Introduction

The decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and merit are some of the most important decisions the faculty of the School must make. The Standards and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure of the School of Education and Human Services are intended to be consistent with the School and University mission and reflective of the academic and civic mandates of the professorate in an urban, regional university. Our goal has been to develop standards and criteria for promotion, tenure, and merit that recognize the full range of faculty activities, talent, and diversity required of a professional school in this environment. In developing these criteria, we have used the elements of scholarship as defined by Boyer (1990) in the Carnegie Foundation’s special report, “Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate.”

The primary mission of the University of Michigan – Flint is to be the leading university in our region by:

▪ Educating all students in an environment that emphasizes literacy, critical thinking, and humanistic scientific inquiry, while guiding their development into thoughtful and productive citizens and leaders.
▪ Facilitating student participation in the learning process and promoting individual attention to students through small class size and an involved faculty and staff.
▪ Assuring that the faculty and staff give all those in our diverse student population the necessary guidance, support, and encouragement to achieve their academic goals.
▪ Enabling faculty to achieve high quality scholarship in areas of basic and applied research and creative activity.
▪ Promoting respect and understanding of human and cultural diversity.
▪ Collaborating with local and regional educational institutions and other public and private organizations to provide access to academic programs; advance economic, cultural, and artistic interest; and enhance health and education in our region.

The primary mission of the School of Education & Human Services is to prepare teachers, administrators, social workers, and other professionals to serve the diverse educational and human service needs of the Greater Flint Metropolitan Region.

To fulfill this mission, the faculty will:

▪ Design, deliver, and continually improve highly effective programs for educators and human service professionals from baccalaureate through graduate programs,
▪ Create an atmosphere that welcomes students and other individuals and supports their participation as members of an inclusive learning community,
• Collaborate with K-12 educators, human service professionals, and colleagues across the campus as partners in the mission,
• Promote and be influenced by the reciprocal relationship between quality teaching, scholarship, and practice,
• Provide leadership in teaching, learning, assessment, and professional development for diverse communities within and outside the University.

In all of these endeavors, creativity and excellence of practice are rewarded, the potential of all learners is recognized, and high academic standards, academic integrity, critical inquiry, and reflection are valued.

Although these standards and criteria are defined at the School level, the role of the academic department in the tenure and promotion process is critical. The department is charged with recruitment, orientation, mentoring, developing, and assessing the growth of the faculty member in terms of the mission of the School and University and these guidelines. In all matters related to tenure and promotion, the department must make the initial recommendation.

**General Criteria for Tenure, Promotion and Merit**

These criteria apply to *all* levels, including promotion from Assistant to Associate and Associate to Full. Additional criteria for promotion to Full Professor appear in a separate section at the end of this document.

The criteria for tenure, promotion, and merit are based on teaching, scholarly activity, and service.

1. Teaching is central to the mission of the University and School. All faculty members must demonstrate a high level of scholarship in the area of teaching as a requirement for tenure and promotion to associate and full professor as well as for consideration for merit and other faculty rewards.
2. Scholarly activity should be consistent with the mission and tradition of the University as well as the unique needs of the School of Education & Human Services. All faculty members must demonstrate scholarly activity for consideration for tenure, promotion, merit, and other faculty rewards.
3. Service benefits the School, University, general society, one’s professional field, and the individual faculty member. All faculty members must demonstrate service activities that benefit, at a minimum, the department, school and the University.

**Defining (1) Teaching, (2) Scholarly Activity, and (3) Service**

It is the goal of the faculty of the School of Education and Human Services to develop a faculty assessment and reward system that recognizes the mission of the University and School, priorities of the department, the strengths of the individual, and the uniqueness of the disciplines. In these assessment activities, the faculty of the School of Education and Human Services recognize the unique effort on the part of faculty to develop the School
to its full potential. The work of the faculty in a professional school encompasses three areas of activity that are separate, but related: (1) **teaching**, (2) **scholarly activity**, and (3) **service**. Here we define what these areas of activity are expected to encompass in order to qualify the candidate for tenure and promotion.

