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I. Introduction

The Department of Social Work is committed to producing competent, entry-level social workers ready to engage in generalist practice. The department has a long-standing history of service to the region, as well as an ongoing commitment to scholarship and teaching. Its mission is directly in keeping with the goals and mission of the University and the requirements of its accrediting body, The Council on Social Work Education.

In order to maintain high academic standards, the Department engages in 3 levels of faculty review: an annual evaluation for merit, review for tenure, and review for promotion. This document outlines the criteria for achievement of tenure and promotion.

A documented history in 3 areas of evaluation is required. The areas of Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Growth, and Service are outlined below.

II. General Requirements and Procedures

In addition to the departmental requirements outlined in this document, there are additional criteria and guidelines established in the Faculty Handbook which also apply to candidates seeking tenure or promotion. These requirements and criteria include, but are not limited to, the composition and functioning of related committees, peer evaluation, and adherence to calendars for the tenure and promotion process. A candidate who is contractually granted years toward tenure or exceptions related to rank should refer to the faculty handbook for criteria or procedures. Candidates should familiarize themselves early in the process with both this document and the requirements stated in the Faculty Handbook. All criteria, policies, and procedures not found in this document but present in the Faculty Handbook apply. In the case of discrepancies or ambiguities, criteria, policies and procedures found in the Faculty Handbook supersede those found in this document.

The candidate will have 3 letters of recommendation by faculty members of equal or higher rank from within Southeast Missouri State University sent to the department chair. These letters will be included in the recommendation from the department chair to the Dean.

In addition to the requirements given in the Faculty Handbook for departmental tenure and promotion committees, the size and make up of the departmental committee is further defined: A committee will be comprised of not less than 3 tenured faculty members. In
the case of the committee utilizing members from outside the department (as per the Faculty Handbook), the chair of the committee will be from the department, if possible.

Candidates may not use the same work under two different categories or subcategories, unless specified as acceptable in the criteria related to the categories.

Candidates must provide clear supporting documentation of all activities.

**Sustained (also: to sustain)** is defined as multiple accomplishments over the evaluation period, but not necessarily every year.

Performance standards under each area of evaluation are rated as Good, Superior or Outstanding. Eligibility for each rank is based upon the performance under each level of the faculty performance standards. The minimum standards for academic rank are as follows:

- **Assistant Professor**: A rating of superior in teaching effectiveness and ratings of good in professional growth and service.

- **Associate Professor**: A rating of outstanding in Teaching effectiveness, a rating of superior in either professional growth or service, and a rating of good in the remaining area of evaluation.

- **Professor**: A rating of outstanding in Teaching effectiveness, a rating of outstanding in either professional growth or service, and a rating of superior in the remaining area of evaluation.

Criteria for tenure are the same as that for promotion to associate rank.

Criteria for post professorial review are the same as that of promotion to full professor.

In addition to these standards, collegiality may be considered in all tenure and promotion decisions. Collegiality is defined as working constructively with others to achieve common goals and upholding high ethical standards in work and in all relationships with students and colleagues at the university and elsewhere.
III. Areas of Evaluation and Related Criteria

A. Teaching Effectiveness

Sections under this area of evaluation include General Requirements and Definitions and Pedagogy.

1. General Requirements and Definitions:

Candidates are required to provide evidence of sustained teaching effectiveness from peers. Classroom teaching evaluations by tenure committee members, the department chair, and the dean must be accomplished in accordance with policies outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Candidates are required to provide evidence of sustained teaching effectiveness from students. It is recommended that this be accomplished by using a University approved instrument for all classes for at least one semester of every year. (See the Faculty Handbook for the official policy on student evaluation and related instruments.)

The candidate must engage in self analysis and planned activities to improve teaching effectiveness, including a sustained effort to utilize feedback from peers and/or students.

