

Old Dominion University
Darden College of Education and Professional Studies
Department Criteria for Research Teaching & Service

<u>Department of Communication Disorders and Special Education</u>	2
Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Scholarly Activity.....	2
<u>Department of Counseling and Human Services</u>	5
Evaluation Criteria for Candidates Applying for Promotion to Professor.....	5
Teaching, Research, and Service.....	11
Criteria for Scholarly Activity and Research.....	12
<u>Department of Educational Foundations & Leadership</u>	18
Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty.....	18
Evaluation Criteria for Candidates Applying for Promotion to Professor.....	23
<u>Department of Human Movement Sciences</u>	28
Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Scholarly Activity and Research.....	28
Guidelines for HMS Teaching Portfolio.....	31
<u>Department of STEM Education and Professional Studies</u>	32
Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Scholarly Activity and Research.....	32
<u>Department of Teaching & Learning</u>	35
Scholarship Statement.....	35
Teaching and Service Expectations.....	39

Department of Communication Disorders and Special Education
Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Scholarly Activity and Research
December 2013
Approved by Provost: February 2014

The primary areas of scholarly activity and research, as listed in the Faculty Handbook, are (a) publications, (b) presentations at professional meetings, and (c) grants and contracts. Additional areas of consideration relevant to CDSE are (d) computer software and educational media, (e) instructional research, (f) interdisciplinary research and (i) published technical reports. The following are guidelines by which these will be evaluated within CDSE.

a. Publications

Peer-reviewed journal articles: These are the primary indicator of research and scholarship. The following criteria apply to the evaluation of their quality.

Authorship: First authorship of a multi-author paper is of greater quality than other co-authorship. Being a mentor of a first-authored student paper is also valued.

Original research: An article that presents results of an original research study (which may be quantitative or qualitative research) is of greater import than other articles. A peer-reviewed position paper or critical review is also valued.

Journal reputation: Journals that are recognized as leading journals within the faculty member's field of study are of higher quality than other national and international journals, which are of higher quality than regional journals. The impact factor of journals is one measure that may be used in evaluating journal reputation.

Citations: The number of citations for a faculty member's articles is a measure of impact within the field. However, it is recognized that such citations will be low soon after publication, and that citations vary with the number of individuals publishing in different fields.

Books and book chapters: While these are a valuable indicator of scholarship, books and book chapters are not as valued as original empirical peer-reviewed journal articles. Untenured faculty members should focus on developing a research agenda that results in published peer-reviewed articles. Book writing should not detract from establishment of such a research and publication record.

Publisher: Books published by academic/scientific publishers are of greater value than those from trade publishers. Books published by national/international publishers with broad distribution are of greater quality than those from regional publishers or with less distribution.

Authorship/Editorship: Being first-author or senior editor is of greater quality than other authorship/editorship.

b. Presentations at Professional Meetings

Presentations are one indication that a faculty member is engaging in scholarship, but do not provide substantive, stand-alone evidence of scholarship. Peer-reviewed journal articles are valued more than presentations. Presentations at national/international meetings are of greater quality than regional meetings. Presentations of research findings and invited tutorials/keynote addresses are of greater quality than other presentations (such as tutorials or educational sessions submitted to the conference by the faculty member or faculty member's colleagues). If

abstracts of presentations have been published in journal form or as proceedings that are available outside the conference, these should be documented by the faculty member.

c. Grants and Contracts

Availability of grants and contracts varies among fields, and success in receiving grants must be weighed in light of this factor. External funding is of higher quality than internal funding. Awards from federal sources are of greater quality than awards from private or state sources. The extent to which faculty members have sought out research opportunities is considered, along with their effectiveness at receiving funding and establishing collaborative lines of research. Both the number of applications submitted for potential funding and the organizations to which they are submitted, even when not awarded, are considered, along with the faculty member's leadership role (i.e., principal investigator, co-principal investigator, collaborator, consultant or other major participant).

d. Computer Software and Educational Media

Materials created for use external to the university are considered as one indicator of scholarly activity, though of considerably lesser weight than publications or grants and contracts.

e. Instructional Research

Research on teaching within one's discipline is credited. Its value is determined solely by its expression within the categories above.

f. Interdisciplinary Research

Research that involves collaboration with others outside the faculty member's field, whether internal or external to the university, is credited. Its value is determined solely by its expression within the categories above. However, interdisciplinary research has the potential to bring added impact and prestige.

i. Published Technical Reports

In some disciplines, applied projects are performed that directly support the needs of industry, government or the community. If these projects result in the publication of comprehensive technical reports that are accessible to researchers outside the university as citable documents, they are credited as scholarly activity, though not as valued as peer-reviewed journal articles. If technical reports are accessible only to the author(s) and the agencies for which they were written, they are considered service projects, not scholarly activity.

Authorship/Editorship: Being first-author or senior editor is of greater quality than other authorship/editorship.

Impact: Technical reports written for a federal agency/audience are considered to have greater quality and impact, given the potential for wider readership and dissemination, followed by technical reports written for regional/state and local agencies.

Level 2 Graduate Certification in CDSE

According to the DCOE Graduate Certification Policy, to achieve Level 2 certification the faculty member must meet the following criteria:

- 1) Completed a terminal degree
- 2) Provide evidence of professional contributions to the discipline such as: record of scholarly publications, engagement in professional activity, or distinguishing characteristics that would add value to master's level preparation
- 3) Renewal requires satisfactory teaching in the discipline

The department of CDSE defines **Professional Contributions** as at least one of the following areas:

-record of scholarly publications: In the past 5 years, at least one scholarly publication or presentation at a professional meeting

-engagement in professional activity: Professional experience or activities in the discipline for the course(s) to be taught

-other distinguishing characteristics: specialized credential, certification, specialty recognition, evidence of continuing education, membership on special committees, boards, or agencies pertaining to course topic

Evaluation Criteria for Candidates Applying for Promotion to Professor

Department of Counseling and Human Services (CHS)

ODU Policy for Establishing Guidelines

Each department should establish, with the approval of the dean and the provost and vice president for academic affairs, a clear statement of the criteria for evaluating scholarly activity and research in that department. These criteria should take into consideration both the mission of the department and the nature of the scholarly activity and research within the discipline.

CHS Policy for Establishing Guidelines

The Department of Counseling and Human Services proposes the following guidelines for use in reviewing faculty for promotion in rank to Professor. In all cases, University and College policy governs this process and these policies and procedures are intended to work within those existing policies and procedures. They are not intended to supersede existing policy as described in the ODU Faculty Handbook. Rather, the following establishes the evaluation criteria established by the department which builds upon and are consistent with existing ODU policies.

Overall Expectations for Promotion to Professor

The Faculty Handbook's policy describes the promotion to Professor as being "one of the highest honors that the University can bestow." The Faculty Handbook further defines the rank as: "Professors are teacher-scholars of *genuinely national standing* who have made recognized contributions to the University and to their disciplines. They are expected to have demonstrated *excellence in teaching*, to have performed *recognized and outstanding research in their fields of specialization*, and to have been *pre-eminent in professional service*."

Our department evaluation criteria build on these general expectations and provide more specific expectations for accomplishments in areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. For promotion to Professor, the expectations of attainment in these three areas are higher than for promotion to Associate Professor. Since receiving tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, candidates shall be judged in terms of whether they have an established record that indicates continued growth, development and accomplishment in teaching; research, scholarship; and service including leadership.

Integration of Scholarship, Teaching, and Service

It should be clear that for purposes of advancement to Professor, the department views research, teaching and service as mutually beneficial and interrelated components. Promotion to Professor should only be awarded to a faculty member who has clearly demonstrated leadership through

significant scholarly accomplishments and contributions to their discipline/field. Personnel committees should weigh these components together in terms of the degree to which they represent significant scholarly accomplishments and contributions to the field or discipline.

Faculty Responsibility

It is the faculty member's responsibility to describe how they met or exceeded expectations in their field and their integration of scholarship, teaching, and service within this field. They are encouraged to submit a cover letter that describes their contribution in each of the areas and any extenuating circumstances that might influence how their contributions are evaluated.

Teaching

Old Dominion University's Faculty Handbook states, "The University is committed to the goal of excellence in teaching" (p. 64) and for promotion to the rank of professor, "They are expected to have demonstrated excellence in teaching ... " (p. 25). Teaching should be related to the candidate's area of expertise and research agenda. Promotion to Full professor cannot occur without evidence to support teaching excellence.

The following questions guide the review process, are not exhaustive, and are followed by examples of excellence. There are many paths to becoming a Full professor and faculty are expected to address most but not necessarily all of the following.

