

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

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

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.

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 Educational Foundations & Leadership

Scholarship Statement to Evaluate Faculty Scholarly Activity and Research

Scholarly activity and research are central to the mission of the Department of Educational Foundations & Leadership, Darden College of Education and Professional Studies, Old Dominion University. Scholarly activity and research are highly valued and expected of all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department. Per Old Dominion University's Faculty Handbook (July 2023), this document establishes the criteria agreed upon by the departmental faculty that is to be used for evaluating scholarly activities and research including publications, presentations at professional meetings, grants and contracts, and other scholarly output. This scholarship statement is to accompany faculty submitted materials and is to serve as a reference when conducting faculty annual performance reviews and deliberating faculty tenure and promotion decisions. The departmental faculty, per the faculty handbook, acknowledges that it is the responsibility of the department chair, the promotion and tenure committee (referred to as the Academic Personnel Committee in the Department of Educational Foundation & Leadership), the dean, and the provost to evaluate the quality of faculty scholarly activity and research.

Throughout their career, faculty are expected to produce rigorous, high quality, impactful scholarship that contributes to their scholarly identity. Examples of types of scholarly output include articles in scholarly academic journals, conference proceedings, books, book chapters, presentations at professional conferences, grants and contracts, computer software and educational media, and awards and recognition related to scholarship. The amount and type of scholarship produced should be appropriate to a faculty member's field, academic rank, career stage, and take into consideration any administrative duties or other contractual obligations they may have within the department, college, and university. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to state how such administrative duties and obligations may affect the amount and type of scholarship they produce. For tenure-track and tenured faculty, two peer-

reviewed publications and one submission of an external grant, unless otherwise funded, are expected on average annually.

Evidence of Quality and Impact of Scholarly Activity and Research

Candidates under review are expected to provide evidence of the quality and impact of their scholarly activity and research. Indicators of quality and impact could include:

A. Articles in scholarly academic journals.

1. Reputation of journal – include acceptance rates, impact factors, reputational ratings, etc.
2. Evidence of impact of article – include citation counts, H index, awards, reviews, etc.
3. Distinction between “refereed” (double blind or blind peer review process), “reviewed” (reviewed but not a blind process), and “invited” (due to known expertise in an area).
4. Circulation and readership – include downloads, reads, etc.
5. The quality and impact of the author’s contribution to collaboratively authored articles should be evaluated according to relative position of author order unless otherwise noted.

B. Grants and contracts.

1. External grants are more highly valued than are internal grants.
2. Submission of proposals - indicate role, e.g., PI, co-PI, Senior Researcher, Evaluator; requested funding amount; percentage of effort; type of grant, e.g., internal vs. external, research vs. service.
3. Award of grants - indicate role, e.g., PI, co-PI, Senior Researcher, Evaluator;

requested funding amount; percentage of effort; type of grant, e.g., internal vs. external, research vs. service.

4. Participation in existing funded grants or contracts - indicate role, e.g., PI, co-PI, Senior Researcher, Evaluator; requested funding amount; percentage of effort; type of grant, e.g., internal vs. external, research vs. service.

C. Conference proceedings.

1. Reputation of conference – include scope, i.e., international, national, regional, state, local.
2. Evidence of impact of conference paper – include citation counts, H index, awards, reviews, etc.
3. Circulation and readership – include downloads, reads, etc.
4. Distinction between “refereed” (double blind or blind peer review process), “reviewed” (reviewed but not a blind process), invited” (due to known expertise in an area).
5. Circulation and readership – include downloads, reads, etc.
6. The quality and impact of the author’s contribution to collaboratively authored conference papers should be evaluated according to relative position of author order unless otherwise noted.

D. Books.

1. Reputation of publisher.
2. Evidence of impact of book – include citation counts, H index, awards, reviews, etc.
3. Market penetration – include sales figures.

