Terry B. Rogers College of Education & Social Sciences (TBRCOESS) Promotion & Tenure Guidelines

West Texas A&M University has long been a teaching institution, beginning in 1909 as West Texas State Normal College. The Terry B. Rogers College of Education and Social Sciences (TBRCOESS) is dedicated to quality teaching and therefore places a high priority on the teaching capabilities of faculty. Thus, instructional standards are a vital component in the achievement of promotion and tenure, and teaching effectiveness is imperative to ensure the most rigorous academic experience possible for our students.

Students, faculty, and academic resources are the essential core of a university. All other parts of a university are to support and facilitate the interaction of these key elements. The guiding principle to the tenure and promotion standards for the college is to recognize and reward the importance of weighing faculty work with students, colleagues, and the university community to create a collegial and energetic intellectual environment at West Texas A&M University. The standards for each area: instructional responsibilities (IR), intellectual contributions (IC), and professional service (PS), shall be viewed through the lens of this guiding principle and, thereby, reward ideal activities for faculty at WTAMU. Likewise, the level of achievement for faculty to be awarded tenure and/or promotion should reflect the degree of efforts of a faculty member and the support the college has made to encourage these ideal activities.

Recognizing that different disciplines have different expectations and pedagogical approaches, below are the standards for promotion and tenure in our college. This information assures faculty members a clear understanding of the standards, allowing them to establish goals early in their career at WTAMU. Candidates must qualify as either outstanding or excellent in all three categories to be considered for promotion and/or tenure. Refer to the faculty handbook for updated requirements. Candidates should provide a holistic explanation of themselves as a candidate for the committee's consideration.

INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES (IR)

The college evaluates instructional responsibilities based on three categories: 1) instructional contributions 2) pedagogy 3) teaching effectiveness. Evidence from all three categories will be reviewed and evaluated when considering a candidate's promotion and tenure. Categorical measures are listed below. Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process:

1. **Instructional Contributions**
   - Collaborating with peers in updating courses and programs in the department or college; providing leadership in curricular changes, course preparation, and/or program evaluation. Examples include the development of new syllabi or serving on department, college, and university curriculum committees

- Teaching courses needed in the department, college, and university. Examples may include teaching core curriculum, distance /online learning, graduate courses, course overloads, and independent study courses
- Consider the class size, number of courses, class/lab preparations, and the total classroom, lab and/or clinical contact hours per week
- The direction of internships, field placements, independent studies, student research, major student projects, theses, dissertations, and capstone courses
- Quality of course syllabi that communicate high academic expectations, assessment of student learning outcomes, timely return of graded materials, grading and/or other course materials
- Responds to students in a student-oriented, courteous, helpful, and friendly manner
- Responds to student contact (WTClass messages, email, telephone, in-person, and other) in a timely manner
- Encourages student questions, participation, and discussion both in and out of the classroom
- Advising Students
- Professional interactions with students that promote student learning and the mission of the university outside of the classroom
- Holds regular office hours and is available to students

2. **Pedagogy**
- Uses evidence-based, innovative, inclusive, and/or high-impact teaching and assessment practices
- Remains current in teaching fields, such as staying abreast of new developments in field-relevant literature, and incorporates this knowledge in the classroom
- Development of instructional materials, including appropriate use of emerging and digital technologies
- Clearly stated and measurable course goals, objectives, and learning outcomes
- Classroom activities that stimulate student interaction
- Innovative tests and assignments that enhance students' learning outcomes
- Community-based learning, such as service learning or study abroad
- Internal and external funding for curricular development and piloting teaching methods
- Engagement in activities such as professional conferences or university sponsored professional development, professional certifications, internships, and licensures that improve knowledge, ability, expertise, or professional effectiveness
- Fosters professional student development or student achievements, such as conference presentations, awarding of grants, or acceptance into graduate school

3. **Teaching Effectiveness**

As recognized in the prologue, the quality of teaching is one element of the essential core of this university. The judgement of quality is more than looking at a quantification on a university-adopted teaching effectiveness form. Indeed, current student evaluations of teaching effectiveness do not account for much of the variability in faculty's teaching excellence when

considered against studies of validation.[1] Evaluators have the responsibility to use multiple indicators of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness—and not just use a measure of low validity because it has a quantified score. Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process:

- Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness. The evaluation considers the different nature and types of classes (core, hybrid, graduate, online, upper-division) and class size
- Candidates have the option to provide a file that contains the entirety of student comments regarding their teaching; this may be helpful in a more holistic assessment of candidates who feel qualitative evidence may provide useful nuance for assessment
- Instructor developed evaluations of teaching effectiveness
- Peer evaluations
- Alumni evaluations
- Honors or other recognition of teaching effectiveness

INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS (IC)

Recognizing that different disciplines have different expectations and research methodologies, the evaluators for tenure and promotion should keep in mind the whole of any candidate's intellectual portfolio over the particularities of any one specific element. While one discipline might consider a scholarly book a major achievement, another discipline may prefer a few peer-reviewed professional journal articles. It is up to the committee to weigh these factors.
As a guiding principle: Faculty have different opportunities that contribute to advantages and disadvantages to be successful in Intellectual Contributions. Administrative responsibilities, travel funding, and teaching load, among other factors, may contribute to a candidate's accomplishments in Intellectual Contributions. The committee will consider the whole promotion and tenure package rather than solely focusing on Intellectual Contributions in evaluating the scholarly activities of a candidate.

Candidates should provide the committee with an indication of how much support for academic research they requested from the college and how much they received. This amount will be verified via the data recorded in the candidate's APS. The committee will consider the specific mixture of teaching load and financial support from the college in evaluating factors such as professional memberships, conference attendance, and number of conference presentations. For example, faculty with lower teaching loads and higher financial support would be in an

---

[1] Bob Uttl, Carmela A. White, and Daniela Wong Gonzalez, "Meta-analysis of Faculty's Teaching Effectiveness: Student Evaluations of Teaching Rating and Student Learning are not Related," *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 54 (September 2017), 22-42; Shipra Ginsburg and Lynfa Stroud, "Necessary but Insufficient and Possibly Counterproductive: The Complex Problem of Teaching Evaluations," *Academic Medicine* 98, no. 3 (March 2023), 300-303; see also Scott M. Gelber, *Grading the College: A History of Evaluating Teaching and Learning* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2020).

advantageous position relative to colleagues who have higher teaching loads and lower financial support.

Publications

Some Intellectual Contributions are more highly regarded than others; quantity does not trump quality. Simply stated, peer-reviewed publications are necessary for tenure. The committee will weigh articles, books, and other works published in highly regarded outlets or from university or scholarly presses more highly and consider that the methodology of a particular project may affect time to completion. Candidates must provide all articles, books, and other works they list in their portfolio so that faculty evaluating a candidate can review the items listed as either .pdf attachments or a weblink.

Each of the following areas are value-added contributions. IC relevance is at the discretion of the evaluators, who will make judgements based on the candidate's justification of an entry as scholarly work of their discipline.

Candidates should clearly explain the nature of the publication (peer reviewed/non-peer reviewed, etc.) and the role they played (whether sole or collective authorship) in any scholarly work, grant writing, research, or otherwise. Although collaboration is welcome and encouraged, candidates should explain their contributions to collective scholarly activities, including research and publications with students.

Candidates should explain their work in the context of their own discipline and rank, including additional conventional peer reviewed/non-peer reviewed activities such as conference presentations, professional editing of scholarly journals or books, research or conference awards, book reviews, research briefs, or other scholarly production. Candidates should list research grants, noting those that were applied for, accepted, or not accepted, with a description of the peer-review process.

The table below includes a mode for distinct types of intellectual contributions. The mode is calculated using data from the past six years across all successful candidates (those who received tenure and promotion to associate professor). A mode refers to the most common or repeatedly occurring value and thus reveals what is most typical among the successful candidates. So, if there were four people who went up for tenure and three had 0 books and one had 1 book, the modal value would be 0. When reading the mode below, then, a zero does not mean that no candidates wrote a book but that writing a book was not the most common thing that candidates did.

Three benefits of using the mode are: 1) changes will be cumulative over time, so any changes will happen gradually—this means that new candidates can base their expectations on standards that will not suddenly change 2) categories below reflect what successful candidates did, but are not exhaustive, so they reflect accomplishments, but they do not indicate all possible nor all required accomplishments—the categories may change over time 3) the mode is not vulnerable to outlying cases (those that are very high or very low), and it does not specify a rigid number without regard to professional qualitative differences.

This is a placeholder table that does not reflect real information at this time but represents a putative variety of potential intellectual activities. This table is most appropriate for candidates seeking the rank of associate professor.

Table 1. (EXAMPLE) Modal profile based on the past six years of successful candidates

Type of Intellectual Contribution	Six Year Mode*
Academic Conferences	x*
Conventional Peer reviewed Activities: Peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, research monographs	x
Documented instances of the faculty member collaborating on research with other faculty to the benefit of the campus community	x
Any scholarly product completed in collaboration with students that help interested students conduct, write, and publish independent research and foster additional professional development of students. (Listing gives students' work products).	x
Research grants (Note: applied for, rejected, or received)	x
Scholarly book	x
Scholarly book review	x
Additional rows will reflect the contributions of faculty who received tenure and promotion in the previous 6 years	x

Each year, the chair of the college T&P committee will provide the data for that year's modal profile to the Dean to be added to the collective data from the previous years. The Dean's office will post this information to the College website by December.

