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MENTORS AND PRE-TENURE REVIEW

Soon after the appointment of each tenure-track faculty member the candidate and the Dean will confer and select a faculty member to assist the candidate in preparing for the promotion and tenure process.

Untenured SOE faculty will have a pre-tenure review after the completion of their third year in the tenure track. The time of the review will be determined in consultation with the Dean. Faculty will be encouraged to begin collecting evidence for dossiers after their initial appointment. The Mentor, Dean, and Promotion and Tenure Committee will all be involved in this review.

For this review, the faculty member will create a dossier as close as possible to what is require below for the P&T process—except that external reviews are not necessary. After the review, the members of the P&T Committee will meet with the untenured faculty member, give their impressions of the dossier, and make suggestions for the formal promotion and tenure review to come later.

PROMOTION AND TENURE

INTRODUCTION

This document explains how the criteria for promotion and tenure set forth in the Indiana University Northwest Academic Handbook and Promotion and Tenure Guidelines must be interpreted in evaluating the performance of faculty members in the IU Northwest School of Education.

Tenure and promotion are based on the three areas of teaching, research, and service. To be tenured and/or promoted, each candidate must be found to be excellent in one or more of these areas and found to be at least adequate in the areas not selected for excellence. Thus, each candidate will select at least (but normally just) one of these areas to be his/her area for excellence.

I U Northwest’s School of Education, a professional school with a national reputation for excellence and a long tradition of leadership in service to education in the State of Indiana, must maintain a faculty of richly diversified, specialized competencies. As a result, criteria within the traditional areas of teaching, research, and service must be defined broadly enough and in sufficient detail to represent and encourage the major missions of the School.

On occasion, the School will recruit new faculty members who have university experience at other institutions with the expectation that they may, if they choose, go up for promotion and/or tenure sooner than the normal 6th year. In such cases, teaching evaluations received, service performed, research done, and publications accepted before the start of their employ at IU Northwest may be used in support of their case for tenure and/or promotion as long as such teaching, research, and service were done, and publications so used were published, within six (6) years of the date the dossier was submitted for review. Such faculty should still have a pre-tenure review as described above.
THE DOSSIERS

Dossiers should be divided into two components, the principal and supplemental dossiers.

The Principal Dossier
This dossier must be submitted in a pressboard report binding. It must contain:
- All reviews and recommendations (internal and external)
- Brief professional biographies of external reviewers
- Candidate narratives of teaching, research and creative activities, and service
- Candidate’s curriculum vitae
- Approved department or unit promotion and tenure Guidelines.

The Table of Contents of essential material in this principal dossier follows in these Guidelines.

The Supplemental Dossier
This second dossier must be submitted either in a pressboard report binding or a three-ring binder. The supplementary binder should include all of the supporting material most appropriate for primary and/or unit committee review, such as:
- Copies of publications
- Proposals for external funding
- Other relevant supporting documentation of teaching.
- Other relevant supporting documentation of service

Recommendations from primary and/or unit levels should reflect consideration of the evidence cited in the supplemental dossier and serve as an assessment of the merits of contributions.

CANDIDATE’S NARRATIVES ON TEACHING, RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES, AND SERVICE
Candidates should provide thoughtful narratives about their teaching, research and creative activities, and service. Each narrative should be three to five pages and should convey both the candidate’s views of these areas and his or her accomplishments. The teaching narrative should reflect not only a pedagogical attitude, but should also discuss student and any relevant peer evaluations and how they have been integrated into subsequent practice, particular kinds of successes and even instructive missteps. A series of courses or a program successfully designed is useful. Noteworthy advising or mentoring could well figure into a person’s philosophy of teaching.

The narrative on Research and Creative Activities should not simply recount what is already in the candidate’s bibliography, but rather highlight particular achievements and ongoing projects or programs or funding, endeavors that have been especially fruitful and where they might lead. The narrative about Service would ideally reflect the candidate’s understanding that (and how) service to the university, the profession, and the region is an important part of a faculty member’s commitment. The emphasis should be on significant undertakings and the breadth of their effect—not a list of token memberships. If pertinent, it is appropriate and useful to indicate how these areas may have overlapped and reinforced each other.

PRINCIPAL DOSSIER TABLE OF CONTENTS
The university will soon be moving to electronic dossiers that can be circulated in a stable, pdf-like format. Only one original, paper copy will then be required. Until that time, there should be one original and two copies of the principal dossier, and one copy of the supplementary dossier.

Only the principal dossier is forwarded beyond the campus to the Vice President’s office. This press-board bound dossier will contain the documents listed below, arranged in the following order:
1. P & T Routing and Action Summary Form (the form that follows is provided by the office of Academic Affairs)
2. Recommendation from the Executive Vice Chancellor
3. Recommendation of Campus P & T Committee, including vote and rationale
   (This report should reflect the committee’s discussion and concerns, including disagreements.)
4. Recommendation from Dean
5. Recommendation from unit P&T Committee vote, including vote and rationale
6. Summary list of External Reviewers (Required information for each review received includes name, rank, institution, and relationship to candidate. Credential information of the reviewers is required. A copy of the letter sent to reviewers must be included.)
7. Letters from External Reviewers
8. Supplemental letters from external reviewers who have mentored or collaborated with the candidate, commenting on their roles in the research, or internal letters from faculty who have peer-reviewed his or her teaching or have direct knowledge of service activities
9. Candidate’s Narratives—of teaching, research and creative activities, and service
10. Curriculum Vitae
11. Department and Unit Promotion and Tenure policy documents

SUPPLEMENTARY DOSSIER

The contents of this folder provide the evidence and documentation that will enable the departmental committee, chair, dean, and the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee to make informed, persuasive recommendations. It should be as well-organized, clear, and concise as possible. This information will not generally be transmitted beyond the campus review levels.