4. The quality and impact of the author's contribution to collaboratively authored books should be evaluated according to contribution of authors denoted by relative position of author order unless otherwise noted.

E. Book Chapters.

1. Reputation of publisher.
2. Evidence of impact of chapter – include citation counts, H index, awards, reviews, etc.
3. Distinction between “refereed” (double blind or blind peer review process), “reviewed” (reviewed but not a blind process), and “invited” (due to known expertise in an area).
4. Circulation and readership – include downloads, reads, etc.
5. The quality and impact of the author's contribution to collaboratively authored book chapters should be evaluated according to relative position of author order unless otherwise noted.

F. Presentations at professional conferences.

1. Reputation of conference – include scope, i.e., international, national, regional, state, local.
2. Distinction between “refereed” (double blind or blind peer review process), “reviewed” (reviewed but not a blind process), and “invited” (due to known expertise in an area), non-reviewed.
3. The quality and impact of collaboratively authored presentations should be evaluated according to contribution of authors denoted by relative position of author order unless otherwise noted.

G. Computer software and educational media.

1. Creative work resulting in the creation of significant computer software or educational materials, e.g., creative work available for use external to the university will be evaluated based on external evaluations and reviews.

H. Awards and recognition related to scholarship.

Department of Educational Foundations & Leadership

Scholarship Statement to Evaluate Faculty Scholarly Activity and Research

Scholarly activity and research are central to the mission of the Department of Educational Foundations & Leadership, Darden College of Education and Professional Studies, Old Dominion University. Scholarly activity and research are highly valued and expected of all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department. Per Old Dominion University's Faculty Handbook (July 2023), this document establishes the criteria agreed upon by the departmental faculty that is to be used for evaluating scholarly activities and research including publications, presentations at professional meetings, grants and contracts, and other scholarly output. This scholarship statement is to accompany faculty submitted materials and is to serve as a reference when conducting faculty annual performance reviews and deliberating faculty tenure and promotion decisions. The departmental faculty, per the faculty handbook, acknowledges that it is the responsibility of the department chair, the promotion and tenure committee (referred to as the Academic Personnel Committee in the Department of Educational Foundation & Leadership), the dean, and the provost to evaluate the quality of faculty scholarly activity and research.

Throughout their career, faculty are expected to produce rigorous, high quality, impactful scholarship that contributes to their scholarly identity. Examples of types of scholarly output include articles in scholarly academic journals, conference proceedings, books, book chapters, presentations at professional conferences, grants and contracts, computer software and educational media, and awards and recognition related to scholarship. The amount and type of scholarship produced should be appropriate to a faculty member's field, academic rank, career stage, and take into consideration any administrative duties or other contractual obligations they may have within the department, college, and university. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to state how such administrative duties and obligations may affect the amount and type of scholarship they produce. For tenure-track and tenured faculty, two peer-

reviewed publications and one submission of an external grant, unless otherwise funded, are expected on average annually.

Evidence of Quality and Impact of Scholarly Activity and Research

Candidates under review are expected to provide evidence of the quality and impact of their scholarly activity and research. Indicators of quality and impact could include:

A. Articles in scholarly academic journals.

1. Reputation of journal – include acceptance rates, impact factors, reputational ratings, etc.
2. Evidence of impact of article – include citation counts, H index, awards, reviews, etc.
3. Distinction between “refereed” (double blind or blind peer review process), “reviewed” (reviewed but not a blind process), and “invited” (due to known expertise in an area).
4. Circulation and readership – include downloads, reads, etc.
5. The quality and impact of the author’s contribution to collaboratively authored articles should be evaluated according to relative position of author order unless otherwise noted.

B. Grants and contracts.

1. External grants are more highly valued than are internal grants.
2. Submission of proposals - indicate role, e.g., PI, co-PI, Senior Researcher, Evaluator; requested funding amount; percentage of effort; type of grant, e.g., internal vs. external, research vs. service.
3. Award of grants - indicate role, e.g., PI, co-PI, Senior Researcher, Evaluator;

requested funding amount; percentage of effort; type of grant, e.g., internal vs. external, research vs. service.

