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This document describes the EDST policies and procedures that guide deliberations and decisions about promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure and to the rank of full professor for tenure track faculty in the Department of Educational Studies. This document describes some factors considered in decisions about promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure and to the rank of full professor in the Department of Educational Studies. The official University criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure are outlined in the University Promotion Policy (Form 36). The criteria discussed in this document are intended as useful information for faculty seeking promotion, for members of the Department’s Primary Committee, for members of search committees who have responsibility for evaluating candidates’ credentials, and for members of the Annual Performance Review and Awards committees. The items included in this discussion are not intended to be a checklist for promotion. Instead, each of them will be evaluated in the context provided by the full record.

The primary committee will focus on the individual’s record, derived from objective evidence of discovery/research, teaching/learning, and service/engagement. We expect all of our faculty members to follow relevant codes of professional ethics. (Links to Codes of Ethics for relevant professional organization are provided in the Appendix.)

Consistent with Purdue University Policy, a candidate for tenure and or promotion may be nominated on the basis of contributions to the scholarship of discovery/research, teaching/learning, and/or engagement/service. In all cases the candidate’s record must demonstrate a sustained record of scholarly achievement supported by peer-referred publications and other scholarly products as appropriate. The Department expects that all candidates for promotion demonstrate a sustained record of scholarly achievement. The general criteria for advancement to associate professor and full professor are outlined in the University Promotion Policy. The criteria for scholarship are elaborated fully in the section on research/discovery. For additional criteria that are important in the scholarship of learning and engagement, please see those sections.

Discovery/Research (adapted from the Department of Psychological Sciences document)

A critical mission of the Department of Educational Studies is to demonstrate excellence in scholarship. With regard to demonstrating excellence in research or creative endeavors, section B of Form 36 is relevant. However, the Department considers it valuable to supplement these University regulations with further guidance about expectations for faculty.

Research excellence is assessed through an examination of a number of evaluative criteria: (1) One key criterion is the research productivity of a candidate, that is, the number of scholarly products that result from the candidate’s discovery efforts (e.g., journal articles, books, book chapters). Additionally, evaluation of research excellence involves examination of the (2) quality of the research, including its impact on the research activities of others in the field and external funding as indicators of quality, and the (3) intellectual independence and continuity of the
candidate’s research program. As they plan their research activities, junior faculty should recognize that these criteria will form the basis for recommendations of promotion. Further, candidates should discuss evidence that they have met these criteria explicitly when preparing their statements of current research interests (as specified in Form 36). Each of these criteria is further elaborated below.

(1) **Productivity.** In assessing productivity, faculty should be aware that primary emphasis will be given to publications in refereed journals or books, in fields where that is the hallmark of scholarship. Presentations at meetings are encouraged as a way of testing ideas in public forums and indicate active involvement in the field but will not substitute for publications in refereed journals. Authored books, edited books, and book chapters will be considered positively where such work indicates evidence of national and international recognition within the research/discovery context of that faculty member’s field. The primary committee assesses most textbooks as contributions to the scholarship of learning, unless books are valuable contributions related to the discovery of a faculty member’s discipline.

(2) **Quality.** The quality of a candidate’s research will be an important component in the assessment of scholarly contribution. Members of the primary committee have the responsibility for examining the publications of candidates when making judgments of quality. In addition, the quality of the journals, as indicated by journal impact factors, circulation/readership metrics, and acceptance rates for articles, will be considered. Additionally, the independent evaluations of a candidate’s scholarship by invited external reviewers who are experts in a candidate’s field will be used to assess quality and impact.

(3) **Impact** - Candidates must be able to demonstrate that their research has had an impact on their field of inquiry. Outside reviewers from the candidate’s discipline will be asked to evaluate the impact or likely impact of the research program. Citation analysis (e.g., Social Science Citation Index, h-index) is another common way to assess impact; these analyses must be done within the context of the citation expectations for top scholars in the candidate’s area of research. When thinking about where to submit their research for publication, faculty should consider both the quality of the journal as well as the visibility of the journal. Publication in widely read and respected journals in one’s program area will generally lead to greater impact.

Candidates for promotion to associate professor should show publication evidence of developing national and international recognition. Editorial board memberships can be evidence of such recognition. However, board members and memberships on grant panels are more likely for senior scholars. For promotion to full professor, candidates must also be able to show evidence of intellectual leadership and impact on the research of the field. Theoretical contributions that influence the research programs of other scholars are considered significant and can be recognized by citations in those articles.