This dossier includes the following items for the years in rank:

- Annual reports and (signed) evaluations
- Student evaluations—both the numerical and the prose comments (under Teaching)
- Student letters, indicating how they were chosen (under Teaching)
- Grade Point Distributions (under Teaching)
- A copy of all published scholarship or other evidence of creative activities (under Research and Creative Activities)
- Description and documentation of any notable service to the unit, university, profession, or region (under Service)
- CVs of external reviewers, if provided (brief biographies of them appear in the principal dossier)

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION: CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

Teaching
This category includes all forms of university-level instructional activity on or off campus including:

A. classes taught for credit as well as non-credit workshops
B. working with in-service teachers or community groups
C. course and program development
D. directing master’s degree theses and exit projects
E. production of university-level course materials including web pages, teaching technology, textbooks, and the creation or revision of instructional techniques.
F. supervising student teachers
G. guiding field experiences and field-based practica

Documentation of teaching performance requires more than one kind of evidence. Evaluation results gain significance as they approach 100% of potential opinions and when the tools of evaluation are clearly described.

Documentation for the claim of ADEQUACY in teaching must include:

- an introductory statement explaining teaching goals and describing how this section of the dossier makes the case for adequacy/excellence
- a year by year list of courses taught since the initial appointment at I U Northwest
- the standard SOE student course evaluations for each section of each course taught within the previous five years
• letters concerning the candidate’s teaching requested by the Dean of a random sample of the candidate’s students.
• each of the Dean’s annual evaluations of teaching for the previous five years
• a evaluation of teaching and teaching materials conducted by a peer from a comparable institution
• syllabi of courses (placed in the appendix)
• a grade distribution chart for all courses taught within the last five years and a statement that explains the distribution pattern
• course materials designed by the candidate such as handouts, web pages, teaching technology, textbooks, and the creation or revision of instructional techniques

Documentation for the claim of EXCELLENCE in teaching must include all the above and also:
• course development or program development materials
• letters concerning the candidate’s teaching requested by the dean of a random sample of the candidate’s students
• a second evaluation of teaching and teaching materials conducted by a peer from a comparable institution

Candidates may also include:
• teaching awards or nominations for teaching awards
• unsolicited letters concerning the candidate’s teaching
• list of graduate student exit projects directed
• teaching-related publications not included in the section on research
• other materials deemed helpful or appropriate by the candidate to substantiate the claim or adequacy or excellence.

For tenure and/or promotion to associate professor

Adequacy in teaching may be shown when the candidate meets all of the following:
• a clear and consistent introductory statement
• syllabi that reflect the School of Education syllabus format
• for the last three years an average student course evaluation of 3.0 or higher
• teaching evaluations from the dean for each of the previous 3 years of adequate or higher
• a peer evaluation that claims at least adequacy in teaching

Excellence in teaching may be shown when the candidate meets all of the following:
• a clear and consistent introductory statement
• syllabi that reflect the School of Education syllabus format
• for the last three years an average student course evaluation of 4.0 or higher
• teaching evaluations from the dean for each of the previous 3 years of excellent or higher
• two peer evaluation that claim excellence in teaching and in course or program development activities
For promotion to professor

**Adequacy in teaching** may be shown when submitted documentation of each of the five bullets listed above for adequacy shows that teaching since the awarding of the rank of associate professor has continued to be acceptable and that there are no uncorrected serious faults or deficiencies.

**Excellence in teaching** may be shown when submitted documentation of each of the five bullets listed above for excellence shows that teaching and course or program development activities since the awarding of the rank of associate professor have remained or have become exemplary and may be used as a model for others to follow and that, in addition, at least three of the following apply:

- **widespread reputation for excellence in teaching** (e.g., teaching awards, testimony from former students, colleagues, and/or client groups)
- **versatility** That is, excellence in teaching at more than one level (undergraduate, masters, advanced graduate) or in more than one form (e.g., lecturing, small-group instruction, on-line instruction, teaching by inquiry, directing independent study or research).
- **publication of articles about teaching**
- **publication of original instructional materials** developed by the candidate (textbooks, software, films, and publications)
- **national or international impact** of published materials of this category
- **unusual student achievement** attributable to his or her teaching

---

**Research**

Research is that type of scholarly activity that contributes to the body of knowledge about schools, teaching and/or learning, or results in original resources for P-12 teachers, and is distributed in widely-disseminated publications and/or presented at state, regional, national, or international professional meetings.

**Documentation of research** may be shown by the following:

- refereed or invited publications with the acceptance rates of the relevant journals
- non-refereed publications
- books and monographs, or chapters thereof
- conference presentations
- funded research proposals and reports
- research honors and awards
- research projects in progress

**All candidates must include the following in their dossiers:**

- a statement explaining the routes, goals, and context of the candidate’s research agenda.
- lists of publications, presentations, reports, awards, etc. Publications, presentations, or reports with more than one author must include the percentage of the work attributable to each of the authors.
- two evaluations of the research agenda and published materials conducted by peers from comparable institutions
- the dean’s annual evaluations of research
- an appendix containing the publications, presentations, and reports cited

**Candidates claiming excellence in research must include:**

- four evaluations (instead of two) of the research agenda and published materials conducted by peers from comparable institutions

**All candidates may also include:**

- research awards or nominations for research awards
- unsolicited letters concerning the candidate’s research
- other materials deemed necessary by the candidate to substantiate the claim or adequacy or excellence.
For tenure and/or promotion to associate professor:

**Adequacy in research** may be shown when submitted documentation shows that the faculty member is contributing to scholarly inquiry in a specific field by either some original inquiry or by interpretations or syntheses that are contributions to the disseminations of new knowledge. Progress beyond the doctoral dissertation must be in evidence. Evidence of these contributions will be shown primarily by documentation of papers presented at competitive regional or national conferences and through publications in peer-reviewed journals. Although quality of publications is more important than quantity, the following criteria apply:

- three presentations at national or international conferences for which proposals were approved on a competitive basis.
- either three articles published (or accepted) as sole author in peer-reviewed journals (totaling 300%) or two articles published (or accepted) as primary author (at least 60% input) and sufficient additional peer-reviewed publications to equal an input of “300%.”
- two additional items from the following: additional competitive conference presentations, additional peer-reviewed articles, non-refereed articles books or book chapters, funded research projects.
- evaluations by 2 peers from comparable institutions that attest to at least adequacy in this area.
- annual evaluations from the Dean of at least adequacy for three of the previous five years.