4. Participation in existing funded grants or contracts - indicate role, e.g., PI, co-PI, Senior Researcher, Evaluator; requested funding amount; percentage of effort; type of grant, e.g., internal vs. external, research vs. service.

C. Conference proceedings.

1. Reputation of conference – include scope, i.e., international, national, regional, state, local.
2. Evidence of impact of conference paper – include citation counts, H index, awards, reviews, etc.
3. Circulation and readership – include downloads, reads, etc.
4. Distinction between “refereed” (double blind or blind peer review process), “reviewed” (reviewed but not a blind process), invited” (due to known expertise in an area).
5. Circulation and readership – include downloads, reads, etc.
6. The quality and impact of the author’s contribution to collaboratively authored conference papers should be evaluated according to relative position of author order unless otherwise noted.

D. Books.

1. Reputation of publisher.
2. Evidence of impact of book – include citation counts, H index, awards, reviews, etc.
3. Market penetration – include sales figures.

4. The quality and impact of the author's contribution to collaboratively authored books should be evaluated according to contribution of authors denoted by relative position of author order unless otherwise noted.

E. Book Chapters.

1. Reputation of publisher.
2. Evidence of impact of chapter – include citation counts, H index, awards, reviews, etc.
3. Distinction between “refereed” (double blind or blind peer review process), “reviewed” (reviewed but not a blind process), and “invited” (due to known expertise in an area).
4. Circulation and readership – include downloads, reads, etc.
5. The quality and impact of the author's contribution to collaboratively authored book chapters should be evaluated according to relative position of author order unless otherwise noted.

F. Presentations at professional conferences.

1. Reputation of conference – include scope, i.e., international, national, regional, state, local.
2. Distinction between “refereed” (double blind or blind peer review process), “reviewed” (reviewed but not a blind process), and “invited” (due to known expertise in an area), non-reviewed.
3. The quality and impact of collaboratively authored presentations should be evaluated according to contribution of authors denoted by relative position of author order unless otherwise noted.

G. Computer software and educational media.

1. Creative work resulting in the creation of significant computer software or educational materials, e.g., creative work available for use external to the university will be evaluated based on external evaluations and reviews.

H. Awards and recognition related to scholarship.

Reviewed and approved
by Dr. Austin Agwu, VPAA
4/24/2024

Department of Human Movement Studies and Special Education (HMSE) Scholarship Statement

HMSE Scholarship Guiding Framework

The Department of Human Movement Studies and Special Education 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, grants, 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, educational tools, and research methods across a variety of populations, including educators and students as well as sport, recreation, hospitality, and tourism participants and managers. 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, business leaders, organization managers, and policymakers) with primary emphasis on scholarly contributions dedicated to furthering understanding within our disciplines and fields of study.

Scholarly Work

The Department of HMSE 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 with 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 HMSE 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 in publications are highly valued. 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 some scholarly journals do not often have these), acceptance rates, and/or 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 journal metrics or 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, and 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 policymakers, funders, and government leaders. Review hierarchy: Peer review or non-peer review. It is important to note that each of these four criteria (i.e., 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 Human Movement Studies and Special Education, 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, or other major participant). 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.

Adopted October 5, 2023 Department Meeting

Scholarship Committee

Dana Childress

Justin Haegele

Silvana Watson

Lindsay Usher

Addendum

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

Expected

Publications

- An average of two peer-reviewed publications* per year. Each faculty should provide impact factors and citation scores (where available, as we understand that some scholarly journals do not often have these), or acceptance rates, and/or information about the readership.

Grants

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

*For a hierarchical listing of valued publications in HMSE, please see the Department's Scholarship Statement.