Since the time of being promoted to associate professor, has the faculty member:

1. Enhanced teaching effectiveness and competence?
 - a. Received student opinion survey rankings comparable to the college mean (e.g., at or above) and mostly positive qualitative student responses on the questionnaires
 - b. Received teaching awards from the College, the University, or professional organizations
 - c. Received favorable teaching portfolio reviews
 - d. Participated in the review of colleagues' teaching portfolios including peer reviews of teaching
 - e. Taught successfully in both face to face and/or online environments, as congruent with the program of appointment
 - f. Demonstrated evidence of continuous improvement in teaching

2. Demonstrated a commitment to chairing or being a member of students' dissertation committees?
 - a. Chaired or served on dissertation committees
 - b. Had students' dissertations awarded national recognition and/or honors.

3. Demonstrated a commitment to supporting undergraduate and/or graduate student participation in experiential learning through:
 - a. Practicums and internships
 - b. Service-learning opportunities

- c. Research and scholarship opportunities
4. Provided professional development and leadership in teaching?
 - a. Mentored junior faculty in professional and collegial manner
 - b. Wrote instructional publications or guidelines
 - c. Held statewide, national or international workshops or trainings related to teaching/instructional and/or professional effectiveness
 5. Contributed to existing curriculum development or the creation of new programs?
 - a. Developed new courses or substantially modified courses
 - b. Aligned curricula across program and department
 - c. Assisted in review of existing programs
 - d. Assisted in accreditation review

Scholarly Activity and Research

Darden College of Education and Professional Studies faculty are members of a research extensive university. Consequently, we aspire to contribute in meaningful ways to the knowledge base in our discipline. The most highly valued type of scholarship results in publications in peer refereed journals. We also highly value books (as a primary author or editor) aimed at academic audiences based on theory and research, especially those stemming from the candidate's own scholarship. Other types of scholarship are valued in balance with these articles and books. Faculty members are also encouraged to have sought funding to support their programs of scholarship.

Pace

While the department recognizes that faculty productivity in the three primary areas of the academy (teaching, scholarship, service) may fluctuate given the greater responsibilities to university and national service among other commitments, an overall assessment of sustained efforts and contributions will be made. For instance, faculty may have a less productive year in scholarship due to heavy commitments to important service. Candidates for Full professor should demonstrate sustained and balanced merit and contributions to scholarship over time. The *recommended* goal for scholarship is an average of two empirical or theoretical articles per year published in high quality refereed journals in the field that are aimed at academic audiences.

The following questions guide the review process, are not exhaustive, and are followed by examples of excellence. There are many paths to becoming a Full professor and faculty are expected to address most but not necessarily all of the following.

Has the faculty member

1. Had a national or international impact with their scholarship?
 - a. For *journal articles*, there should be evidence of impact of the journals and individual articles (e.g, impact scores and/or acceptance rates and/or on the department list of *Top Tier Journals*, and/or journals that meet the values and criteria aligned with the department scholarship statement. A distinction should be made between blind, peer reviewed articles versus reviewed articles such as those that are invited or special issues.
 - b. For *books and book chapters* a distinction should be made among those written for academic audiences (e.g., other scholars in the field), for students (e.g. text books), and practitioners (e.g., trade books).
 - c. For *conference papers or presentations*, we expect more invited, keynote, or plenary presentations and presentations made to national or international audiences.

2. Grown in their approach and contributions with their scholarship since the time of being promoted to associate professor?
 - a. We expect to see enhanced quality of scholarly work (e.g., journal prestige) at a reasonable pace. Quality is more important than quantity, although there must be sufficient quantity to provide evidence of a significant level of scholarly productivity and impact. At this stage of one's career, the scholarly record should reflect a more mature formulation of questions and a richer exploration of them.
 - b. Awards or other formal recognitions of scholarly activity is indicative of enhanced quality.

3. Used his/her scholarship to enhance student success?
 - a. Consideration of publications and conference presentations with current and former students; chairing and membership on dissertations related to the faculty member's research agenda.
 - b. We recognize that lead authorship on publications may be given to the student even when the contributions are roughly equal.
 - c. Supervised student research

4. Established an intentional and coherent scholarly program or agenda?
 - a. The faculty member's scholarship should reflect his/her areas of expertise and contribute to a cohesive line of inquiry.
 - b. Conference presentations, publication, and grant proposals will often reflect a similar area of research/line of inquiry.

5. Sought funding to support his/her research agenda?
 - a. Acquisition of grants or contracts. The role of the researcher (P.I. or co-P.I.), the amount of the grant, the type of grant (e.g., research or service), the funding source (e.g., external or internal, national or regional) and the percentage effort in terms of

workload will be considered.

- b. Submission of proposals as Co-P.I. are also valued but to a lesser extent, depending on percentage of work on the grant. The same considerations as noted above will be used to evaluate the proposals submitted.

Service

It should be clear that for purposes of advancement to Full Professor, service is viewed as an integral and highly valued component of one's overall promotion portfolio. Service at all professional/university levels is often seen as a key way that faculty can demonstrate the degree to which they have become established and recognized for their contributions. As research professors, service roles will often capitalize on one's area(s) of expertise.

The following questions guide the review process, are not exhaustive, and are followed by examples of excellence. There are many paths to becoming a Full professor and faculty are expected to address most but not necessarily all of the following.

Since promotion to associate professor, has the faculty member demonstrated growth in their various service roles. To what extent have they:

6. Established a notable or significant national or international impact on their field through their various service roles? Examples may include:
 - a. Journal editorship
 - b. Member of a journal editorial review board
 - c. Holding office in or receiving awards from scholarly or professional societies
 - d. Service-related publications/ reports (e.g., publications in non-scholarly journals; white papers; legislative reports; policy advocacy)
7. Provided leadership or significant service to the departmental, college, and university?
 - a. Special service assignments and quasi-administrative roles (e.g., program director, chair, assistant chair, or primary program advisor)
 - b. Sponsorship of student activities and organizations, particularly those relating to the discipline and those that are successful in increasing the intellectual atmosphere and esprit de corps among students.
 - c. Involvement and leadership in critical committees at all university levels
8. Provided community service in the application of a faculty member's research and professional skills for the service of the community?
 - a. Professional development/outreach (e.g., noncredit courses, workshops, projects, and colloquia in areas of the faculty member's expertise)
 - b. Professional service does not include service to religious, political, or social organizations that (although meritorious in itself) is not relevant to the faculty member's professional area.
 - c. Engagement with community-based organizations
9. Contributed to student success

- a. Discussing field placement opportunities with students
- b. Suggesting field placement opportunities to the field placement coordinators
- c. Mentoring undergraduate and graduate students
- d. Assisting with career development concerns with students

Approved - 8/24/2021
Austin Agnew

IX. CRITERIA USED FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Appendix One includes the faculty information sheet, which full-time faculty complete for the annual review process. Appendix Three lists the criteria used for the evaluation.

- A. Evaluation of Teaching** (see Faculty Handbook at <http://www.odu.edu/content/dam/odu/offices/human-resources/docs/faculty-handbook.pdf>)

As provided for in the Faculty Handbook, the teaching evaluation consists of information gained from the teaching portfolio reviews and aggregate student opinion surveys. The teaching portfolio is the primary review document and the description and list of materials for review are provided in Appendix Two. In addition, other methods, such as peer observation, are encouraged.

- B. Evaluation of Service** (see Faculty Handbook at <http://www.odu.edu/content/dam/odu/offices/human-resources/docs/faculty-handbook.pdf>). Service activities refer to service in a professional capacity at all levels. Examples of service activities, evaluated by the department, may be found in Appendix Three.

- C. Evaluation of Scholarship and Research** (see Faculty Handbook at <http://www.odu.edu/content/dam/odu/offices/human-resources/docs/faculty-handbook.pdf>). The department has compiled a list of activities that are considered as scholarship and research (see Appendix Three). The list of recommended journals, where publication is encouraged as evidence of a national/international professional presence, may be found in Appendix Five.

Department of Counseling and Human Services

From CHS Policies and Procedures Manual, last updated 8/2022

Evaluation of Scholarship and Research (see Faculty Handbook at <http://www.odu.edu/content/dam/odu/offices/human-resources/docs/faculty-handbook.pdf>).

The department has compiled a list of activities that are considered as scholarship and research (see Appendix Three). The list of recommended journals, where publication is encouraged as evidence of a national/international professional presence, may be found in Appendix Five

Appendix Three

Guidelines for Performance Review

The department chair and members of the department promotion and tenure committee who serve on review subcommittees will adhere to the criteria for evaluating faculty found in the ODU Faculty Handbook (see Evaluation of Faculty in Faculty Handbook)
Preface to the Faculty Evaluation Criteria

The following examples for faculty activities to be used as a part of the performance review are intended to be guidance for reviewers and for faculty. Faculty are not expected to do all that are listed but can use these examples and the rankings as primary or secondary as guides to focus their energies and efforts.