---

For tenure and/or promotion to associate professor:

**Excellence in research** may be shown when submitted documentation shows that the faculty member is beginning to establish a national reputation as a regular and original contributor to research and that there is a well-defined domain of inquiry being established, with continuity and connectedness between individual projects. Although quality of publications is more important than quantity, the following criteria apply:

- six presentations at national or international conferences for which proposals were approved on a competitive basis.
- either six articles published (or accepted) as sole author in peer-reviewed journals (totaling 600%) or four articles published (or accepted) as primary author (at least 60% input) and sufficient additional peer-reviewed publications to equal an input of “600%.”
- four additional items from the following: additional competitive conference presentations, additional peer-reviewed articles, non-refereed articles, books or book chapters, funded research projects.
- evaluations by four peers from comparable institutions that attest to excellence in this area.
- annual evaluations from the Dean of excellence for three of the previous five years.
For promotion to professor

**Adequacy in research** may be shown by evidence that shows that the candidate has continued to be productive as a scholar. Although quality of publications *since promotion to associate professor* is more important than quantity, the following criteria apply:

- three presentations at conferences for which proposals were approved on a competitive basis.
- either three articles published (or accepted) as sole author in peer-reviewed journals (totaling 300%) or two articles published (or accepted) as primary author (at least 60% input) and sufficient additional peer-reviewed publications to equal an input of “300%.”
- two additional items from the following: additional competitive conference presentations, additional peer-reviewed articles, non-refereed articles, books or book chapters, funded research projects.
- evaluations by two peers from comparable institutions that attest to at least adequacy in this area.
- annual evaluations from the Dean of at least adequacy for three of the previous five years.

**Excellence in research** may be shown by clear evidence of having established a national reputation for research contributions. In addition to publications in refereed journals, citations by other authors and the public acknowledgement of the importance of the faculty member’s contributions are common forms of evidence of national prominence in research. Although quality of publications is more important than quantity, the following criteria apply for services performed after promotion to associate professor:

- six presentations at conferences for which proposals were approved on a competitive basis.
- either six articles published (or accepted) as sole author in peer-reviewed journals (totaling 600%) or four articles published (or accepted) as primary author (at least 60% input) and sufficient additional peer-reviewed publications to equal an input of “600%.”
- four additional items from the following: additional competitive conference presentations, additional peer-reviewed articles, non-refereed articles, books or book chapters, funded research projects.
- evaluations by four peers from comparable institutions that attest to excellence in this area.
- annual evaluations from the Dean of excellence for three of the previous five years.
- documentation that shows the significance of the published works

**Service**

This category consists of professional level activities (other than teaching and research) performed for the benefit of the University, the public, and the profession. Service can take a variety of forms and directions. It may or may not be compensated. It includes, for example, all of the following:

A. Service to one’s profession
   1. Service to professional organizations such as:
      a. serving as an officer or as a member of committees or of the board
      b. editing, reviewing, refereeing, journals or manuscripts
      c. conference planning
   2. Service to schools such as
      a. serving on accreditation committees or school improvement committees
      b. providing in-service for teachers
      c. serving in an advisory capacity

B. Service to Indiana University
   1. Service to Indiana University
      a. serving on the University Faculty Council (UFC)
      b. serving on UFC or University committees
   2. Service to the IU Northwest campus such as
      a. serving on or chairing campus committees
      b. serving as an officer of the Faculty Organization
      c. planning or assisting with special events for the campus
d. sponsoring student groups
  e. administrative duties
3. Service to the IU Northwest School of Education (SOE) such as
   a. serving on or chairing SOE committees
   b. advising students or student groups
   c. planning or assisting with special events for the SOE
   d. administrative duties
C. Service to the Community
   1. Service to civic organizations, service clubs, a PTA or PTO
   2. Service to organizations for youth, seniors, or disadvantaged/underrepresented groups
   3. Service as a member of a governmental commission or committee such as a school board,
       park board, or safety commission
   4. Service to literacy, environmental or health-related organizations
   5. Service to similar groups organized for the common good
D. Publications related to service not included elsewhere in the dossier

Documentation for the claim of ADEQUACY in service must include:
   • a statement explaining the goals and context of the candidate’s service agenda.
   • a year by year list of service activities since the initial appointment at I U Northwest
   • each of the Dean’s annual evaluations of service for the previous five years.

Documentation for the claim of EXCELLENCE in service must include all the above and also:
   • two evaluations of service conducted by a peer from a comparable institution.

Candidates may also include:
   • service awards or nominations for service awards
   • unsolicited letters concerning the candidate’s service
   • other materials deemed necessary by the candidate to substantiate the claim of adequacy or
     excellence.

For tenure and/or promotion to associate professor

**Adequacy in service** may be shown when submitted documentation shows a record of acceptance (in a
spirit of willing cooperation) of:
   • assigned School of Education committees
   • at least one Faculty Organization / I U Northwest committee
   • at least one service activity to the profession (see list on preceding page)
   • at least three service activities at the community level

Documentation must include a rating on the dean’s annual evaluation of satisfactory in 3 of the previous 5
years.