*The six year mode is a statistic that will be generated based on actual data that will be posted on the College website as it is collected over time.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE (PS)

The faculty of TBRCOESS plays an important role in serving the many constituents of West Texas A&M University, including students, the department, the college, the university, the community, the Panhandle, the state, and their academic profession. Because faculty members have different interests and strengths they can contribute to these constituencies, evaluators will recognize a variety of ways to perform Professional Service. Regardless of what form this service takes, faculty members are expected to serve these constituents actively.

Faculty should consult with the department head for service options at different levels (e.g., departmental, college, university)

Faculty will be evaluated in three categories of Professional Service: 1) Service to the University, 2) Service to the Profession, and 3) Service to the Community, State, Nation, or

World. Each department will determine the weight of the three categories used to determine the overall score for Professional Service and will be consistent for every faculty member in the department. Candidates should note any awards they receive in the following service roles. Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process may include:

1. **Service to the University**
   - Participation in administrative assignments, committees, or governance processes of the program, department, college and/or university
   - Assisting student organizations or activities
   - Participation in the recruitment and retention of students (e.g., Discover WT, Transfer Student and New Student Orientation)
   - Mentoring of students and faculty
   - External development activities for the department, college, and/or university
   - Participation in alumni and donor relation activities
   - Demonstration of leadership in the development of academic programs, curricula, or other special projects assigned by the department head, dean or provost
   - Other service not included in the departmental faculty evaluation document

2. **Service to the Profession**
   - Elected or appointed offices, committees, or conference assignments
   - Editorial assignments
   - Board or committee membership in area of academic expertise
   - Service grant
   - Manuscript referee, adjudicator, reviewer, or editor
   - Reviewer for professional publications and/or presentations
   - Maintains membership in national, regional, or state professional associations, given reasonable university support
   - Organizer, commentator, panelist, or discussant at professional meetings
   - Member of an accreditation review team or professional association
   - Other service not included in the departmental faculty evaluation document

3. **Service to the Community, State, Nation, or World**
   - Application of professional knowledge in service to the community, state, nation, or world
   - Public service activities for governmental or non-governmental units at local, state, national, or international levels
   - Demonstrates a sustained record of active service and leadership by serving on community committees
   - Serves as a consultant in their area of professional expertise (Note: prior approval required. See TAMUS Policy 31.05, 31.05.01)
   - Represents the department, college, or university in print or electronic media
   - Other service not included in the departmental faculty evaluation document

Addendum to College and Departmental Standards Clarifying Doctoral Faculty Activities

Added January 13, 2025

A faculty member's performance as **Chair** or **Methodologist** of an Ed.D. Candidate's Scholarly Deliverable Committee, is considered "**Instructional Responsibility"** and will be documented and evaluated accordingly. Performance as Committee Chair or Methodologist is not considered "**Professional Service**."

A faculty member's performance as a **Member** (not Chair or Methodologist) of an Ed.D. Candidate's Scholarly Deliverable Committee is considered "**Professional Service**" and will be documented and evaluated accordingly. In the event the contributions of the Committee Member are significant, the contributions of the Committee Member may be categorized and evaluated as "**Instructional Responsibility**."

The Ed.D. Program requires that each Ed.D. Candidate's Scholarly Deliverable (empirical research) results in a manuscript that is submitted for publication by the Candidate before graduation with attribution of authorship to include the Committee Members who contributed meaningfully to the empirical study. In the case of extenuating circumstances, the Scholarly Deliverable Committee, by consensus of two members, may recommend against submission of the manuscript for publication. In lieu of submission for journal publication or in addition to submission for journal publication, the Candidate and Committee may determine that an alternative scholarly outlet is appropriate, including but not limited to conference presentation or comparable professional outlets. Additionally, the Candidate and Committee may collaborate in the submission of proposals for research funding supporting additional research.

All such Scholarly Deliverables submitted by an Ed.D. Candidate for journal publication and/or dissemination through other scholarly outlets are considered the "**Intellectual Contribution"** of any Scholarly Deliverable Committee Member attributed to the work as an author. Such Intellectual Contribution should be documented by the Faculty Member with submission details such as "manuscript under review" or other appropriate descriptors and evaluated accordingly.