### 1. Teaching

Teaching involves not only communicating knowledge but transforming and extending it as well. It is a dynamic activity in which both professor and students learn from and instruct one another. Good teaching has at its foundation: (1) the careful study and research into the body of knowledge that comprises the discipline; (2) the transmission of that body of knowledge to students and the next generation of scholars; and (3) the assurance that students learn from the teaching activity. Teaching includes, but is not limited to:

A. Quality instruction as measured by:
   - Syllabi
   - Course packs and other prepared handouts
   - Assessment measures
   - Student evaluations
   - Peer evaluations

B. New course development

C. Significant course revision

D. Innovative methods and techniques

E. Interdisciplinary teaching

F. Student mentoring

G. Independent study supervision

H. Supervision of student research (theses, projects, honor’s theses, etc.).

**Core Standards for Review of Teaching**

1. **Clear Goals.** Does the candidate state his or her pedagogical aims clearly? Does the candidate define objectives that are ambitious, achievable, and defensible? Does the scholar identify important knowledge, skills, and dispositions that students should acquire?

2. **Adequate Preparation.** Does the candidate prepare well for each teaching opportunity? Does the candidate show an understanding of a variety of teaching methods and strategies? Does the candidate bring the necessary skills to his/her work? Does the candidate bring together the resources necessary to carry out his or her teaching?
3. **Appropriate Methods.** Does the candidate use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the candidate effectively apply the methods selected? Does the candidate modify methods in response to changing circumstances?

4. **Assessment.** Does the candidate use appropriate methods to assess student learning? Does the candidate use both formative and summative assessments to inform his or her teaching?

5. **Effective Communication.** Does the candidate communicate to students using a suitable style and effective organization for each pedagogical purpose? Does the candidate use appropriate formats for communicating with students? Is the candidate sufficiently responsive to students both in and out of class?

6. **Reflective Critique.** Does the candidate critically evaluate his or her teaching? Does the candidate bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to the critique? Does the candidate show dedication to improving the quality of future work?

---

2. **Scholarly Activity**

Scholarly activity must be activity in the pursuit of *new knowledge*. The knowledge can take any format and can be abstract, symbolic, practical, applied, contingent, transactional, or aesthetic, but it must be new. Data collection, analysis, and synthesis, as well as strategic use of data, is often part of scholarship, but it does not in itself constitute scholarship. The key is that the knowledge that comes out of the activity, the understandings that result, must not be determined in advance.

In order for scholarship to count toward promotion, the new knowledge must have an impact beyond the School, and so must be disseminated in a form that is subject to scholarly review. While there are many ways for scholarship to be disseminated, as described below, this almost always must include articles, book chapters, or books. In addition, for knowledge to have an impact it must be validated by others in the field who are not already invested in the content of the knowledge, and so “arm’s-length” peer review is important. It is also important for the scholar to know the field well, so one can be sure that knowledge created is truly new.

Teaching may be considered scholarship if it meets criteria outlined in the Carnegie Foundation statement on the scholarship of teaching (see Appendix), and service may also be considered scholarship if it meets similar criteria of involving inquiry and public accounting subject to critical peer review.

The following types of scholarly activity are included:

A. Those creative activities documented as significant contributions to knowledge, works, techniques, and/or principles of the discipline. These scholarly activities occur in media, which are available to critical evaluation within the discipline(s) both in and outside the university; these activities may be interdisciplinary. It generally includes the generation of new knowledge that is critically evaluated and professionally recognized through:
Refereed journal articles
Monographs
Proceedings
Preparing grants and receiving resources to support the research
Public presentation of findings

B. Those scholarly activities that give meaning to isolated facts, putting them in perspective. These scholarly activities occur at the interface of disciplines, especially where one field of learning connects with another body of knowledge. The resulting interaction provides the setting for new insights and understanding as traditional facts and theories are considered in another part of the universe of learning. New bridges and relationships between and among disciplines are established. Those activities where knowledge is used to make connections across/within disciplines include:
  - Developing new courses and/or programs of study
  - Writing textbooks
  - Developing audio/video programs and/or computer software
  - Developing/sponsoring colloquia, forums, and interdisciplinary seminars

C. A third category of activities are those that use knowledge to address demanding, substantive, human problems including community issues and those challenges facing our K-12 educational community. These activities must be tied directly to one’s special field of knowledge. The scholarly work is serious, demanding work, requiring the rigor and the accountability of all serious scholarship. These activities require the research to use knowledge to address demanding, substantive human problems by:
  - Conducting applied research and evaluation
  - Providing technical assistance and/or consulting to schools, agencies, etc.
  - Developing new products, practices, clinical procedures, etc.
  - Performing clinical service
  - Preparing grants and securing resources to address these problems
  - Promoting experiential learning and professional development

Core Standards for Review of Scholarly Activity

1. **Clear Goals.** Does the candidate state the basic purpose of his or her work clearly? Does the candidate define objectives that are realistic, achievable, and defensible? Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?