**Excellence in service** may be shown when submitted documentation shows evidence of more than a
routine amount and range of service, an assessment that indicates some superior performance, and
evidence of a developing reputation for excellence in professional service. For one to be considered
excellent in this area, documentation must show:
   • products from assigned School of Education committees
   • leadership in at least two of the assigned School of Education committees
   • at least two Faculty Organization / I U Northwest committees
   • at least three service activities to the profession (see list on preceding page)
   • at least six service activities at the community level

Documentation must include a rating on the dean’s annual evaluation of excellence in 3 of the previous 5
years and two evaluations of service materials conducted by a peer from a comparable institution which
attest to excellence in this area.
For promotion to professor

**Adequacy in service** may be shown by evidence that shows that the candidate has expanded his/her service activities as shown by a record of either a greater range of service or a larger amount of service than is considered satisfactory for promotion to associate professor. Such documentation, of activities after promotion to associate professor, must show work similar to:

- an active role in assigned School of Education committees
- continued leadership in at least one School of Education committee
- at least one Faculty Organization / I U Northwest committee
- at least three service activity to the profession (see list on preceding page)
- at least six service activities at the community level

Documentation must include a rating on the dean’s annual evaluation of satisfactory in 3 of the previous 5 years.

**Excellence in service** may be shown by clear evidence of having outstanding performance over a period of years and of a regional, state, national, or international reputation in professional service. For one to be considered excellent in this area, documentation must show:

- products from assigned School of Education committees
- leadership in two or more of the assigned School of Education committees
- at least two Faculty Organization / I U Northwest committees
- at least three service activities showing leadership to the profession
- at least six important service activities at the community level.

Documentation must include a rating on the dean’s annual evaluation of excellent in 3 of the previous 5 years and two evaluations of service materials conducted by a peer from a comparable institution which attest to excellence in this area.
The Determination of Salary Increases
Approved January 12, 2001 / Revised

The salary of every member of the faculty is to be reviewed annually by the Dean of the School of Education. The Dean recommends to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs salary adjustments in accordance with this procedure. These recommendations are reviewed by the Chancellor and then forwarded to the President and the Board of Trustees.

Salary increases for faculty members in the School of Education rest on two factors: percentage cost-of-living and merit. Each faculty member shall receive a percentage cost-of-living increase at the exact amount appropriated by the Chancellor. In instances where additional dollars (above the cost-of-living) have been made available, these monies will be dispersed on the basis of merit.

The criteria used in making “merit” decisions are found in the Indiana University Academic Handbook. Note that the standards to be used are to be the same as those used for promotion and tenure. All salary disbursements based on merit in the School of Education will be given as fixed amounts. These standards to be used in these decisions read as follows

Teaching - The prime requisites of any effective teacher are intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a willingness to consider suggestions and to cooperate in teaching activities, a spirit of scholarly inquiry which leads the teacher to develop and strengthen course content in the light of developments in the field as well as to improve methods of presenting material, a vital interest in teaching and working with students, and, above all, the ability to stimulate their intellectual interest and enthusiasm. The quality of teaching is admittedly difficult to evaluate. This evaluation is so important, however, that recommendations for an individual’s promotion should include evidence drawn from such sources as the collective judgment of students, of student counselors, and of colleagues who have visited other classes or who have been closely associated with his or her teaching as a supervisor or in some other capacity, or who have taught the same students in subsequent courses.

Research/Creative Activity - In most of the fields represented in the programs of the University, publications in media of quality are expected as evidence of scholarly interest pursued independently of supervision or direction. An original contribution of a creative nature is as significant or as deserving as the publication of a scholarly book or article. Quality of production is considered more important than mere quantity (italics added). Significant evidence of scholarly merit may be either a single work of considerable importance or a series of studies constituting a general program of worthwhile research. The candidate should possess a definite continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works (italics added).

Service - Educated talent, technical competence, and professional skills are indispensable in coping with the complexities of modern civilization. Because most technical assistance is carried on by professional persons, and a high proportion of them have university connection, the University must provide people to fill this need. The performance of services for the University or the external organizations may retard accumulation of evidence for proficiency in research or teaching even while contributing to the value of the individual as a member of the University community (italics added). In such cases effective service should be given the same consideration in determining promotion as
teaching and research. The evaluation of the service should be in terms of the effectiveness with which the service is performed, its relation to the general welfare of the University, and its effect on the development of the individual. In such cases effective service should be given the same consideration in determining promotion as teaching and research. The evaluation of the service should be in terms of the effectiveness with which the service is performed, its relation to the general welfare of the University, and its effect on the development of the individual.

Interpretation of criteria in the categories of teaching, research, and service and subsequent judgments will always be viewed in the context of the School of Education and the individual faculty member’s contribution to the mission of the unit. Prepared statements, faculty reports, and other available data should be considered to clarify the individual’s meritorious contributions in each category (See attached Criteria). The following rating scale is to be used for each area (teaching, research, and service):

- 3 merit units – outstanding (very much exceeds criteria)
- 2 merit units – excellent (far exceeds criteria)
- 1 merit units – adequate (meets criteria)
- 0 merit units - less than adequate (criteria not met)

The three ratings shall be added to determine the total number of merit units earned. The dollar value of a merit unit for any given year will equal the number of dollars available for merit increases that year divided by the total number of merit units earned in the School.

The Dean’s salary recommendations are to be based in part upon an individual conference. At this conference the Dean and the faculty member shall discuss and agree upon a set of goals for the coming year which are compatible with the individual’s areas of expertise and interest, the School’s general and instructional mission, and promotion and/or tenure criteria. The faculty member has the right to request and receive a written statement from the Dean summarizing the substance of the conference; in other instances, the Dean may, at his or her discretion, provide such a written statement even though it is not requested. Any written statements are to be placed in the personnel file and given to the faculty member.

Note that for faculty members who feel that salary increases have not been awarded following the procedures established by the School, the Salary Committee is to convene and render an opinion to the Dean concerning that appeal.

As the Board of Trustees releases the funds available for salary increases, the Dean is to inform the faculty of the dollar amount received by the SOE and the dollar value of each merit unit.
Teaching Overload Compensation

Teaching overload salary for full-time faculty members in the School of Education will rest on two factors: academic rank and actual class enrollment.