- Evaluation in teaching can include the following activities:
 - Teaching portfolio – This is the primary means for evaluation of teaching.
 - Professional development activities related to teaching
 - Student opinions of teaching
 - Advising
 - Chairing doctoral advisory committees
 - Serving on doctoral advisory committees
 - Chairing dissertation committees
 - Serving as a member on dissertation committees
 - Curriculum development/electronic media, including new programs
 - Course development, revisions, and teaching
 - Projects designed to improve student learning outcomes
 - Faculty development grants received
 - Co-teaching with first semester GTAs
 - Supervising GTA's who are faculty of record

- Evaluation in scholarship and research. The quality of scholarly activity and research is assessed by publications in one's discipline or in a related field. Evaluation of quality, as described in the Faculty Handbook, rests on the reputation and editorship of the professional journal, the extent of peer review for

articles, books, and other publications, and external reviews, citations, and index listings. See below for the CHS Department Criteria.

Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Scholarly Activity and Research

The primary areas of scholarly activity and research, as listed in the Faculty Handbook, are (a) publications, (b) presentations at professional meetings, and (c) grants and contracts. Additional areas of consideration relevant to CHS are (d) major editorships and (e) interdisciplinary research.

a. Publications

Peer-reviewed journal articles: These are the primary indicator of research and scholarship. The following criteria apply to the evaluation of their quality.

Authorship: First authorship and being the mentor of a first-author student, is of greater quality than other co-authorship.

Original research: An article that presents results of an original research study (which may be quantitative or qualitative research) is of greater import than other articles.

Journal reputation: Journals that are recognized as leading journals within the faculty member's field of study are of higher quality than other national and international journals, which are of higher quality than regional journals. The impact factor of journals is one measure that may be used in evaluating journal reputation. Another may be the membership size of those receiving the journal, with larger memberships assuming to garner larger readership for the journal.

Citations: The number of citations for a faculty member's articles is a measure of impact within the field. However, it is recognized that such citations will be low soon after publication, and that citations vary with the number of individuals publishing in different fields. When citations are calculated, it is important that individuals adjust the total number by deleting duplicate or self-citations from that number. Please see the list of *Top Tier Journals* for examples of journals highly regarded by the department (Appendix Five).

Books and book chapters: These are a valuable indicator of scholarship, and books are considered more scholarly than book chapters. However, untenured faculty members should focus on developing a research agenda that results in published peer-reviewed articles. Book writing should not detract from establishment of such a research and publication record.

- Publisher: Books published by academic/scientific publishers are of greater value than those from trade publishers. Books published by national/international publishers with broad distribution are of greater quality than those from regional publishers or with less distribution.
- Authorship/Editorship: Being first-author or senior editor is of greater quality than other authorship/editorship.
- Impact: The impact of the book should be considered on the basis of published reviews or external evaluation.
-

b. Presentations at Professional Meetings

Presentations are one indication that a faculty member is engaging in scholarship, but do not provide substantive, stand-alone evidence of scholarship. Presentations at national/international meetings are of greater quality than at regional meetings. Refereed presentations are of greater quality than non-refereed. Presentations of research findings and invited tutorials/keynote addresses are of greater quality than other presentations (such as tutorials or educational sessions submitted to the conference by the faculty member or faculty member's colleagues). If abstracts of presentations have been published in journal form or as proceedings that are available outside the conference, these should be documented by the faculty member.

c. Grants and Contracts

Availability of grants and contracts varies between fields, and success in receiving grants must be weighed in light of this factor. External funding is of higher quality than internal funding. Large awards from national sources (either federal or private) are of greater quality than smaller awards from regional sources. The aggressiveness with which faculty members have sought out research opportunities is considered, along with their effectiveness at receiving funding and establishing collaborative lines of research. Both the number of applications submitted for potential funding and the organizations to which they are submitted, even when not awarded, are considered, along with the faculty member's leadership role (i.e., principal investigator, co-principal investigator, collaborator, consultant or other major participant).

Ongoing grant activity in the form of developing technical reports is a valuable indicator of research and scholarship, particularly since this is a time-consuming byproduct of obtaining grants. Technical reports written for a federal agency/audience are considered to have greater quality and impact, given the potential for wider readership and dissemination, followed by technical reports written for regional/state and local agencies. The faculty member should strive for a balance across years between grant submissions and activities that result from implementing a grant-funded project.

d. Major Editorships

Service as an editor of flagship journals of larger professional associations (e.g., ACA, NOHS, APA, ASCA, AMHCA, ACES) can be considered a significant indicator of scholarship. It is expected that this service extends beyond the definition of professional service in the Faculty Handbook to include active mentorship of professionals needing assistance with scholarship-related activities. Further, Editors are often required to engage in significant study of methodology to audit carefully how data are presented for the readership.

- Evaluation of service:

National/International

- Holding office in a national/international professional organization
- Board member and/or committee chair for a national/international professional organization
- Serving as an editor or on the editorial board of a national refereed journal
- Reviewer for several articles for one or more national/international refereed journals
- Working for a national government committee

- Serving on a national accreditation committee

Regional/State

- Holding office in a regional or state professional organization
- Working for a state government committee
- Service as an evaluator for a regional accrediting agency

University/College/Department

- Leadership position on university, college, and/or department committees, and task forces
- Serving on university, college, and department committees
- Serving on the Faculty Senate
- Faculty Senate officer or Executive Committee member
- Administrative service, e.g., GPD, UPD, etc.
- Leading and serving on accreditation preparation committees
- Mentoring junior faculty

Professional and Community Service

- Community Service in area of academic expertise
- Consulting in an area of academic expertise
- Service to the profession

Appendix Five

CHS Top Tier Journal List

Please note, these are peer-reviewed national/international journals approved by a department committee; these journals do not have faculty costs associated with publication.

1. Adultspan
2. American Journal of Public Health
3. Career Development Quarterly
4. Child and Adolescent Mental Health
5. Community Development: Journal of the Community Development Society
6. Counseling and Values
7. Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation
8. Counselor Education and Supervision
9. International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling
10. International Social Work
11. Journal of Addictions and Offender Counseling
12. Journal of American College Health
13. Journal of Black Studies
14. Journal of Career Assessment
15. Journal of Child and Adolescent Counseling
16. Journal of College and Character
17. Journal of College Counseling
18. Journal of College Student Development
19. Journal of College Student Psychotherapy
20. Journal of Community Practice
21. Journal of Counseling and Development
22. Journal of Counseling Psychology
23. Journal of Counselor Leadership & Advocacy
24. Journal of Creativity in Mental Health
25. Journal of Employment Counseling
26. Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Social Work
27. Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services
28. Journal of Homosexuality
29. Journal of Humanistic Counseling
30. Journal of Human Services
31. Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling
32. Journal of Mental Health Counseling
33. Journal of Military and Government Counseling
34. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development
35. Journal of Progressive Human Services
36. Journal of School-Based Counseling Policy and Evaluation
37. Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology
38. Journal of Social Work Education
39. Journal of Social Service Research
40. Journal of Specialists in Group Work
41. Journal of Youth Development
42. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development

43. Personality and Individual Differences
44. Prevention Science
45. Professional School Counseling
46. Qualitative Social Work
47. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin
48. Social Work Education: An International Journal
49. Social Work Research
50. Social Work
51. The Clinical Supervisor
52. The Counseling Psychologist
53. The Family Journal
54. The Professional Counselor
55. Urban Education
56. Vulnerable Children and Youth

Educational Foundations & Leadership Evaluation of tenured and tenure-track faculty

Relevant ODU policy extract from:

<http://www.odu.edu/ao/facultyhandbook/index.php?page=ch02s20.html>

It is the responsibility of the chair to evaluate the quality of the scholarly activity and research of the faculty member (a mere listing of publications or grants does not constitute evaluation). Each department should establish, with the approval of the dean and the provost and vice president for academic affairs, a clear statement of the criteria for evaluating scholarly activity and research in that department. These criteria should take into consideration both the mission of the department and the nature of the scholarly activity and research within the discipline.

Policy Statement:

As a faculty of the Darden College of Education we value excellence in teaching. As a member of a research-extensive University we value excellence in scholarship. Service, extension, and engagement is also critical to the mission of a metropolitan university, and as such is highly valued and necessary to perform the work of the institution. Promotion in rank and awarding of tenure is an important process both for the faculty members being reviewed and for the good of the institution.

In this spirit the Academic Personnel Committee of the Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership proposes the following guidelines for use in reviewing faculty for promotion in rank and/or awarding of tenure. In all cases, University and College policy governs this process and these policies and procedures are intended to work within those existing policies and procedures. They are not intended to supersede existing policy as described in the ODU Faculty Handbook. Rather, the following establishes the evaluation criteria established by the department which builds upon and may be more stringent than the existing ODU policies.