2. **Adequate Preparation.** Does the candidate show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the candidate bring the necessary skills to his/her work? Does the candidate bring together the resources necessary to carry the project forward?
3. **Appropriate Methods.** Does the candidate use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the candidate effectively apply the methods selected? Does the candidate modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

4. **Significant Results.** Does the candidate achieve the goals? Does the candidate’s work add consequentially to the field? Does the candidate’s work open additional area for further exploration?

5. **Effective Presentation.** Does the candidate use a suitable style and effective organization to present his/her work? Does the candidate use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences? Does the candidate present the message with clarity?

6. **Reflective Critique.** Does the candidate critically evaluate his/her work? Does the candidate bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to the critique? Does the candidate use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?

---

3. **Service**

Service refers to those activities that faculty must perform as members of the campus community, professional community, and public communities. It involves numerous activities including campus committee activities, serving on professional and civic committees, etc. This is meritorious work and work that faculty must perform as members of the academic community. It differs from scholarly activities in that the service is not always tied to one’s discipline nor is there the rigor or public accountability of traditional scholarship associated with this activity. In a professional school such as SEHS, service and scholarly activities may often occur in the same or similar setting. In order to differentiate between the two, service activities are those activities for which expertise in one’s discipline is not required and/or the public accountability of traditional scholarship not directly tied to disciplinary inquiry is not expected or required.

Service activities are considered in four areas: (1) Service to the Department, (2) Service to the School, (3) Service to the University, and (4) Service to the Profession/Community. In each area, the type of service activity, the role of the faculty member, and the effort (time and energy) are considered in the assessment process. Faculty are not expected to make contributions in all four areas. The areas simply reflect a structure to communicate and organize service activities. These activities include:

A. Service to the Department
   a. Committee work
   b. Program development
   c. Work on program review, accreditation reports, etc.
   d. Working with student groups
   e. Student recruitment

B. Service to the School of Education & Human Services
   a. Committee work
   b. Work on school-based initiatives
   c. Special events (honors, etc.)
C. Service to the University of Michigan – Flint
   a. Committee work
   b. Work on university-wide initiatives

D. Service to the Profession/Community
   a. Contributions to national, state, and/or local professional organizations
   b. Providing support to local schools and human services agencies.

Core Standards for Review of Service Activity

1. **Clear Goals.** Does the candidate set clear goals for her or his service activity? Does the candidate define objectives that are achievable, and defensible?
2. **Adequate Preparation and Productivity.** Does the candidate prepare sufficiently for his or her service activity? Does the candidate carry out necessary tasks in a timely way? Does the candidate bring the necessary skills to his/her work? Does the candidate bring together the resources necessary to carry out his or her service activity?
3. **Appropriate Strategies.** Does the candidate use strategies that are effective in meeting service goals? Does the candidate modify strategies in response to changing circumstances?
4. **Assessment.** Does the candidate provide adequate evidence to assess her/his impact of service? Does the candidate describe how service is logically integrated into her/his professional goals?
5. **Effective Communication.** Does the candidate communicate to colleagues using suitable styles and formats for each purpose? Is the candidate sufficiently responsive to colleagues?
6. **Reflective Critique.** Does the candidate critically evaluate his or her service activity? Does the candidate bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to the critique? Does the candidate show dedication to improving the quality of future work?

Standards for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

Candidates for promotion to Full Professor are expected to meet the general criteria for tenure, promotion, and merit and to demonstrate growth in depth and maturity beyond the core standards expected of junior faculty in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly Activity, and Service.

Additional guiding questions that delineate the Core Standards for the move from Associate to Full Professor across the areas of Teaching, Scholarly Activity and Service include:
Core Standards for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

1. **Goals.** How have the candidate’s goals developed since promotion to Associate Professor? Have they become increasingly well-articulated? How have they changed in scope and impact? How do they reflect and expand the knowledge of the discipline and important challenges in the field or area of activity?

2. **Preparation.** How has the candidate’s professional development in teaching, scholarship and/or service activities resulted in greater effectiveness, expanded skills required, significant use of resources, connection to the field or discipline, and/or timeliness, etc.?

3. **Methods and Strategies.** How has the candidate’s use of methods and strategies developed over the course of their career with respect to breadth of repertoire, flexibility, adaptiveness, creativity, depth of expertise, etc.? How do the candidate’s methods and strategies relate to and extend others used in the field and profession?