Reviewed and Approved
Austin Azho, Provost/VPA
4/8/2024

LIS Department Scholarly Metrics

The P & T committee is requesting that all faculty include a PDF copy of published manuscripts as well as clarifying information on their annual review materials to help facilitate reviews. This process will help faculty become familiar with what is expected as you prepare your documentation for future promotion and tenure decisions.

- 1) Provide the following clarifying information on your annual materials and CV when appropriate:
 - a) On the CV, highlight any materials to be considered during the period of review.
 - b) Indicate authorship of journal articles, research papers, conference proceedings, posters, etc.
 - c) Use an asterisk (*) to indicate works that were peer-reviewed.
 - d) Use a dagger (†) to indicate works that were invited.
 - e) Use a double dagger (‡) to indicate works that were co-authored with students.

- 2) Provide quality metrics and the year. You may find this information in Cabell's, Ulrich, Journal Citation Research (JCR), Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), PubMed, Scimago (SJR), or other indexes, or on a journal's website. For each publication and conference, provide as many of the following types of information as possible:
 - a) Review process (e.g., anonymous, peer-reviewed, editor- reviewed)
 - b) Indexing (e.g., Cabell's, Ulrich, JCR, ERIC, SJR)
 - c) Impact factor (and source of metric) of the journal
 - d) H-index and Quartile of the journal (and specific discipline)
 - e) Acceptance or rejection rate
 - f) Subscription/circulation rate and/or online metrics
 - g) Reputability of publisher and/or sponsor
 - h) How long journal has been in existence
 - i) Time to publication (i.e., queue)
 - j) Citation metrics for the specific article

Example of a publication with information and metrics:

*‡Blue, B. I. G. and Monarch, A. (2023). Enrollment trends at Old Dominion University. *Journal of Good Scholarship*, 59(2), 57-73.

The Journal of Good Scholarship is indexed in Cabell's and uses a double-blind peer review process. It has an impact factor of 1.23. The acceptance rate for manuscripts published in 2023 was 18%. The journal has been published by the ABC Association since 1958.

*It is also **suggested** that all faculty **provide full metrics for their scholarship**

STEMPS/LIS Scholarship Statement

As the Darden College of Education and Professional Studies is a member of a Carnegie R1-designated, very high research activity 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 for LIS faculty is an average of two published manuscripts aimed at academic audiences—defined as articles (empirical or theoretical) published in high quality, refereed journals in the field. Faculty members are also encouraged to seek funding to support their programs of research. The expectation is that LIS faculty members apply for at least one grant annually if not already receiving grant support. 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. 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 by the same standards of work in each category. Research that has been recognized through an award or distinction is especially valued. Additionally, scholarly activities that promote diversity, equity, and inclusion related to the faculty member's field are valued.

Faculty Responsibility

It is the faculty member's responsibility to describe how they met or exceeded scholarship expectations in their field. They are encouraged to submit a personal narrative and overview of accomplishments that describe their contribution in scholarly activity as well as any extenuating circumstances that might influence how their contributions are evaluated.

Scholarly Expectations

Peer-reviewed journal articles and grant submissions are an expectation in consideration for promotion and tenure.

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles

These are the primary indicators of research and scholarship. The following criteria apply to the evaluation of publication quality.

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 an anonymous peer-review process and the journals are indexed. The reputation and editorship of journals, including journal metrics such as rejection rates, impact factors, and reputational ratings should be considered.

Evidence of Impact: Evidence of impact of individual articles, such as citation counts, h-index, i10-index, awards, reviews, as well as circulation and readership is considered. Faculty are encouraged to note distinction between “refereed” (anonymous peer review process), “reviewed” (reviewed but not an anonymous process), and “invited” (due to known expertise in an area) when providing quality metrics.

Authorship: While sole authored works demonstrate scholarly leadership, collaboratively authored articles should not be viewed as less desirable than solo-authored publications. Collaboratively-authored publications should be evaluated according to the contribution of faculty member, quality of the work, impact on the field, and relative position within author order where author order represents relative contribution. Publications are particularly valued when they involve substantial collaboration and mentoring of a student as co-author.