In instances where a class taught by a full-time faculty member falls below an enrollment of 17 students, compensation will be a prorated percentage of the minimum number (e.g., a faculty member teaching only 9 students will receive seventy-five percent (9/17) of the agreed salary amount for his or her rank.

It is also understood that overload teaching assignments should be assigned sparingly, and only under the conditions where a qualified part-time faculty cannot be hired.

Note that an overload course is any three-hour class that is taught beyond the requisite full-time load of twelve hours (includes 3 hour reassignment for research). It is further understood that a supervision assignment of 6 student teachers beyond the requisite full time load of twelve hours is the equivalent of a three-hour overload.
Policy for Faculty Reassignment for Scholarship and Creative Activities

**Definition:** Quarter-time reassignment is a procedure by which faculty spend time pursuing one or more academic goals which shall benefit both the faculty member and the School of Education and/or Indiana University Northwest. The amount of time to be spent on this pursuit shall be comparable with that spend on preparing, teaching, and assessing one 3-credit hour course. This policy allows for one or more quarter-time reassignments each semester.

**Underlying assumptions:** The faculty load is the equivalent of teaching 12 semester hours each semester of the regular academic year.

Faculty shall be expected to account for quarter-time reassignment because of the benefits that it brings to the School, University, and the larger education community.

**Uses for quarter-time reassignment include:**
- Scholarly activities leading to scholarly publications (contracted books and monographs, refereed articles, invited reviews, invited book chapters)
- Scholarly activities leading to presentations (refereed or invited). These include such things as presentations at professional conferences, to university faculty, to P-12 personnel, or other education audiences.
- Scholarly activities leading to grant procurement for the School, P-12 schools, or other community educational agencies.
- Scholarly activities leading to unpublished materials that enhance the faculty member’s teaching, the School, or the University.

**Procedure:**

1. In the fall, the Dean will distribute Reassignment for Scholarship/Creative Activities Forms to all faculty members. On that form, the faculty members shall describe their academic goals and plans for the ensuing calendar year made possible by quarter-time reassignment.

2. Faculty shall return forms to the Dean for approval.

3. The Dean shall discuss the proposed scholarship/creative activities with individual faculty members.

**Reporting:** Faculty members’ Annual Reports shall include a description of the time and products related to quarter-time reassignments.
Arranged Courses
Adopted June 18, 1999

Students should plan to take regularly scheduled courses when they are offered. However, it is at times necessary to offer an independent study course or a regular course on an arranged basis to best serve a student’s academic needs. The purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines whereby the SOE can ensure the quality of offerings, promote equity among faculty, and make provisions for real student need.

Definitions:

- An independent study course is a course designated for independent study in the course descriptions of the IUN Bulletin.
- A capstone course is any of the exit option courses for the Elementary or Secondary Master’s programs.
- A workshop course is any course that is designated as a workshop course in the course descriptions of the IUN Bulletin.
- An arranged course, for the purposes of this policy, is
  1. not an independent study course, a capstone course or a workshop course.
  2. a course made available outside of a faculty member’s teaching load during the term in question.

Policies for Arranged Courses

Faculty:

1. A faculty member shall not teach or be the instructor of record for more than one arranged course per term.
2. A faculty member shall not teach or be the instructor of record for more than a total of 3 arranged courses per calendar year.

Approval

1. The Dean of the SOE must approve an arranged course before it is made available.
2. Initial approval of an arranged course requires an acceptable rationale and meeting schedule for the student and faculty member; final approval requires the further submission of a syllabus following the SOE Conceptual Frameworks and syllabus format.
3. Arranged courses shall contain no more than 3 students.

Reporting

There shall be a reporting of all arranged courses to the faculty of the SOE on a term-by-term basis.
Faculty Recruitment Plan

Our Unit affirms our commitment to promoting and broadening the diversity of the Unit’s faculty and administration, particularly in race and ethnicity, as well as gender and age. Openings for each new position will follow the procedures outlined below:

1. The Unit will form an advisory group of persons representative of protected class individuals to assist with recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty. Special attention will be given to factors influencing retention.

2. Advertisements for the opening and flyers defining the position will be reviewed by the Affirmative Action Officer and the Unit search committee—with at least one faculty member representative of protected class individuals on the committee—to ensure that the language is open and affirming and will be effective with a broadly diverse audience of readers.

3. Understanding that many persons who might be interested in our openings might not have a completed terminal degree at the time of the posting, all position descriptions will make it possible for a qualified person in all other aspects to be hired without the terminal degree in hand. In those cases where the best candidate is a person who does not hold the terminal degree, the individual will be provided information at the time of hire which will explicitly outline the requirements for when the degree must be finished and the support system the Unit and the University will provide to assist the new hire to complete the degree.

4. The Unit will contact the University’s Affirmative Action Officer to secure a listing of the most effective job placement listings and professional journals for reaching a broadly diverse candidate pool. Each of these will be contacted, and the Unit will assume the expense of having the position descriptions included in these listings and journals.

5. The Unit will work with the Chancellor and Affirmative Action Officer to ensure that highly qualified candidates for any Unit opening can be offered a competitive salary. The Unit will contact other area universities to gather data on the average compensation of faculty in general with same rank and experience as well as faculty members belonging to protected classes. This information will be shared with the Chancellor and Affirmative Action Officer.

6. The advisory group will meet following each School of Education faculty search to evaluate the recruitment process. Findings, comments and suggestions of the committee will be forwarded to the School for improving the recruitment and retention process.
Faculty Development Plan

The School of Education is committed to professional development activities that enhance the intellectual vitality of the unit faculty, collaborating school faculty and others engaged in the preparation of “Agents of Changes” and “Professional Leaders.” In order to support this commitment, the unit encourages professional development activities in two distinct areas:

• **professional area specialty growth** (e.g., Science Education, Special Education) and

• **group professional growth** (e.g., curriculum planning for the conceptual frameworks, integrating technology into all education courses).