Realms of responsibility

All faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of teaching, research, and service. The weighting of these three areas will vary from one faculty member to another depending upon the needs of the department and the particular accountability of the individual faculty member in contributing toward the fulfillment of these needs. Faculty members, especially those seeking tenure and promotion, are encouraged to submit a cover letter that describes their contribution in each of these areas and any extenuating circumstances that might influence how their contributions are evaluated.

1. *Teaching* – As faculty members within the Darden College of Education excellence in teaching is expected. Student opinion questionnaires, peer evaluations of portfolios, and service on dissertation committees will be most heavily weighted. In addition, faculty

can provide evidence of excellence in teaching by other types of evidence. A list of possible types of evidence appears below.

- a. Student opinion questionnaires - Results of current student opinion questionnaires must be used in the evaluation. Such results, however, constitute important raw data concerning teaching performance and cannot be meaningful of themselves unless interpreted in relationship to other factors. It is the responsibility of faculty member to provide the Personnel Committee and the Department Chair interpretive evaluation. (Required of all faculty.)
 - b. **Peer evaluations of course portfolios or their equivalent. (Required of non-tenured faculty.)
 - c. *A list of dissertation committees on which the faculty serves or has served. Designate role (chair or member) as well as dates of graduation or expected graduation (Required of all faculty).
 - d. Student work products, including examples of feedback provided to the student.
 - e. Results of student achievement tests, if feasible and appropriate.
 - f. Peer observations of classes (either observing a strong tenured faculty member or being observed by a tenured faculty member)
 - g. Awards and recognition related to teaching
 - h. The number of student credit hours produced by the faculty member should also be taken into consideration since the best teachers should be showing a decided impact on the largest number of students.
 - i. The number of new course preparations or development.
2. *Scholarly Activity and Research* – As the Darden College of Education is a member of a research extensive university, we aspire to contribute in meaningful ways to the knowledge base in our discipline. The most highly valued type of scholarship is publications in peer reviewed journals. The annual goal in research and scholarship is two published or in press aimed at academic audiences- defined as articles (empirical or theoretical) published in high quality, refereed journals in the field (information on how quality might be established is provided below). Other forms of scholarship are encouraged and considered important in the development of one’s research agenda as complements to the core contributions of articles in refereed journals.

Faculty members are also encouraged to seek funding to support their programs of research. The expectation is that faculty members apply for at least one grant annually if not already receiving grant support. External grants are more valued than internal grants, and research grants are more valued than service grants.

Faculty should provide evidence of excellence in scholarship through a variety of types of evidence, which can include:

- a. Publications in scholarly academic journals
 1. the reputation and editorship of journals, including journal metrics such as rejection rates, impact factors, reputational ratings, etc.
 2. evidence of impact of individual articles, such as citation counts, H index, awards, reviews, etc.
 3. circulation and readership
 4. distinction between “refereed” (blind peer review process), “reviewed” (reviewed but not a blind process), and “invited” (due to known expertise in an area).
 5. publications are particularly valued when they involve substantial collaboration and mentoring of a student as co-author.
 6. collaboratively authored articles should not be viewed as less desirable than solo-authored publications. Collaboratively-authored publications should be evaluated according to substantive contribution of faculty member, quality of the work, impact on the field, and relative position within author order where author order represents relative contribution.
- b. Non-peer reviewed publications, including invited articles, practitioner-focused articles, book chapters, conference proceedings, etc.
 1. the reputation and editorship of publications, including metrics such as rejection rates, impact factors, reputational ratings, etc.
 2. evidence of impact of individual articles, such as citation counts, H index, awards, reviews, etc.
 3. circulation and readership
 4. Publications are particularly valued when they involve substantial collaboration and mentoring of a student as co-author.
 5. Collaboratively authored articles should be viewed as less desirable than solo-authored publications. Collaboratively-authored publications should be evaluated according to substantive contribution of faculty member, quality of the work, impact on the field, and relative position within author order where author order represents relative contribution.
- c. Books and other publications
 1. Reviews received
 2. Sales figures
 3. Citation counts
- d. Presentations at professional meetings

1. extent of external peer review before acceptance of the paper and the prestige associated with having a paper accepted for presentation at that meeting.
 2. Scope and reputation of conference (international, national, regional, state, local, etc.)
 3. Invited vs. peer-reviewed, keynote, plenary.
 4. Presentations at scholarly conferences are particularly valued when they involve substantial collaboration and mentoring of a student as co-author/presenter.
 5. Collaboratively authored presentations should not be viewed as less desirable than solo-authored presentations. Collaboratively-authored presentations should be evaluated according to substantive contribution of faculty member, quality of the work, impact on the field, and relative position within author order where author order represents relative contribution.
- e. Grants and contracts
1. Submission of proposals (including role (PI, co-PI, etc.) and requested funding amount)
 2. Award of grants or contracts (including role (PI, co-PI, etc.) and requested funding amount)
 3. Type of grant (internal vs. external, research vs. service)
 4. Participation in existing funded grants or contracts (including role (PI, co-PI, etc.) and requested funding amount)
 5. Support and/or mentoring of students or postdoctoral research assistants as part of the work of the project.
- f. Computer software and educational media
1. Creative work resulting in the creation of significant computer software or educational materials (e.g., videotapes) for use external to the university will be evaluated based on external evaluations and reviews.
- g. Awards and recognition related to scholarship
3. *Service* - The category of professional service is more difficult to define than teaching or research, but deserves the same kind of rigorous evaluation and positive credit. Faculty members can provide evidence of contributions to the Department, College, University, community and profession. In the area of service, a balance of service activities across categories is expected.
 - a. Departmental, college, and university service
 1. Evaluations of advising
 2. Special service assignments – effectiveness in specific service roles (for example, as graduate program director or assistant chair)

3. Sponsorship of student activities, particularly those relating to the discipline – particularly where successful in increasing the intellectual atmosphere and esprit de corps among students.
 4. Cooperation with the Office of Development in securing external funding for the university.
 5. Service on departmental, college, and university committees and task forces – accomplishments and scope of service
 6. Cooperation with the Office of Admissions in recruiting of students to the university
 7. Other departmental, college, and university service - Specific roles in working with other university departments (for example, Academic Technology Services, the Office of Residence Life, or the University Library) may be given to the individual faculty members
- b. Community service, i.e., the application of a faculty member's professional skills for the service of the community in a manner that assists in the fulfillment of the mission of the university - Professional service does not include service to religious, political, or social organizations that (although meritorious in itself) is not relevant to the faculty member's professional area.
1. Service to university outreach programs
 2. Noncredit courses, workshops, projects, and colloquia in areas of the faculty member's expertise
 3. Speaking activities, particularly through the university Speakers Bureau
 4. Consulting, either reimbursed or unreimbursed
 5. Any other ways in which the faculty member is using professional knowledge for the service of constituencies in the Eastern Virginia region.
- c. Service to the discipline
1. Service to scholarly or professional societies - This category may include holding of office, editing proceedings, reading non-research papers, being instrumental in bringing a group to campus and serving on the local arrangements committee, developing a teleconference, and any other ways in which the faculty member is active within such a society.
 2. Service as editor or reader for a scholarly journal in the field, reviewer for scholarly meeting, etc.
 3. Any other way in which the faculty member is making a contribution to the advancement of the discipline other than in areas relevant to teaching and research.
- d. Awards and recognitions related to service

Evaluation Criteria for Candidates Applying for Promotion to Professor

Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership (EFL)

ODU Policy for Establishing Guidelines

Each department should establish, with the approval of the dean and the provost and vice president for academic affairs, a clear statement of the criteria for evaluating scholarly activity and research in that department. These criteria should take into consideration both the mission of the department and the nature of the scholarly activity and research within the discipline.

EFL Policy for Establishing Guidelines

In this spirit the Academic Personnel Committee of the Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership proposes the following guidelines for use in reviewing faculty for promotion in rank to Professor. In all cases, University and College policy governs this process and these policies and procedures are intended to work within those existing policies and procedures. They are not intended to supersede existing policy as described in the ODU Faculty Handbook. Rather, the following establishes the evaluation criteria established by the department which builds upon and are consistent with existing ODU policies.

Overall Expectations for Promotion to Professor

The Faculty Handbook's policy describes the promotion to Professor as being "one of the highest honors that the University can bestow." The Faculty Handbook further defines the rank as: "Professors are teacher-scholars of *genuinely national standing* who have made recognized contributions to the University and to their disciplines. They are expected to have demonstrated *excellence in teaching*, to have performed *recognized and outstanding research in their fields of specialization*, and to have been *pre-eminent in professional service*."