Impact can also include the development of future scholars. Therefore, a candidate’s contribution to graduate education may be considered as evidence of research excellence if supported by appropriate scholarly co-publishing and placement of student graduates in academic or other premier research settings. However, simply chairing or serving on a number of graduate student committees is a baseline expectation and will not serve as a basis for promotion in the area of Research/Discovery.
All tenure track faculty are expected to actively seek both internal and external funding to support their research. In addition to its ability to facilitate the conduct of research, funding helps to demonstrate impact, continuity, and intellectual independence. Consequently, when examining the case for promotion, the primary committee will look closely at the history of successful external funding. However, external funding should not be considered a litmus test for promotion, especially in those areas where funding possibilities are limited. That is, the absence of external funding when coupled with an otherwise excellent scholarly record will not preclude a recommendation of promotion, and the presence of funding when coupled with a weaker record of productivity, quality, or impact, will not guarantee it.

(4) Intellectual Independence and Continuity. The primary committee believes that all candidates for promotion should be able to demonstrate intellectual independence in their program of research, while also acknowledging the importance of interdisciplinary and collaborative research. Traditional ways of demonstrating independent contributions include publications independent of graduate school advisors, sole-authored or first-authored papers, as well as publications with one’s own students. If issues arise regarding responsibility for collaborative work, candidates will be asked to provide evidence regarding their contributions. It is further expected that candidates for promotion be able to demonstrate the programmatic nature of their independent research (i.e., continuity). Of course, this expectation does not mean that candidates are discouraged from moving into new areas. It simply means that the primary committee believes that contributions usually develop out of continuous efforts to solve problems.

Teaching and Learning

Excellence in university teaching is expected for all faculty in the College of Education. Teaching at a major research university such as Purdue University includes not only teaching courses in one’s area of expertise but also mentoring undergraduate and graduate students. Evidence of excellence in university teaching can be documented in a variety of ways, including, but not limited to, teaching awards; contributions to course, curriculum, and program development; preparation of innovative instructional materials; positive course evaluations; student achievement of course learning outcomes; and/or outstanding mentoring of doctoral students. Therefore, the teaching records of all candidates for promotion in the EDST Department are expected to include evidence of excellence in teaching and mentoring university students. Section A of Form 36 outlines the kinds of evidence that support teaching excellence.

Faculty members who have a program of scholarship focused on teaching and learning may be promoted on the basis of the scholarship of learning. Since Education and related fields focus on learning and teaching in a wide variety of contexts, the Department understands and supports the value of scholarship that focuses on learning. An outstanding record of undergraduate and/or graduate classroom teaching is a prerequisite for promotion on the basis of the scholarship of learning. However, outstanding classroom teaching is not sufficient to support a case for promotion in this area. In other words, outstanding classroom teaching is a necessary but not sufficient component of a case for promotion on the basis of the scholarship of learning.
The primary standards used to evaluate the quality of the scholarship of learning are similar to the standards used to evaluate the scholarship of discovery. These standards include such things as refereed publications, innovation(s), external funding, and national and international reputation. Thus faculty seeking promotion on the basis of the scholarship of learning should provide a record of P-20 learning-related publications and grants, as well as evidence of national/international visibility.

Additional indicators of excellence in the scholarship of learning include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Instructional innovations (e.g., development of curricula, instructional models, and/or educational programs) that are supported by evidence of efficacy and impact (e.g., refereed publications, widespread adoptions)
- Published media that enable learning (e.g., textbooks, book chapters, articles in journals for practitioners, software, interactive web sites, instructional videos, case materials)
- Training, professional development, and personnel preparation grants

**Engagement and Service**

In the College of Education, *engagement* is defined as “collaborative work done by mutually committed partners (community and/or P-16 partners with college of education partners) in order to address issues of common interest. Engagement simultaneously serves the needs of COE partners and invigorates the research, teaching, and service missions of the College. Engagement activities have intellectual merit and broad impact” (COE Web Site). *Professional service* is defined as service to the Department, College, University, and/or field through activities, such as serving on committees or providing leadership for committees or professional organizations. Professional service is expected of all faculty in Educational Studies, with greater expectations for those who are more senior in rank.

Faculty members who have a highly engaged program of scholarship may be promoted on the basis of the scholarship of engagement. Since education and related fields have a long history of applied research and contributions to the welfare of the general public, the Department understands the value of scholarship that connects with constituencies outside of academia. As evidence of this, most disciplines within the Department of Educational Studies have refereed journals devoted to applied research, funding is available for applied research, and scholars regularly make substantive contributions to the development of new knowledge (i.e., discovery) through engaged research that directly benefits participants (e.g., pk-12 school partners engaged in trying out innovative techniques of teaching and learning). Research and scholarship that connects to the public good as well as advancing science is both valued and commonplace.