Grants and contracts

The availability of grants and contracts varies between fields, and success in receiving grants must be weighed in light of this factor. Faculty are evaluated on their scholarly efforts to seek and receive funding to support their research efforts.

Source: 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.

Evaluation: 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). Faculty should clearly document their contributions to each individual grant.

Documentation of Effort: When submitting evidence of grant activity, faculty should document their role (PI, co-PI, etc.) and requested funding amount, the funding agency and type of grant (internal vs. external, research vs. service). Participation in existing funded grants or contracts, including role (PI, co PI, etc.) and support and/or mentoring of students or postdoctoral research assistants as part of the work of the project.

Additional Scholarship

Faculty are encouraged to publish and/or participate in additional opportunities to enhance their professional reputation and contribute to their scholarship. Faculty may provide evidence of excellence in scholarship through additional types of evidence, which can include:

Published Conference Proceedings

These works are valued as scholarship. Conference proceedings must be anonymous peer-reviewed. 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: Priority of authorship in a conference proceeding (e.g., sole, first, second) may be discipline-specific; however, level of authorship and significance should be documented.

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.

Books and Book Chapters

These are a valuable indicator of scholarship. Published books are evaluated on the level and reputation of the publishing company, as well as overall impact of the work.

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 considered.

Reputation: Reviews received, sales figures and citation counts all contribute to the reputation and impact of books and book chapters

Non-peer reviewed publications

This may include invited articles, practitioner-focused articles, book chapters, conference abstracts, etc that are published without the rigor of a full review process.

Reputation: the reputation and editorship of publications, including metrics such as rejection rates, impact factors, reputational ratings, etc.

Evidence of impact of individual articles: such as citation counts, h-index, awards, reviews, etc. circulation and readership.

Authorship: publications are particularly valued when they involve substantial collaboration and mentoring of a student as co-author. 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.

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.

Conference Reputation: Anonymous, peer-reviewed presentations are of greater value than those that are non-refereed. The extent of external peer review before acceptance of the paper and the prestige associated with having a paper accepted for presentation at that meeting should be considered.

Scholarly Contribution: Presentations of research findings and invited keynote addresses are most valued. Presentations that are judged competitively are of greater 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.

Authorship: Presentations at scholarly conferences are valued when they involve substantial collaboration and mentoring of a student as co author/presenter. 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.

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. The value of these materials is evaluated based on external evaluations and reviews.

Published Technical Reports

In some disciplines within the department, 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 anonymous peer reviewed journal articles. If technical reports are accessible only to the author(s) and the sponsoring agency, then they are not as 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.

Addition Considerations for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Seeking Promotion

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: "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 LIS department evaluation criteria build on these expectations and provide specific accomplishment expectations to be considered for promotion. For promotion to Professor, the expectation is higher than for promotion to Associate Professor. Since receiving tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, faculty shall be judged in terms of whether they have an established record that indicates continued growth, development and accomplishment in their scholarship to include leadership.

Integration of Scholarship, Teaching, and Service

For the 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 excellence and leadership through significant scholarly accomplishments and contributions to their discipline/field. Faculty are responsible for emphasizing the trajectory of their accomplishments.

Darden College of Education faculty are members of a Carnegie R1-designated, very high research activity 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, especially those stemming from the candidate's own scholarship. Tenured faculty members are also expected to seek funding to support their programs of research. They may serve on their own projects as well as collaborate with other faculty and mentor more junior faculty and students seeking funding support. Other types of scholarship are also valued in balance with articles, books, and grants, especially projects that enhance the scholarly reputation of the faculty member.

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. Candidates for full professor should demonstrate sustained and balanced merit and contributions to scholarship over time in the review period. A typical, recommended pace for scholarship is an annual average of two empirical or theoretical articles published in high quality refereed journals in the field that are aimed at academic audiences.