**Professional Area Specialty Growth.** The goal of this commitment is to ensure that each unit faculty member and unit collaborator is fully qualified and current in her/his specialty(s). Unit faculty and other education professionals are encouraged to involve themselves in such developmental activities related to their areas of specialty as

• professional society activity (e.g., memberships, officer roles, committee participation at local, state, regional, national/international levels),
• conference activity (e.g., attendance, paper/presentations, panel discussions, and organizing/planning committees at the state, regional and national/international levels),
• research, exchange teaching, professional training),
• fellowships,
• intra- and inter-institutional visitation/consultation, and
• collaborative study/program development with P-12 schools.

**Group Professional Growth.** The goal of this commitment is to ensure that all unit members and unit collaborators are prepared to successfully conduct the common activities of the School. Group professional growth seminars, web-based conferences and workshop sessions will be offered to unit members on a voluntary participant basis. Topics for professional development will be determined on the basis of group needs assessment and can include

• learning to advise and mentor undergraduate and graduate students,
• preparing specific teaching activities that spotlight classroom management/discipline techniques across all education courses,
• devising ways to incorporate diversity into each education course,
• developing systematic evaluations for improving teaching, scholarship and service within the unit, and
• guiding and directing graduate students’ projects and theses toward completion of the masters’ degree in elementary or secondary education.

Those development activities that pertain to the needs of various unit collaborators, will be held at times that will make them available to those collaborators. Because all of the unit’s collaborators have full-time employment outside of the SOE, the School will have offer such faculty development activities late in the afternoon or early evening. The unit’s collaborators will also be informed of and invited to both SOE and campus-wide development activities so that they may choose to participate as deemed relevant to their needs.

To ensure that group professional growth is continuous, the School of Education will implement the procedure described below to sponsor at least one professional development activity each semester.
Group Professional Development Process

1. The Dean will appoint a Group Professional Development Coordinator each year.
2. The Group Development Coordinator in collaboration with the Director of Field Experiences will conduct a needs assessment each academic year in order to determine the proposed direction(s) of the professional growth of the faculty.
3. The Group Development Coordinator will rank the topics/activities proposed each on annual needs assessment.
4. The Group Development Coordinator will forward the ranked topic/activity recommendations to the Education Cabinet for discussion and approval.
5. The Group Development Coordinator will arrange and organize the group area development activities selected by the Education Cabinet.
6. The Group Development Coordinator will inform and invite the unit faculty and unit collaborators to the development activities selected by the Education Cabinet.
7. The Assessment Committee will conduct an evaluation of each group professional development activity and report the findings to the unit faculty.

To ensure the continual growth of all faculty in the unit, each member reports each year on her/his Annual Report the developmental activities in which she/he has been and/or is currently engaged.
Policy for Use of Individual Faculty Development Monies

Assumptions and Definitions (Amended November 20, 2009 and November 18, 2011)

There will be a fund designated for the support of individual, tenure line faculty for activity associated with individual faculty development; this is hereafter referred to as the Faculty/Staff Expense Fund (F/SEF). This policy relates only to the F/SEF.

This fund is not to be confused with either funds designated for faculty development presentations and/or seminars, nor with funds set aside to provide for travel associated with School business e.g. supervising student teaching or attendance at system-wide committee meetings.

Addendum to Policy for Use of Individual Faculty Development Monies

In recognition of the importance of representing the School of Education at professional conferences, clinical faculty is eligible for funding up to $300. In addition, the UAS Coordinator may be eligible for up to $600 in funds for each of the 2 years prior to NCATE to attend workshops and training which will enhance their professional skills.

Exceptions to the above policy must be approved by the majority of the faculty.

Policies

I. Use: Faculty development expense funds may be used for travel and associated costs relating to individual faculty and staff development.

II. The Faculty/Staff Expense Fund Committee: An F/SEF-committee of 3 faculty members will be elected on staggered terms to receive and review individual faculty/staff proposals for use of the F/SEF. The committee will determine its own chair. This committee will make award recommendations that must be approved by the Dean of the School of Education on the basis of the criteria presented below. Clinical faculty shall be eligible for funding at the faculty rate.

III. Criteria for Awards: Given the availability of funds to support individual faculty developmental activity, each faculty member submitting a reasonable proposal shall be awarded at least $300 and no more than $1000. As funds allow, additional awards may be made in terms of the following ordered priorities.

1. Support of research or service activity such as: (1) presentation of research or important service presentations, or (2) presiding as an officer at a state or higher-level conventions or conferences that are judged to be important to tenure and/or promotion. Tenure-track faculty shall be funded first. (Added October 17, 2008)

2. Support for specific learning activities associated with recognized SOE priorities and/or present faculty expertise.

3. Support for the general development of individual faculty members such as attendance at a State or National Conference.

The SOE receives $Total funds for faculty & staff professional development annually. Each faculty and staff is invited to submit a proposal to request the use of these travel funds. One successful proposal per individual will receive the following funds:
• Faculty, $300
• Clinical, $300
• Professional, $275 (in the preceding two years, in preparation of NCATE, UAS Coordinator is allowed to request up to $600.00).
• Support, $250

Remaining funds will be distributed by merit according to the following table of information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Travel</th>
<th>Faculty Track</th>
<th>Factor times proposal</th>
<th>Max. fund</th>
<th>OR % of funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Non-tenured</td>
<td>2 and 1/3</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>2 and 1/4</td>
<td>$675</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Non-tenured</td>
<td>2 and 1/6</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>2 and 1/12</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend</td>
<td>Non-tenured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>1 and 11/12</td>
<td>$575</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Big picture formula for the distribution of professional development funds: From the initial quantity remove the necessary funds to cover the total number of successful proposal received. From the remaining total, using the table above, distribute the funds based upon Non-tenured or Tenured, and whether presenting, serving as an officer, or attending professional development. If funds are insufficient to distribute based upon the “factor times proposal” value, then the “% of funds” will be used to distribute the remaining funds.