The primary standards used to evaluate scholarship of engagement are similar to the standards used to evaluate the scholarship of discovery, such as refereed publications, innovation(s), external funding, and national and international reputation. Thus, faculty seeking promotion for engagement activities should provide a record of engagement-related publications and evidence of national/international visibility related to engagement.

Additional criteria can be important in documenting the scholarship of engagement. For
example, the quantity, strength, and impact of the mutually beneficial partnerships may be a critical aspect of an engaged scholars work. Documentation of impact on policy makers, economic development, quality of life, and/or educational practice can take a variety of forms such as the enactment of related legislation, adoption of innovations, commercialization, and/or widespread changes in professional practice. Publications that translate research for practitioners and/or policy makers are valued in the scholarship of engagement. Because it can take a long time to build effective partnerships and to demonstrate the impact of the work flowing from those partnerships, assistant professors should be cautious about selecting this form of engaged scholarship as the major focus of their early career work. Engagement activities tend to be synergistic with discovery and/or learning, so candidates may wish to cross-list their scholarship/engagement activities throughout Form 36.
Faculty Review and Promotion Procedures

The EDST Primary Committee consists of the associate and full professors of the regular EDST faculty (faculty with an appointment of 50% or greater in EDST or with an administrative position in the university and a faculty appointment in EDST). Members of the EDST Primary Committee review the progress of junior faculty toward promotion each year in the spring semester (typically in February); that is, all associate and full professors of the regular faculty are expected to participate in reviewing and voting on tenure-track assistant professors. All full professors are expected to review and vote on both assistant and associate professors.

1. For cases of tenure-track promotion from associate to full professor and for consideration of distinguished professorships, all full professors of the regular (tenure track) faculty are expected to participate and to vote.

2. For cases of tenure-track promotion from assistant to associate professor, all associate and full professors of the regular (tenure track) faculty are expected to participate and to vote.

3. For cases of clinical faculty promotion from clinical associate to clinical full professor, the EDST Primary Committee will be supplemented by clinical full professors from the Department who will be expected to participate in reviewing such cases and to vote.

4. For cases of clinical faculty promotion from clinical assistant to clinical associate professor, the EDST Primary Committee will be supplemented by clinical associate professors from the Department who will be expected to participate in reviewing such cases and to vote.

5. Specific rules of order, methods and order of presentation, and voting procedures are determined by the Department Head and members of the Primary Committee in accord with Purdue University Promotions Procedures and with College of Education Promotion Procedures.

6. All junior faculty with EDST appointments of 50% or greater are required to submit an updated Form 36 document and a Summary of Vita for EDST Primary Committee Review in January.

7. Each junior faculty member is assigned a primary and a secondary reviewer to summarize and present his/her case to the EDST Primary Committee at the spring business meetings. Where possible, the primary reviewer will be a faculty member from the same program area as the junior faculty member being reviewed. Relevant primary committee members jointly deliberate on and evaluate each junior faculty member’s progress toward tenure and/or promotion. At the spring business meetings, EDST Primary Committee members may nominate a junior faculty member for consideration for tenure and/or promotion in the fall of the following academic year.

8. A tenure-track or clinical faculty member in EDST may ask to be considered for promotion and may request a specific associate or full professor of the faculty to present his/her credentials to the EDST Primary Committee. Junior faculty members considering a self-nomination for tenure and/or promotion must inform the Chair of the EDST Primary
Committee of their decision to self-nominate by February 1 of the spring semester prior to the fall semester in which their case will be considered and voted on. This requirement allows the chair to identify and seek external review letters in a timely manner.

7. External reviews are an important part of the promotion process. A candidate may suggest the names of external reviews. However, the final list will be comprised of 10 reviewers, at least half of whom were named by senior members of the primary committee and the others put forward by the candidate. It is expected that these reviewers will be experienced senior members of the field, typically holding the rank of full professor or equivalent. In the case of candidates for promotion to associate with tenure or for clinical faculty, nationally recognized external reviewers at the rank of associate professor may occasionally be appropriate. Evaluators will tend to discount the opinions of reviewers with close personal or professional relationships with the candidate. Therefore candidates are advised to consider this limitation when recommending outside reviewers.

8. Following each year's EDST Primary Committee review of junior faculty, each assistant and associate professor of the Department is given detailed written feedback on the review conducted in his/her case. The Department Head is responsible for scheduling feedback meetings for junior faculty at which at least one of the two lead primary committee reviewers present.
Appendix

*Codes of Ethics for Relevant Professional Organizations*

AERA  

ACA  

APA  

ASCA  