Scholarly Expectations

The following guides the review with respect to scholarship in promotion to Professor:

- A. The faculty member demonstrates a national or international impact through scholarship
 - 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/or reviewed articles (e.g., invited or special issues).
 - 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). The impact of the book should be considered on the basis of published reviews or external evaluations.
 - Conference papers or presentations:** There is an expectation of more invited, keynote, or plenary presentations and presentations made to national or international audiences.
- B. The faculty member has grown in their approach and contributions with their scholarship since the time of being promoted to associate professor
 - Enhanced quality of scholarly work (e.g., journal prestige).** 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 reflect a more mature formulation of questions and a richer exploration of them.
 - Awards or other formal recognitions of scholarly activity.** These are indicative of enhanced recognition and standing in the professional field.
- C. The faculty member used scholarship to enhance student success
 - Evidence includes consideration of publications and conference presentations with current and former students; authorship on publications with current and former students; chairing dissertations related to the faculty member's research agenda; supporting students through funded grants.
- D. The faculty member has established an intentional and coherent scholarly agenda
 - The faculty member's scholarship reflects his/her areas of expertise and contribute to a cohesive line of inquiry.
 - Conference presentations regularly lead to publication and grant proposals.
- E. The faculty member has sought funding to support their research agenda
 - 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 of effort are considered.
 - Submission of unfunded proposals as are valued, but to a lesser extent.

Policy Department Vote: May 2, 2024, 10 Aye, 2 abstain, 0 Nay.

Policy to Dean's Office: June 24, 2024

Policy to Provost: June 24, 2024

Policy Adopted: June 24, 2024

Policy Review: May 2029

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.

LIS Policy on Expectations of Service

The category of professional service is more difficult to define than teaching or research, but deserves the same rigorous evaluation and positive credit given to teaching and scholarly activities. Faculty members are asked to provide evidence of contributions to the department, college, university, community, and profession. The includes appendices provide examples of service opportunities that may be considered.

Pre-Tenure and Pre-Promotion (non-tenure track)

In the area of service, a balance of service activities across categories is expected. 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. Faculty are required to describe their contributions and the impact of their service efforts, not just provide a list of participation.

The evaluation of service should consider evidence of the following:

A. Departmental, College, and University Service

1. 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.
2. Mentoring. Review committees are encouraged to recognize and reward faculty who mentor faculty and students.
3. Special Compensated Service Assignments. Although a compensated activity, we acknowledge the importance of service in special service assignments. Service in these roles is time-intensive and can limit a faculty member's ability to serve in other ways. As such, faculty should not be penalized in other areas of service for their work in compensated service assignments.
4. 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.

B. 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.

1. Service to university outreach programs and efforts.
2. Cooperating with the Office of Development and stakeholders to secure external funding and sponsorship.

C. Service to the Discipline. As members of their respective disciplines, faculty make important contributions beyond the university. These contributions may enhance different areas of scholarship or professional development such as professional organizations, scholarly communication and publishing, and conference or other presentation venues. As faculty progress through their professional careers, they are encouraged to take on higher-level roles and responsibilities within their field.

1. Service to scholarly or professional organizations or societies
2. Service to scholarly communication or publication within the field
3. Other ways in which the faculty member is making a contribution to the advancement of their professional disciplines.

D. Commitment to Equity and Inclusive Excellence. The Department, College, and University are committed to enhancing equity and inclusive excellence. Faculty work at each level contributes to the diversity of learners and scholars at the University and enhances our environment of equity and inclusion. Service that promotes DEIA initiatives should be recognized in the review process.

E. Awards and recognitions related to service. We affirm that service should be judged on the basis of quality and effectiveness, not just quantity. Awards and recognitions are one method of indicating the quality of a faculty member's service, and should be recognized in the review process.