No one individual will receive more than $1000.

For example: Dr. Bluejay is a non-tenured faculty presenting at a spring conference. Dr. Bluejay will receive $300 for the submission of a successful proposal plus $700 for presenting, which is a total of $1000. Dr. Bluejay must provide evidence of his presentation prior to receiving these funds.

Dr. Cardinal is a tenured faculty planning to attend a fall and a spring conference. Dr. Cardinal will receive $300 for the submission of a successful proposal plus $600 to attend, which is a total of $900.

IV. Applications: An FDEF/Staff award for the 12 month period from September 1 through August 31 must be applied for by means of a proposal presented to the FDEF/Staff committee. The committee will make its initial determinations on the basis of the proposals received by September 15th of the same funding cycle year. F/SEF. (Date range revised on 11-18-11).

Any form may be used, or the FDEF/Staff Committee may generate its own form. But, every application must be limited to two pages exclusive of appended supportive or explanatory materials. F/SEF

The proposal must always include:
  i. a brief description of the activity proposed,
  ii. a budget for the amount of the support requested, and
  iii. a rationale for the request related to the criteria presented above.

Appended materials may include such things as programs or pages of programs, announcements and related registration materials including estimates for travel and housing.

V. Amounts of awards: The Dean will inform the chair of how much money can be awarded for the academic year.
The committee will then divide that amount by the number of faculty members to determine how much can be allotted to each faculty member. Funds not requested or not used by faculty may be allotted to others.

Awards will be based on the initial proposals. Faculty members are to inform the committee of substantial changes from their original proposal. If significant conditions of a proposal should change or not be realized, the award will be reviewed and may be adjusted up or down.

Additional funds may be awarded to proposals at a later time if funds should become available.

VI. Announcement of Awards

1. All applications will be responded to within 1 month, or earlier if the situation warrants.
2. The FDEF Committee will report to the faculty of the SOE the number of requests received, and the awards that were recommended and approved by the Dean of the SOE. This reporting is for informational purposes only and not for formal faculty approval.
Unit Collaborative Educators Policy

The unit recognizes the importance of appropriately prepared unit collaborators (e.g., adjunct faculty, cooperating teachers, intern supervisors, field experience supervisors, teacher instructors, and mentors) to its mission. All unit faculty are selected on the basis of their professional expertise, their willingness to devote their time and their talents to the preparation of educational professionals, and their ability to meet the demands that teacher preparation programs make upon faculty members. However, within the greater professional community there are people with exceptional expertise who can provide services and experiences to students in the teacher education program which cannot be provided by unit faculty.

When it becomes necessary to utilize unit collaborators, it is the policy of the SOE to recruit individuals of exceptional expertise. In the case of unit collaborators, exceptional expertise is defined by several factors:

1. three or more years of experience in P-12 settings;
2. outstanding performance as recognized by others in the profession;
3. appropriate academic preparation for the position for which they are to be employed;
4. outstanding ability to work with professionals and pre-professionals in a teaching/mentoring role.

It is important to the efficacy of the SOE to integrate adjunct faculty into the SOE information/communication network. In order to accomplish this, adjunct faculty shall be invited to attend the opening organizational SOE faculty meetings at the beginning of each semester. In addition, all adjunct faculty are assigned mailboxes by which the School can share important and timely information with them. Selected group professional development opportunities that are made available to unit faculty are also made available to all adjunct faculty. Lastly, all adjunct faculty are given full access to university e-mail services at no charge, full access to internet services through university computer labs, and full access to university library privileges.

Student evaluations of their teaching are required of every adjunct faculty member for each course they teach every semester. Student evaluations of adjunct faculty are reviewed by the Dean of the SOE each semester.

Unit collaborators other than adjunct faculty (e.g., cooperating teachers, intern supervisors, field experience supervisors, teacher instructors, and mentors) are evaluated each semester by the unit faculty and the students with whom they work.
Criteria Used to Hire Adjunct Faculty

The School of Education strives to have qualified persons teach all classes. The SOE has for long had most of its courses taught by full-time faculty members. However, on occasion adjunct faculty are recruited to teach courses when no full-time faculty member is available.

On such occasions the School hires persons who:

- display exceptional expertise in pedagogy and the subject matter of the course (see definition in the policy on Unit Collaborators)
- have a doctorate or masters degree in an appropriate area. (Doctorate preferred)
- have experience in teaching (or for administration courses, in administration)
- are good teachers
- are professional leaders
- can make themselves available to students for course-related advising

The School looks for candidates for adjunct positions who:

- have won teaching awards or recognitions
- are recommended by their peers
- have conducted staff development seminars or workshops
- are national board certified teachers
- have experience teaching post-secondary courses

All adjunct instructors are evaluated each semester by the students in their courses. Whenever student evaluations are negative, the Dean determines whether that adjunct instructor should be invited to teach again.
Mentoring and Evaluating Adjunct Professors in the School of Education

Mentoring
A faculty mentor will be assigned for each course an adjunct teaches. It may be a different mentor for each course. The mentor will have expertise in the course.

If time allows, a new adjunct may be invited to sit in on a course taught by full-time faculty or a well-established adjunct prior to being asked to teach the course.

The faculty mentor introduces the adjunct to other faculty and staff, provides syllabi, explains the conceptual framework and course objectives, discusses dispositions, plans for inter-rater reliability, points out relevant areas of the SOE policy manual, shows how to use classroom technology, shows how to use Oncourse, and addresses any questions or concerns.

Evaluation
Student Evaluations
For each course taught in the SOE, faculty members are asked to conduct the SOE course evaluations. Data from these evaluations are reported to the adjunct professor, the faculty mentor, and the Associate Dean.