Our department evaluation criteria build on these general expectations and provide more specific expectations for accomplishments in areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. For promotion to Professor, the expectations of attainment in these three areas are higher than for promotion to Associate Professor. Since receiving tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, candidates shall be judged in terms of whether they have an established record that indicates continued growth, development and accomplishment in teaching; research, scholarship; and service including leadership.

Integration of Scholarship, Teaching, and Service

It should be clear that for purposes of advancement to Professor, the department views research, teaching and service as mutually beneficial and interrelated components. Promotion to Professor should only be awarded to a faculty member who has clearly demonstrated leadership through

significant scholarly accomplishments and contributions to their discipline/field. Personnel committees should weigh these components together in terms of the degree to which they represent significant scholarly accomplishments and contributions to the field or discipline.

Faculty Responsibility

It is the faculty member's responsibility to describe how they met or exceeded expectations in their field and their integration of scholarship, teaching, and service within this field. They are encouraged to submit a cover letter that describes their contribution in each of the areas and any extenuating circumstances that might influence how their contributions are evaluated.

Teaching

Old Dominion University's Faculty Handbook states, "The University is committed to the goal of excellence in teaching" (p. 64) and for promotion to the rank of professor, "They are expected to have demonstrated excellence in teaching ..." (p. 25). Teaching should be related to the candidate's area of expertise and research agenda. Promotion to full professor cannot occur without evidence to support teaching excellence.

The following questions guide the review process. These are coupled with examples of excellence.

Since the time of being promoted to associate professor, has the faculty member:

1. enhanced teaching effectiveness and competence since the time of being promoted to associate professor?
 - a. Received student opinion survey rankings comparable to the college mean and mostly positive qualitative student responses on the questionnaires
 - b. Received teaching awards from the College, the University, or professional organizations
 - c. Received favorable teaching portfolio reviews
2. demonstrated a commitment to student success, including student mentoring and committee membership?
 - a. Chaired or served on dissertation committees
 - b. Had students' dissertations awarded national recognition and/or honors.
 - c. Received mentoring awards or served on panels for professional organizations
3. provided professional development and leadership in teaching?
 - a. Mentored junior faculty in professional and collegial manner
 - b. Wrote instructional publications or guidelines
 - c. Held workshops or trainings for effective teaching

4. contributed to existing curriculum development or the creation of new programs?
 - a. Developed new courses or substantially modified courses
 - b. Aligned curricula across program and department

Scholarly Activity and Research

Darden College of Education faculty are members of a research extensive university. Consequently, we aspire to contribute in meaningful ways to the knowledge base in our discipline. The most highly valued type of scholarship results in publications in peer refereed journals. We also highly value books (as a primary author or editor) aimed at academic audiences based on theory and research, especially those stemming from the candidate's own scholarship. Other types of scholarship are valued in balance with these articles and books. Faculty members are also expected to have sought and obtained funding to support their programs of research.

Pace

While the department recognizes that faculty productivity in the three primary areas may fluctuate given the greater responsibilities to university and national service among other commitments, an overall assessment of sustained efforts and contributions will be made. Is there evidence that a less productive year in scholarship is balanced with heavy commitment to important national service commitments, for example? Candidates for full professor should demonstrate sustained and balanced merit and contributions to scholarship over time. The *recommended* goal for scholarship is an average of two empirical or theoretical articles published in high quality refereed journals in the field that are aimed at academic audiences.

The following questions guide the review process with respect to scholarship. These are coupled with examples of excellence.

Has the faculty member

1. had a national or international impact with their scholarship?
 - a. For *journal articles*, there should be evidence of impact of the journals (e.g, impact scores and acceptance rates) and individual articles (e.g., citation counts and H index). A distinction should be made between refereed and reviewed articles (e.g., invited or special issues).
 - b. For *books and book chapters* a distinction should be made among those written for academic audiences (e.g., other scholars in the field), for students (e.g. text books), and practitioners (e.g., trade books).

- c. *For conference papers or presentations*, we expect more invited, keynote, or plenary presentations and presentations made to national or international audiences.
- 2. grown in their approach and contributions with their scholarship since the time of being promoted to associate professor?
 - a. We expect to see enhanced quality of scholarly work (e.g., journal prestige) at a reasonable pace. Quality is more important than quantity, although there must be sufficient quantity to provide evidence of a significant level of scholarly productivity and impact. At this stage of career, the scholarly record will normally be larger and also reflect a more mature formulation of questions and a richer exploration of them.
 - b. Awards or other formal recognitions of scholarly activity is indicative of enhanced quality.
- 3. used his/her scholarship to enhance student success?
 - a. Consideration of publications and conference presentations with current and former students; chairing dissertations related to the faculty member's research agenda; supporting students through funded grants.
 - b. We recognize that lead authorship on publications may be given to the student even when the contributions are roughly equal.
- 4. established an intentional and coherent scholarly program or agenda?
 - a. The faculty member's scholarship should reflect his/her areas of expertise and contribute to a cohesive line of inquiry.
 - b. Conference presentations regularly lead to publication and grant proposals.
- 5. sought and received funding to support his/her research agenda?
 - a. Award of grants or contracts are expected. The role of the researcher (P.I. or co-P.I.), the amount of the grant, the type of grant (e.g., research or service), the funding source (e.g. external or internal, national or regional) and the percentage effort in terms of workload will be considered.
 - b. Submission of proposals as P.I. or Co-P.I. are also valued but to a lesser extent. The same considerations as noted above will be used to evaluate the proposals submitted.

Service

It should be clear that for purposes of advancement to Full Professor, service is viewed as an integral and highly valued component of one's overall promotion portfolio. Service is seen as a

key way that faculty can demonstrate the degree to which they have become established and recognized for their contributions to the field. As research professors, service roles should have a scholarly component, capitalizing on one's area(s) of expertise, as well as university service components. Service is also seen as a means of encouraging public scholarship and engagement with the broader community (e.g., publications in non-scholarly journals, legislative reports, policy advocacy).

The following questions guide the review process. These are coupled with examples of excellence.

Since promotion to associate professor, has the faculty member demonstrated growth in their various service roles. To what extent have they:

6. established a notable or significant national or international impact on their field through their various service roles?
 - a. Journal editing and reviewing
 - b. Holding office in or receiving awards from scholarly or professional societies
 - c. Service related publications/ reports (e.g., publications in non-scholarly journals; white papers; legislative reports; policy advocacy)

7. provided leadership or significant service to the departmental, college, and university?
 - a. Special service assignments and quasi-administrative roles (e.g., graduate program director, assistant chair, or primary program advisor)
 - b. Sponsorship of student activities, particularly those relating to the discipline and successful in increasing the intellectual atmosphere and esprit de corps among students.
 - c. University committees or roles with chairing or leadership more prevalent (e.g., faculty recruitment and mentoring; Faculty Senate, accreditation, strategic planning)

8. provided community service in the application of a faculty member's research and professional skills for the service of the community?
 - a. Professional development/ outreach (e.g., noncredit courses, workshops, projects, and colloquia in areas of the faculty member's expertise)

 - b. Professional service does not include service to religious, political, or social organizations that (although meritorious in itself) is not relevant to the faculty member's professional area.

Department of Human Movement Sciences

Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Scholarly Activity and Research

The primary areas of scholarly activity and research, as listed in the Faculty Handbook, are (1) publications, (2) presentations at professional meetings, and (3) grants and contracts. Additional areas of consideration relevant to HMS are (4) computer software and educational media, (5) instructional research, (6) interdisciplinary research, (9) entrepreneurship, (10) community-engaged research, and (11) others, including scholarly activities that promote diversity, equity, and inclusion. The following are guidelines by which these will be evaluated within HMS.

1. Publications

Peer-reviewed journal articles: These are the primary indicator of research and scholarship. The following criteria apply to the evaluation of their quality.

Authorship: First authorship, and being the mentor of a first-author student, is of greater quality than other co-authorship.

Research: An article that presents results of a research study (which may be quantitative or qualitative research) is of greater importance than other articles, such as reviews, commentaries, and educational pieces.

Journal reputation: Journals that are recognized as leading journals within the faculty member's field of study are of higher quality than other national and international journals, which are of higher quality than regional journals. Faculty are strongly encouraged to provide the journal ranking within its field (such as the Scimago or Web of Science quartile) for each journal in which the faculty member has published during the period under review. The impact factor of journals is an additional measure that may be used in evaluating journal reputation, however, it is understood that impact factors vary between fields.

Citations: The number of citations for a faculty member's articles is a measure of impact within the field. However, it is recognized that such citations will be low soon after publication, and that citations vary with the number of individuals publishing in different fields.

Books and book chapters: These are a valuable indicator of scholarship. However, untenured faculty members should focus on developing a research agenda that results in published peer-reviewed articles. Book writing should not detract from establishment of such a research and publication record.