Service Expectations

Service obligations are progressive in accordance with faculty rank and time in position. A faculty member meets expectations in LIS 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. **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, university and profession.

For non-tenure track faculty, meeting expectations is defined as quality service to the department, college, university, and profession commensurate with their rank. Appropriate, increased service participation, requiring demonstrated expertise in the field and evidence of recognition within the faculty member's professional field, are expected, along with the expectation of leadership roles and evidence of advising, as appropriate. Non-tenure track faculty seeking promotion meet expectations by demonstrating advanced, quality service to the department, college, university, and profession.

Tenured and Promotion to Full

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. Tenured faculty are expected to provide increasing levels of leadership that are commensurate with their rank. As tenured 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 evaluation of service should consider evidence of the following:

- A. Establishing a notable or significant national or international impact on their field
- B. Providing leadership or significant service to the departmental, college, and university
- C. Providing community service in the application of a faculty member's research and professional skills for the service of the community
- D. Contributing to student success

Service Expectations

A tenured faculty member meets expectations in LIS through evidence of established and recognized service to the department, college, university, profession and community. For tenured faculty, some service expectations have greater time commitments; accordingly, a balance of time and effort of roles should be considered.

Date proposed: Draft February 1, 2024

Date adopted: February 20, 2024 (vote majority: 12 voted, 12 aye)

Date for review: February 2029

Appendix A

Pre-tenure Service Examples

The following items are intended to be a representative sample of types of service commitments appropriate for Pre-tenure or non-promoted faculty. It is not designed to be an exhaustive list.

Departmental, College, and University Service

Committee Service

Examples include:

- Assignments to work with other college faculty or other university departments such as Academic Affairs, Academic Technology Services, the Office of Residence Life, DEI offices, or the University Library

Mentoring

Examples include:

- Mentoring of fellow faculty members. Some information about the extent and type of mentoring activities should be included in the review materials.
- Student mentoring in research, international service work, service learning, entrepreneurial and innovation activities, and work-related experiential learning should be considered.

*NOTE- Student program 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

Special Compensated Service Assignments

Examples include:

- GPD, UPD or Certificate Coordinators

Sponsorship of Student Activities

Examples include:

- Sponsoring student chapters of professional associations,
- Hosting guest speaking events for students;
- Creating/planning/executing extracurricular opportunities that increase student engagement and inclusion in activities related to their field of study
- Facilitating networking opportunities such as social events or job fairs
- Promoting and encouraging leadership roles for students at conferences.

Community Service.

Service to university outreach programs and efforts

Examples include:

- Noncredit courses, workshops, projects, speaking activities, and colloquia in areas of the faculty member's expertise.
- Consulting, either reimbursed or unreimbursed, as a representative of the University
- Serving as an advisory board member
- Other ways in which the faculty member is using professional knowledge for the service of constituencies.

Service to the Discipline

Service to scholarly or professional organizations or societies

Examples include:

- Holding an elected or appointed office
- Membership (elected or appointed) on a professional organization committee
- Editing conference proceedings/submissions
- Reviewing conference proceedings/submissions
- Authoring white papers, reports, standards or other documents sponsored by a professional organization
- Service on a conference committee or hosting a conference
- Bringing a group to campus and serving on the local arrangements committee
- Developing a teleconference or hosting a webinar sponsored by a professional organization
- Other ways in which the faculty member is active within the professional organization/society not identified above

Service to scholarly communication or publication within the field

Examples include:

- Editor, guest editor, or editor-in-chief of a scholarly publication venue
- Member of an editorial review board for a scholarly publication venue
- Developing new scholarly communication or publication platforms (e.g., journals) within the field
- Ad-hoc reviewer for a scholarly publication venue
- Serving as a reviewer for an external funding agency
- Other ways in which the faculty member provides service within scholarly communication and publication not identified above

Appendix B

Post-tenure Service Examples

The following items are intended to be a representative sample of types of service commitments appropriate for tenured faculty, in addition to those listed in Appendix A. It is not designed to be an exhaustive list.

