty Org meeting to ensure feedback and input from SOE Faculty. The SOE Dean's Office should also be consulted prior to a formal vote on the revisions so that potential points of difference between the faculty and administration can be evaluated and potentially resolved prior to a vote. The Faculty Org representatives and officers must vote to approve the revisions. This requires a majority vote of those present and eligible to vote, assuming a quorum is present. Following the approval of Faculty Org, a vote of all SOE faculty will be initiated. The revision requires a majority approval by those voting. Finally, the Dean's office must approve or disapprove of the revisions. In the event the Dean's office disapproves, they must provide a written explanation of their disapproval to the SOE Faculty. In the event the Dean's office approves, the revision will become effective immediately. When policies are updated, the policy document will be updated to note the date the change became effective.

Adopted and approved by SOE Faculty and Dean 04/02/2024