Publisher: Books published by academic/scientific publishers are of greater value than those from trade publishers. Further, trade books only count as scholarship if their audience is practitioners in the field, as opposed to the lay public (the latter books are considered service). Books published by national/international publishers with broad distribution are of greater quality than those from regional publishers or with less distribution.

Authorship/Editorship: Being first-author or senior editor is of greater quality than other authorship/editorship.

Impact: The impact of the book should be considered on the basis of published reviews or external evaluation.

2. Presentations at Professional Meetings

Presentations are one indication that a faculty member is engaging in scholarship, but do not provide substantive, stand-alone evidence of scholarship. Presentations at national/international meetings are of greater quality than at regional meetings. Refereed presentations are of greater quality than non-refereed. Presentations of research findings and invited tutorials/keynote addresses are of greater quality than other presentations (such as tutorials or educational sessions submitted to the conference by the faculty member or faculty member's colleagues). If abstracts of presentations have been published in journal form or as proceedings that are available outside the conference, these should be documented by the faculty member.

3. Grants and Contracts

Availability of grants and contracts varies between fields, and success in receiving grants must be weighed in light of this factor. External funding is of higher quality than internal funding. Large awards from national sources (either federal or private) are of greater quality than smaller awards from regional sources. The aggressiveness with which faculty members have sought out research opportunities is considered, along with their effectiveness at receiving funding and establishing collaborative lines of research. Both the number of applications submitted for potential funding and the organizations to which they are submitted, even when not awarded, are considered, along with the faculty member's leadership role (i.e., principal investigator, co-principal investigator, collaborator, consultant or other major participant).

4. Computer Software and Educational Media

Materials created for use external to the university are considered as one indicator of scholarly activity, though of considerably lesser weight than publications or grants and contracts.

5. Instructional Research

Research on teaching within one's discipline is credited. Its value is determined solely by its expression within the categories above.

6. Interdisciplinary Research

Research that involves collaboration with others outside the faculty member's field, whether internal or external to the university, is credited. Its value is determined solely by its expression within

the categories above. However, interdisciplinary research has the potential to bring added impact and prestige.

7 and 8. Fine Art Exhibitions and Translational Research - Not relevant to HMS.

9. Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurial activities related to the faculty member's research should be considered as scholarly activity, though not as valued as peer-reviewed journal articles. Entrepreneurship involves systematic efforts to identify and solve problems through applied and/or field-based research resulting in innovative social, scientific, civic, economic, creative, pedagogical, technological, and/or consumer interventions and initiatives. The specific problem-solving innovation or intervention will vary by discipline and will encompass a praxis-based approach that may include a direct community or market intervention. Such activities may result in inventions, patents, new products, processes, techniques, and/or intervention strategies. Evaluation of entrepreneurial activity should ascertain the rigor of the approach and the impact on the constituencies targeted by the intervention or patent.

10. Community-engaged research

Community-engaged research can include entrepreneurial research as well as applied projects supporting community agencies, government, industry, business, or other parties, and leading to comprehensive technical papers such as economic impact studies, reports to government agencies, white papers, articles in trade journals, etc. This type of research is credited as scholarly activity, though not as valued as peer-reviewed journal articles.

11. Other

Editorship of prestigious journals may be considered scholarly activity in certain disciplines. Book reviews, instructional manuals, and articles in national popular magazines related to the faculty member's expertise may be considered but are not substantial scholarly publications. Research and scholarly activities that are culturally sustaining and promote diversity, inclusion, and equity related to the faculty's field are valued. These activities may include grant procurements that benefit marginalized groups, development and use of research methodologies centered on equity and cultural diversity, and research that addresses issues of diversity and equity that resulted in scholarly presentations and/or publications.

Approved by the faculty on March 17, 2022

Guidelines for HMS Teaching Portfolio

The following materials are to be compiled into either a single pdf document or into pdf documents for each section. All materials cover **ONLY** the period under review (the current semester for 1st year faculty, the last academic year for non-tenured faculty in their 2nd or subsequent year, the last 3 academic years for senior lecturers, the last 5 academic years for tenured faculty).

1. **TEACHING PHILOSOPHY**
 Provide a brief (1-2 pages, single-spaced) reflective statement describing one’s personal teaching philosophy.

2. **TEACHING SUMMARY**
 - a. List the courses taught (course name, prefix and number, credit hours, number of students) by semester
 - b. Make a brief statement about one’s workload (e.g., 6 hours teaching, 3 hours unfunded research, 3 hours service per semester)
 - c. Attach the official grade distribution reports for each semester (N/A for 1st year faculty)
 - d. Attach documentation of any teaching awards received
 (Note: student opinion surveys are NOT to be turned in with the Teaching Portfolio. They are turned in with the Faculty Information Sheet.)

3. **COURSE MATERIALS**
 - a. Copies of syllabi for each course taught (for multiple sections, only one is needed)
 - b. Samples of exams and class assignments
 - c. Samples of lectures or other instructional activities

4. **EFFORTS TO IMPROVE TEACHING**
 Provide a narrative statement on challenges encountered, steps taken for improvement, and successes achieved. Information about course revisions would be applicable.

5. **PEER OBSERVATION OF TEACHING**
 Provide statements from one or more colleagues who have observed and evaluated your teaching. The instructor should provide the observer with a copy of any materials students have prior to the observation session. The observer will provide the instructor with a positive, constructive evaluation in a brief letter that evaluates such areas as class organization, presentation and student interaction.

The Teaching Portfolio will be reviewed by a sub-committee of at least 3 senior faculty (tenured faculty and senior lecturers). The committee will submit a letter of evaluation to the department chair (copying the faculty member) that comments on the overall quality of the portfolio with specific attention to strengths and areas for improvement.

Deadlines

	Portfolio to Dept Chair	Committee Letter to Dept Chair
1 st year faculty	Dec 1	Dec 15
Other faculty	Sep 1	Oct 1

Adopted 2/17/2016

STEM Education and Professional Studies

Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Scholarly Activity and Research

The primary areas of scholarly activity and research, as listed in the Old Dominion University *Faculty Handbook* (2015), are (a) publications, (b) presentations at professional meetings, and (c) grants and contracts. Additional areas of consideration relevant to STEMPS faculty are (d) computer software, educational media, and curriculum documents, (e) instructional research, (f) interdisciplinary research, (g) translational research and patents, (h) application projects, and (i) published technical reports. Faculty members should focus on developing a research agenda that results with published peer-reviewed articles. Department faculty members value providing mentorship to junior faculty members and students in their scholarly pursuits.

a. Publications

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: These are the primary indicators of research and scholarship. The following criteria apply to the evaluation of publication quality.

Authorship: Level of authorship in a journal article (e.g., sole, first, second) is valued.

Scholarly Contribution: An article that presents original research findings, theory, or philosophy is of greater value than other article contributions.

Journal Reputation: Journals that are recognized, as leading journals within the faculty member's field, are highly valued. International and national journals are valued more than regional, state, and local journals. Higher quality journals are defined as employing a blind peer-review process and the journals are indexed.

Books and Book Chapters: These are a valuable indicator of scholarship. Published books are evaluated on the level and reputation of the publishing company.

Publisher: Books published by academic/scientific publishers are of greater value than textbooks and trade books (books published for the general public). Books published by national/international publishers with broader distributions are of greater value than those from regional publishers or those with less distribution.

Authorship/Editorship: Level of authorship/editorship of books (e.g., sole, first, second) is valued.

Conference Proceedings: These works are valued as scholarship. Conference proceedings need to be blind peer-reviewed. These proceedings need to include full manuscripts, not just abstracts, and peers must be able to obtain full copies of the proceedings either in electronic or printed format.

Authorship: Level of authorship in a conference proceeding (e.g., sole, first, second) is valued.

Scholarly Contribution: A conference proceeding that presents original research findings, theory, or philosophy is of greater value than other conference proceeding contributions.