4. **Results and Assessment.** How has the candidate’s productivity developed over the course of their work, with respect to effectiveness, results, implications for the field or area of endeavor, etc.?

5. **Presentation/Communication.** How has the candidate continued to develop, enhance, diversify and hone presentation and communication with students, colleagues, peers in the field or discipline, and/or diverse audiences?

6. **Reflection and Critique.** How has the candidate’s self-reflection and critique developed? How has the candidate developed capacity for self-evaluation, increased depth of evidence used, to use the reflection to improve future work and to contribute to the field or discipline?

Promotion from Associate to Full Professor also requires the following additional criteria:

(1) Demonstrating substantial impact of one’s work on both the university community and on one’s field and/or profession.

(2) Demonstrating an exceptional epistemological and scholarly maturity in one’s thinking about one’s field and profession, and one’s own work as a faculty member.

While candidates for promotion to Associate Professor are expected to show evidence of significant impact within the School and the University, as well as the beginnings of impact on the larger field and/or profession, candidates for promotion to Full Professor must demonstrate evidence of substantial impact beyond the University.
Evidence of impact must be shown in teaching (for example, in terms of exceptional contributions to the intellectual development of students, or of positive influence on the teaching of others); in service (for example, in terms of exceptional contributions to the leadership of a department, unit, or campus); and in scholarship (having to do with the creation of new knowledge). The candidate’s discussion of the connections between all aspects of their work is deeply reflective and embedded in the literature of the field or discipline.

**Examples**

Below are examples of evidence that a candidate might bring forward in establishing a case for promotion from Associate to Full Professor. These examples are not meant to be definitive or exhaustive, nor should they imply that they are automatically sufficient evidence for promotion, singly or in combination. Together they are meant to provide a repertoire of the kinds of evidence that can contribute to a case for promotion. They also provide the faculty with a shared basis for understanding what constitutes work that merits promotion to Full Professor.

- Design and teaching of courses that break new ground in terms of content or methodology.
- Leadership of campus units, departments, committees, initiatives, etc. in ways that go above and beyond the expected responsibilities of the position, and which have affected faculty, staff, and/or students in significant positive ways.
- Journal articles, books, or other publications that have clearly influenced others in the field or profession, as established by citations or other evidence of impact.
- Programs, curricula etc. that are not only good practice but break new ground and are adopted by others.
- Software that provides a new way for learners to interact with ideas or information.
- New frameworks, instruments, or tools for research or assessment, that have been recognized as valuable by others in the field or profession.
- Leadership positions in regional, national, or international organizations related to one's field or profession, in which one has had visible influence on the organization or its members.
- A scholarly book.

**Appendix: Carnegie Foundation statement on the scholarship of teaching**

In this spirit, we would propose that all faculty have an obligation to teach well, to engage students, and to foster important forms of student learning—not that this is easily done. Such teaching is a good fully sufficient unto itself. When it entails, as well, certain practices of classroom assessment and evidence gathering, when it is informed not only by the latest ideas in the field but by current ideas about teaching the field, when it invites peer collaboration and review, then that teaching might rightly be called scholarly, or reflective, or informed. But in addition to all of this, yet another good is needed, one called a scholarship of teaching, which in another essay, we have described as having the three additional central features of being public ("community property"), open to critique and evaluation, and in a form that others can build on:

A scholarship of teaching will entail a public account of some or all of the full act of teaching—vision, design, enactment, outcomes, and analysis—in a manner susceptible to critical review by the teacher's professional peers and amenable to productive employment in future work by members of that same community (Shulman, in The Course Portfolio, 1998, p. 6).

A fourth attribute of a scholarship of teaching, implied by the other three, is that it involves question-asking, inquiry, and investigation, particularly around issues of student learning. Thus, though we have been referring here to the scholarship of teaching, our work is with the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Indeed, our guidelines for the Carnegie Scholars program call for projects that investigate "not only teacher practice but the character and depth of student learning that results (or does not) from that practice."

And with this, we believe, the circle comes full round. A scholarship of teaching is not synonymous with excellent teaching. It requires a kind of "going meta," in which faculty frame and systematically investigate questions related to student learning—the conditions under which it occurs, what it looks like, how to deepen it, and so forth—and do so with an eye not only to improving their own classroom but to advancing practice beyond it.
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