Observations of Teaching
The faculty mentor or the Associate Dean observes each new adjunct teaching a course once per semester and each returning adjunct once per year and provides feedback on their teaching.

Annual Evaluation
The faculty mentor, or the Associate Dean, will evaluate each adjunct faculty member once each year. Teaching evaluations are conducted in the Spring semester for each adjunct who taught that year and are forwarded to the Dean in June of each year.

Approved 3/2/12 JAG
Adjunct Faculty Teaching Evaluation

Teaching evaluations are conducted in the Spring semester for each Adjunct Faculty member who taught a course that year and are forwarded to the Dean in June of each year.

Name: ___________________________________________ Date: __________

Courses taught in the past year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course number/Title</th>
<th>Spring, Fall, Summer</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond to questions below based on review of syllabus, course materials, observation, and student evaluations of teaching. A = Adequate, AOC = Area of Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>AOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adjunct’s classes met regularly, as scheduled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The adjunct’s syllabus contained the objectives assigned to the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Course assessments were related to the objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Courses demanded an appropriate level of intellectual rigor for students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grading criteria were clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teaching evaluations were favorable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adjunct was available to students for questions and help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adjunct’s teaching style was effective and efficient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Adjunct was professional and agreeable/receptive to his or her mentor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Adjunct responded to e-mails and requests in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
Policy for Faculty Mentors
Approved October 1, 2004

Part One—Mentors for new full-time faculty

Rationale: It is important for new tenure-track faculty to understand policies and practices of the SOE and to be prepared for the promotion and tenure process.

Policy: The Dean shall appoint a mentor for each full-time faculty member in a tenure-track position (mentee). The mentor shall be a tenured member of the SOE faculty and shall remain as mentor until the mentee is tenured, leaves the employ of the campus, or is replaced by another mentor. The mentor shall meet as necessary with the mentee to assure an understanding of SOE policies and procedures concerning teaching (e.g. portfolio artifact requirements, dispositions, technology, and teaching support structures), advising, research, service, and organizational structures (e.g. Faculty Org, writing lab, CETL, etc.). The mentor shall also advise the mentee concerning issues regarding annual evaluations and the tenure and promotion policies.

Part Two—Mentors for part-time faculty

Rationale: It is important for part-time faculty to understand policies and practices of the SOE regarding the teaching of courses.

Policy: The Dean shall appoint a mentor for each part-time faculty member (adjunct). The mentor shall be a full-time member of the SOE and shall remain as mentor for the duration of the semester or session of employment. The mentor shall meet as necessary with the adjunct to assure an understanding of SOE policies and procedures concerning teaching. In particular it is the responsibility of the mentor to advise the adjunct about course content and assessment, the SOE syllabus format, required portfolio artifacts, dispositions, technology, and teaching support structures (e.g. writing lab, CETL, etc.), and course evaluations. Mentors shall be given access to completed course evaluations for their adjuncts. The Associate Dean shall notify mentors when course evaluations are available for perusal.
Preamble

The University and its various communities benefit when standards of professional integrity provide the foundations for a research-focused knowledge base, vibrant professional experience and professional community relations. The IU Northwest School of Education Community is committed to five fundamental values that honor professional integrity: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. Taken together these values establish the principles of behavior that guide all interpersonal interactions within the SOE and that allow it to translate its ideals into actions.

Fairness –
To honor this value, we pledge to:
- Apply policies equitably
- Document clear and reasonable expectations.
- Publicize and adhere to rules, policies, rubrics, curriculum procedures, expectations and processes of appeal
- Demonstrate open-mindedness and approachability
- Demonstrate empathy and an appreciation for others’ perspectives and various vantage points
- Encourages all voices and opinions

Honesty –
To honor this value, we pledge to:
- Sensitive provide full, fair, and clear feedback
- Engage consistently and truthfully in professional interactions pertaining to the SOE
- Perform duties and responsibilities with a sense of accountability and transparency (no hidden agendas)

Trust-
To honor this value, we pledge to:
- Work with others in a collegial and collaborative manner
- Recognize the abilities of SOE colleagues
- Demonstrate belief that professional actions of colleagues are in the best interest of the SOE
- Build positive, professional and personal relationships
- Treat everyone in a consistent and respectful way that transcends differences of opinion, beliefs, and personality.

Responsibility-
To honor this value, we pledge to:
- Seek and utilize feedback from others
- Adopt standards of excellence in job performance
- Practice student-centered behavior
- Accept responsibility and be accountable for our actions.
- Correct mistakes and oversights in a timely manner without excuses or defensiveness
• Communicate changes in policy and/or procedures to all stakeholders
• Maintain open communication across faculty, staff, and students

Respect-
To honor this value, we pledge to
• Support others and celebrate accomplishments
• Communicate with others with courtesy and professionalism
• Recognize and accept others as valuable colleagues
• Value others’ aspirations and goals

Teaching Load Reassignment for Scholarship
Approved October 13, 2006
The teaching load for tenured, tenure-track faculty, and full-time lecturers shall be 12 credit hours (usually four courses) each semester.

Tenure-track faculty shall automatically have a one-course (3 cr. hour) reassignment each semester in order to give them time for scholarship.

Tenured faculty are encouraged to continue their scholarship efforts after tenure and to apply for a one-course reassignment each semester each year. This reassignment will be granted if, within the previous three years the faculty member had:
• published a book
• published two peer-reviewed journal articles
• published one peer-reviewed journal article and presented one professional conference paper, or
• obtained at least $10,000 from external granting agencies and had either published one peer-reviewed journal article or have presented one professional conference paper.

Faculty Office Hours
Approved October 31, 2008
Faculty shall dedicate at least 6 hours of time each week for “Office Hours” when they will be available to meet with students. At least 1 hour a week shall be after 4:00 for the convenience of those students who cannot meet with advisors earlier than that.