A. Service establishing a notable or significant national or international impact on their field

- Journal editing and reviewing
- Holding office in or receiving awards from scholarly or professional societies
- Service related publications/ reports (e.g., publications in non-scholarly journals; white papers; legislative reports; policy advocacy)
- Serving as an external reviewer or conducting program accreditation reviews

B. Providing leadership or significant service to the departmental, college, and university

- Special service assignments and administrative roles (e.g., graduate program director, assistant chair, or primary program advisor)
- University committees or roles with chairing or leadership more prevalent (e.g., faculty recruitment and mentoring; Faculty Senate, accreditation, strategic planning)
- Involvement and leadership in critical committees at all university levels
- Development and delivery of college or university presentations/workshops/panel sessions/webinars

C. Providing community service in the application of a faculty member's research and professional skills for the service of the community

- Professional development/ outreach (e.g., noncredit courses, workshops, projects, and colloquia in areas of the faculty member's expertise)
- Engagement with community-based organizations

D. Contributing to student success

- Overseeing field placement opportunities with students
- Suggesting field placement opportunities to field placement coordinators
- Assisting with career development concerns with students

Appendix C

Non-Tenure Track Examples

Forthcoming to align with Revisions to Teaching and Research Handbook

Procedures for Teaching Portfolio Review for Pretenure and Instructional Faculty

Old Dominion University is committed to the goal of excellence in teaching and has a guiding University Policy on the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness. The Department of Learning and Information Sciences hereby expands upon that policy and lays out procedural guidelines.

The P&T chair appoints a committee of three peers for each teaching portfolio. The assignment of faculty for teaching portfolio review is done at the start of the academic year.

Teaching Portfolio Committee Composition **(VOTED and DECIDED 8/25)**

At least one tenured faculty member serves on each Teaching Portfolio committee.

Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty also serve as peers on Teaching Portfolio committees.

The tenured faculty member is generally identified as the person to write the portfolio letter with input from the other two members.

Cycle of Review:

New faculty, tenure track faculty, and lecturers within the department are evaluated according to the schedule established in the Faculty Handbook.

Who	When	Materials due date
Nontenured faculty members (TT, Faculty of Practice, Clinical Assistant Professors and Lecturers)	First year of employment	November 15
Nontenured faculty members (TT, Faculty of Practice, Clinical Assistant Professors and Lecturers): Mid Year Appointments	First year of employment	January 31
Nontenured faculty members (TT, Faculty)	Second and subsequent years	September 1
Lecturers and Clinical Assistant Professors	Second and subsequent years	October 1
Senior Lecturers, Master Lecturers, Clinical Associate/Professors	Second and subsequent years	October 1 - every 3 years

Date proposed: Draft July 24, 2023

Date adopted: August 25, 2023 (vote majority: 10/15 for using the all department members, 2 for separate committee, 2 for using PnT committee, 1 abstained)

Date for review: August 25, 2028

Resources

ODU Policy on the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness:

<https://itsapps.odu.edu/ao/facultyhandbook/index.php?page=ch02s29.html&search=teaching+portfolio+review>

Tenured Faculty Teaching Portfolios Procedures

Teaching Portfolio Committee Composition for Tenured/Promoted Faculty

A committee of three individuals will be appointed for each review. At least two individuals holding the rank of Associate or Full professor will be assigned to evaluate faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor, as these letters will be included in promotion materials.

Cycle of Review

Tenured/promoted faculty will be evaluated on a five-year cycle.

The department will maintain a schedule of evaluation.

The review committee will conduct a review of each tenured faculty member according to a Five Year cycle from their last review.

Date proposed: Draft July 24, 2023

Date adopted: Oct 12, 2023 (vote majority: 15 yes, 1 abstain)

Date for review: October 2028

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