Conference Reputation: Conferences that are recognized as leading meetings within a field of study are of higher value than other conferences or regional meetings.

b. Presentations at Professional Meetings

Presentations are one indication that a faculty member is engaging in scholarship, but they do not provide substantive, stand-alone evidence of scholarship. Presentations at national/international meetings are of greater value than those at regional or local meetings. Blind peer-reviewed presentations are of greater value than non-refereed ones. Presentations of research findings and invited keynote addresses are valued. Presentations that are judged competitively are of great value than those not reviewed in this manner. If abstracts of presentations have been published in journal form or as proceedings that are available outside the conference, the faculty member should document these.

c. Grants and Contracts

Availability of grants and contracts varies between fields, and success in receiving grants must be weighed in light of this factor. External funding is of higher value than internal funding. Large awards from national sources (federal, foundation, or private) are of greater value than smaller awards from regional sources. The aggressiveness with which faculty members have sought out research opportunities is considered, along with their effectiveness at receiving funding and establishing collaborative lines of research. Both the number of applications submitted for potential funding and the organizations to which they are submitted, even when not awarded, are considered, along with the faculty member's leadership role (e.g., principal investigator, co-principal investigator, senior personnel, consultant, other major participant). When reported for credit faculty should document their contributions to each individual grant.

d. Computer Software, Educational Media, and Curriculum Documents

Materials created for use external to the university are considered as one indicator of scholarly activity, though of lesser weight than publications or grants and contracts.

e. Instructional Research

Research on teaching within one's discipline is credited. Its value is determined solely by its expression within the above categories. If findings are significant these should be communicated through publications.

f. Interdisciplinary Research

Research that involves collaboration with others outside the faculty member's field, whether internal or external to the university, is credited. Its value is determined solely by its expression within the above categories. Interdisciplinary research has the potential to bring added impact and prestige to the faculty member and university.

g. Translational Research and Patents

These are important components of faculty research in educational, business, and technical fields. The STEMPS faculty recognizes credit for patents awarded and translational research that results in important new educational, industrial, and business applications.

h. Application Projects

Research activity projects that result in comprehensive published technical reports, new products, processes, or techniques, or software is valued as scholarship (e.g., publications in trade journals, economic impact studies and forecasts, white papers, reports to government agencies).

i. Published Technical Reports

In some disciplines within STEMPS, applied projects are performed that directly support the needs of industry, government, or the community. If these projects result in the publication of comprehensive technical reports that are accessible to researchers outside the university as citable documents, they are credited as scholarly activity, though not as valued as blind peer-reviewed journal articles. If technical reports are accessible only to the author(s) and the sponsoring agency, then they are not as valued.

Authorship/Editorship: Level of authorship/editorship of published technical reports (e.g., sole, first, second) is valued.

Impact: Technical reports written for a federal agency/audience are considered of greater value and impact, given the potential for wider readership and dissemination, than technical reports written for regional/state and local agencies.

Note: Faculty should include notes when documenting scholarship contributions that might need to be further explained to those who will review these annual evaluations, 3rd year reviews, and promotion and tenure documents. Faculty and administrators should not need to seek explanations of reported contributions.

Department of Teaching and Learning Scholarship Statement

**Final Draft provided by the T&L Scholarship Committee on 11/14/22
Voted into use by T&L Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty on 11/21/22**

Teaching and Learning Scholarship Guiding Framework

The Department of Teaching and Learning affirms the expectations for scholarship as set forth by Old Dominion University and specifically, Darden College of Education and Professional Studies. We use the term scholarship as a broad concept associated with faculty engagement in research activities, grantsmanship, and professional activities within our chosen fields. We encourage faculty members to engage in ongoing scholarly work that promotes respected individual and departmental reputations across the various fields of study represented by our faculty. We are a diverse department, and our scholarly contributions traverse a multitude of disciplines, pedagogies, and educational tools across the lifespan of the learner and educator in formal and informal, non-formal, and virtual settings. As such, we value empirical peer reviewed research that stems from established, emerging, or mixed methodologies that is published and presented in respected outlets across audiences inclusive of scholars to field-based actors (e.g., educators, school leaders, policy makers etc.) with primary emphasis on scholarly contributions dedicated to furthering understanding within our disciplines and fields of study.

Scholarly Work

The Department of Teaching and Learning encourages each faculty member to grow as a scholar according to individual expertise, interests, and opportunities. Faculty members are expected to develop an individualized scholarly agenda and are also encouraged to engage in collaborative work with other scholars, community partners, and undergraduate and graduate students who may reside outside their primary research focus. In alignment to the Old Dominion University Faculty Handbook and the overarching mission and goals of the university and the Darden College of Education and Professional Studies, the Department of Teaching and Learning values international work as well as work centered on diversity and inclusion.

1. Publications

Publications are central to the work of departmental faculty and the reputations of publication outlets are of significant importance for all faculty. Refereed, academic outlets are preferable to other professional publications, and solo or lead roles on publications are highly valued. For collaborative works co-authors should explain their role in multiple authored publications. National or international outlets are generally perceived as having a higher level of prestige than local or regional ones. As our work is diverse, it is the responsibility of individual faculty members to provide evidence of the reputation and level of rigor of their various publication venues, such as impact factors and citation scores (where available, as we understand that scholarly education journals do not often have these), acceptance rates, and information about the readership.

Below is a hierarchical listing of the scholarly contributions from most to least valued:

Journal Articles published in well-respected refereed journals within one's professional field and professional organizations are valued. Metrics including acceptance and rejection rates, impact factors and other indicators provide information that helps evaluate research and conceptual work.

Books (Authored & Edited) scholarly contributions; curriculum and instruction contributions are valued and, when published with widely respected academic publishing outlets, further help inform the field and provide a space to chart future research directions.

Book Chapters in well-respected academic publishing outlets are valued as well and, as edited volumes, help chart existing and new directions in research.

Invited Manuscripts (e.g., commentaries, encyclopedia chapters, featured articles) are valued, particularly if they go through a manuscript review process in a journal or academic volume (e.g., a Research Handbook).

Conference Proceedings that are refereed hold more value than those that are simply accepting and listing papers that were presented.

Other Professional Contributions For example, technical reports, policy papers, policy statements, position statements, field-based reports. Note that these could be higher in this preferred list depending on the nature of the originating organization and potential impact.

2. Presentations

When considering the relevancy and impact of presentations we consider the four following criteria concurrently: 1) presentation genre, 2) scope, 3) audience, and 4) review process. The presentation genre includes a hierarchy; keynote/plenary address, invited, paper presentations, panel, round table, workshop, poster presentation, and content area presentations (non-paper presentations). Scope hierarchy; international, national, local, and community. Audience hierarchy; scholars at professional organization meetings, scholars at organizations e.g., NGOs, and then policy makers, funders, and government leaders. Review hierarchy: Peer review or non-peer review. It is important to note that each of these four (presentation genre, scope, audience, review process) combined determine the level of impact. It is the responsibility of individual faculty members to provide evidence of how these four criteria are represented in each faculty presentation. Faculty are reminded to consider the balance in the number of presentations they conduct and how many contribute to published scholarly work.

3. Grants and Contracts

The Department of Teaching and Learning, in line with expectations set forth by Old Dominion University and specifically, Darden College of Education and Professional Studies, recognizes the importance of faculty work spent in the pursuit of funding to support research, teaching, and service efforts. When considering a grant award, the department considers concurrently: 1) award amount, 2) awarding agency, 3) faculty role, and 4) percentage of effort towards grant-related activities. External funding is of higher value than internal funding. Large awards from national sources (federal, foundation

or private) are of greater value than smaller awards from regional sources. The number of applications submitted for potential funding, even when not awarded, is considered, along with the faculty member's leadership role (e.g., principal investigator, co-principal investigator, senior personnel, consultant, other major participant). When reported, faculty should document their contributions to each individual grant. Faculty in the department are expected to engage in the regular pursuit of funding as part of their scholarship agenda.

Aligned to the Faculty Handbook, these categories below are also recognized contributions:

4. Computer Software and Educational Media

5. Instructional Research

6. Interdisciplinary Research

7. Entrepreneurial Activities

8. Community-Engaged Research

9. Other.

Faculty Responsibility in the Presentation of Scholarship Materials

It is the responsibility of individual faculty members to provide descriptive evidence of how their scholarly works contribute and relate to the faculty member's goals and research agenda.

Revised 02/03/2021

Scholarship Committee

Chair: Helen Crompton

Tom Bean

Angela Eckhoff

Kristie Gutierrez

Jihea Maddamsetti

Addendum

Expectations for Scholarship & Research for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

Expected

Publications

- An average of two peer-reviewed publications* per year. Each faculty member will need to show metrics to support the quality of the publication (e.g., acceptance rate, h5-index, impact factor, CiteScore.)

Grants

- Submission of at least 2 external grant submissions within 2 years unless the faculty member currently holds external funding through that academic year

*For a hierarchical listing of valued publications in T&L, please see the Department of Teaching & Learning Scholarship Statement.

Department of Teaching & Learning **Teaching and Service Expectations**

Teaching

As faculty members in the Darden College of Education and Professional Studies, excellence in teaching is expected. In the Department of Teaching & Learning, we view excellence as ensuring that students learn in supportive, inclusive, and innovative learning environments. To do so, we prioritize efforts to consistently improve our teaching through various educational endeavors. We also acknowledge that achieving excellence in teaching may require faculty to take pedagogical risks and to regularly update course curriculum.

We recognize that teaching is evaluated in an effort to provide information to faculty for self-improvement, and that a number of methods are used to ensure a fair evaluation of teaching. Although faculty will provide evidence for use in the evaluation of their teaching, we do not weigh evidence differently unless specifically noted. A list of possible types of evidence appears below.

Required Evidence

Some evidence is required for faculty evaluation, as indicated by the Faculty Handbook. These include:

1. Student Opinion Surveys. Results of current student opinion surveys must be used in the evaluation of teaching. Such results, however, constitute important raw data concerning teaching performance and cannot be meaningful in themselves unless interpreted in relationship to other factors. It is the responsibility of faculty members to provide their Student Opinion Surveys for review as indicated in the faculty handbook. Student Opinion Surveys should not be submitted as part of the Teaching Portfolio.
2. Peer Evaluation of Portfolios. Faculty are required to submit a portfolio of their teaching for review by a committee of departmental peers. The timeline for submission of a portfolio is determined by a faculty member's status as tenured, untenured, or non-tenure track faculty. Portfolio review committees consist of three faculty members within the department, and use the Teaching Portfolio Statement. A copy of the portfolio letter should, if required, be provided with the annual evaluation.

Additional Evidence

Student Opinion Surveys and Teaching Portfolios provide only partial insights into teaching effectiveness; as such, we acknowledge other potential measures through which a faculty member's teaching effectiveness can be evaluated. Some of the following evidence can be identified within the Teaching Portfolio, as indicated within the Department of

Teaching & Learning's Teaching Portfolio Statement, but they should be viewed as additional evidence of teaching effectiveness for evaluative purposes. Additional evidence includes, but is not limited to:

1. Advisement of Student Research. Advisement of student research includes advising of and service on master's theses and doctoral dissertations, and mentoring, advising, and/or collaboration on undergraduate and graduate student research projects separate from theses/dissertations. If advisement occurs as part of a thesis/dissertation committee, faculty should indicate committee type (master's, doctoral) and their responsibilities on these committees. We hold the view that, as a department, our faculty and students hold a wide array of research interests. Accordingly, there is no expectation that all faculty will serve on student research committees at all times. Although research advisement is encouraged, faculty service should not be viewed comparatively and not used to identify deficiencies in advising.
2. Classroom/Peer Observation. Observations of teaching and/or course materials can provide important feedback for faculty as they improve curriculum and instruction. University centers such as the Center for Learning and Teaching (CLT) and the Center for Faculty Development (CFD) will provide faculty with observations and reviews of teaching and curriculum using university-approved evaluation forms. Informal peer observations of teaching are encouraged and provide faculty with valuable feedback, but they should not be given the same weight as programs of peer observation approved by the university. The department can, if faculty so choose, develop a peer observation program that will be given the same consideration of existing peer observation programs (e.g., CLT, CFD) if approved by the departmental faculty, department chair, the dean, and the provost and vice president for academic affairs.
3. Participation in Professional Development. We acknowledge that, as educators, we continue growing in our professional practice throughout the career span. Professional development provides faculty with the opportunity to develop and improve their teaching practices. Professional development may take the form of training programs sponsored institutionally or from outside providers, or by engaging in empirical investigations of professional practice.
4. Student Interviews. Systematic exit interviews or surveys, or interviews at predetermined stages of a student's major program, may be conducted within the department. A standard format should be used, and a means devised to ensure accurate recording of the interview through the presence of a disinterested observer; maintenance of a written account, recording, or transcription of the interview; or through other appropriate means. Comments about individual faculty members should be transcribed and made available to them, although the identity of students will remain confidential.
5. Awards and Recognition Related to Teaching. This category includes university sanctioned awards and designations such as the Reign On Award, University

Professor designation, and University Distinguished Teacher designation, as well as recognition from regional, state, and national organizations.

6. Instructor-Created Instruments. As educators, we regularly model and encourage the use of formative assessments with those whom we are preparing as teachers and teacher educators. In the course of our instruction, students may complete formative and summative assessments using a range of methods (e.g., tests, exams, quizzes, projects, presentations, essays aligned to national or state professional standards). If faculty choose to include the results of these formative assessments with their evaluation materials, they should be considered as evidence as part of the faculty member's overall dossier of their effectiveness as an instructor; however, such evidence should be limited to a supplemental role and not constitute a primary means of evaluating teaching performance.
7. Course Development. Teaching and learning does not exist in a static environment. Accordingly, we value the continued development of pedagogical practices and course curriculum. Designing and re-designing course materials is a time-intensive endeavor and should be acknowledged as an important facet of our professional growth as educators. This includes efforts to improve existing courses as well as new course development through the Center for Learning and Teaching and even outside entities.

Statement of Teaching Expectations

A faculty member meets expectations in Teaching & Learning by providing evidence that they ensure students are meeting course and programmatic objectives by learning in supportive, inclusive, and innovative learning environments.

Service

The category of professional service is more difficult to define than teaching or research, but deserves the same kind of rigorous evaluation and positive credit given to teaching and scholarly activities. Faculty members can provide evidence of contributions to the department, college, university, community and profession. Ideally, each faculty member should exercise their professional expertise in all three areas of department, college and university service; community engagement; and service to the discipline. However, we also recognize that expectations may vary by faculty rank and status (tenure-track or non-tenure track), and that individual faculty members may be expected to play different roles and hold varying responsibilities in terms of service. In all cases, service should be judged on the basis of quality and effectiveness, not just quantity. The evaluation of service should consider the following evidence:

1. Departmental, College, and University Service

- a. Committee Service. Service on department, college, and university committees and task forces is one of the most important areas of faculty service. As faculty progress through their professional careers, they are encouraged to take on increasing roles and responsibilities in committee service departmentally, and to the college and the university.
- b. Student Mentoring. Review committees are encouraged to recognize and reward faculty who mentor students in research, international service work, service learning, entrepreneurial and innovation activities, and work-related experiential learning. Student advisement associated with program leadership responsibilities cannot be considered under this area. Additionally, service on master's theses and doctoral dissertation committees are evidence of teaching, not service.
- c. Special Service Assignments. Although not officially considered service due to their nature as compensated activity, we acknowledge the importance of service in special service assignments such as undergraduate/graduate program director, certificate coordinator, or assistant chair. Service in these roles is time-intensive and can limit a faculty member's ability to serve the department, college, and university in other ways. As such, faculty should not be penalized in other areas of service for their work in special service assignments.
- d. Sponsorship of Student Activities. Sponsoring student activities, particularly those relating to the discipline, increases the intellectual atmosphere and esprit de corps among students. Such sponsorship is a valued area of service to the department, college, and university.

2. Community Service. Community service refers to the application of a faculty member's professional skills for the service of the community in a manner that assists in the fulfillment of the mission of the university. Community service does not include service to religious, political, or social organizations that (although meritorious in itself) is not relevant to the faculty member's professional area. We define community broadly given the national and international reach of the university's programs of study and our academic scholarship.

- a. Service to university outreach programs.

- b. Noncredit courses, workshops, projects, speaking activities, and colloquia in areas of the faculty member's expertise.
 - c. Consulting, either reimbursed or unreimbursed.
 - d. Any other ways in which the faculty member is using professional knowledge for the service of constituencies.
3. Service to the Discipline
- a. Service to scholarly or professional societies.
 - i. Holding an elected or appointed office.
 - ii. Editing conference proceedings.
 - iii. Authoring white papers, reports, standards or other documents sponsored by a professional organization.
 - iv. Service on a conference committee or hosting a conference.
 - v. Other ways in which the faculty member is active within the professional organization/society not identified.
 - b. Service as editor, member of an editorial review board, or ad-hoc reviewer for a scholarly journal in the field.
 - c. Reviewer for professional conference.
 - d. Other ways in which the faculty member is making a contribution to the advancement of their professional disciplines.
4. Awards and recognitions related to service institutionally.

Statement of Service Expectations

A faculty member meets expectations in Teaching & Learning through evidence of quality service to the department, college, university, and profession appropriate to the faculty member's rank. Service to the community is also recognized but not required. Specifically, we identify service expectations by faculty rank as:

- For tenure-track faculty in their first three years, meeting expectations is defined as quality service to the department and the profession. Following the pre-tenure review, tenure-track faculty meet expectations for quality service through service to department, college, and profession.
- For tenured faculty, meeting expectations is defined as quality service to the department, college, university, and profession. Tenured faculty are expected to provide increasing levels of leadership that are commensurate with their rank.
- For non-tenure track faculty, meeting expectations is defined as quality service to the department, college, university, and profession commensurate with their rank.

Final Draft 1/31/23

Ad Hoc Teaching & Service Committee:

Chair: Brandon Butler

Jori Beck

Starr Bryant

Kelly Rippard

Demetrice Smith-Mutegi