2. Pedagogy

Categories under this section include:

a. Development of a new, fully implemented syllabus for a face to face, web based, or ITV course, approved by the faculty.

b. Conversion of an existing face to face course to Web, ITV or blended format, approved by the faculty.

c. Revision of an existing syllabus at the level of reconceptualizing the purpose and objectives of a course, and requiring faculty approval.

d. Classroom enrichment/innovative teaching, including the implementation of new teaching methods/technologies for the first time: The instructor is expected to make a case for innovative teaching methods. Sustained attendance at CSTL and similar teaching workshops may be included here, however, the candidate must provide evidence that such attendance resulted in changes in pedagogy. It is understood that what may be innovative for one person may not be for another and that there is a wide variety of possible pedagogical innovations.
e. Voluntary, secondary, teaching activities including assuming the role of field instructor, serving on a thesis committee, a student honors committee, or a committee for graduating with distinction.

f. Providing independent studies or serving a specialized mentoring arrangement, such as a McNair mentor.

g. The organization of teaching events outside of the classroom involving students. Note that such activities must clearly relate to classroom activities (not just content), such as student presentations, special projects or reports, or similar activities. (Note: Activities, such as trips, involving students but not directly connected to classroom learning will be categorized under service. Activities cannot be used under both the categories of service and teaching.)

h. Receiving teaching awards, including the departmental, college and university awards for teaching excellence.

i. Other: This is an open category related to teaching. Activities in this category must be clearly related to teaching. The individual should submit a written description making the case for how activities in this category resulted in improved teaching.

In the area of Teaching, performance standards are defined as follows:

Good is defined as all activities in section 1 and sustained involvement in 3 activities (total) across 2 categories within section 2.

Superior is defined as all activities in section 1 and sustained involvement in 4 activities (total) across 3 categories within section 2.

Outstanding is defined as all activities in section 1 and sustained involvement in 5 activities (total) across 4 categories within section 2.

B. Professional Growth

This area of evaluation includes two sections: General Requirements and Scholarly Activity.

1. General Requirements

   The candidate is expected to attend at least one professional conference or workshop every year.
The candidate must have a well-articulated research agenda with a focused area of study.

The candidate is required to sustain membership in at least one professional organization (e.g., MASW, NASW, CSWE), or licensure over the course of the evaluation period.

2. Scholarly Activity

Categories under this section include:

a. Peer reviewed journal articles in which the candidate is first or second author. Candidates must document having made a significant contribution in the case of second authorship.

b. Peer reviewed presentations in which the candidate is first or second presenter. Candidates must document having made a significant contribution in the case of second authorship.

c. Peer reviewed research or training grants in which the candidate is first or second author. Candidates must document having made a significant contribution in the case of second authorship.

d. Other: This category includes all other scholarly activities not included in the categories above, including, but not limited to, books, book chapters, book reviews, monographs, non competitive research or training grants, research awards, GRD and FFR grants, and other non peer reviewed professional work. The candidate should make a case for the importance of work in this category.

Note that under categories a, b, and c articles that have been accepted for publication but “in press”, presentations accepted but not yet given, and grants awarded for funding, count as activities within these categories. Documentation, however, must be provided in such cases. Also, only first or second authorship (presenter) count within these categories.

In the area of Professional development, performance standards are defined as follows:

Good is defined as all activities in section 1; and, sustained work leading to 2 publications (2a), and sustained work leading to 3 presentations (2b).

Superior is defined as all activities in section 1; and, sustained work leading to 3 publications (2a), sustained work leading to 3 presentations (2b), and 1 additional activity in any category 2a through 2d.
Outstanding is defined as all activities in section 1; and, sustained work leading to 4 publications (2a), sustained work leading to 4 presentations (2b), and 1 additional activity in any category 2a through 2d.

C. Service

This area of evaluation includes two sections: General requirements and University Service.

1. General Requirements

Given the service orientation of the Social Work profession, candidates are expected to engage in sustained service to both the University and the Community.

2. University Service

a. Departmental service, including serving on committees, and work with students not defined under teaching effectiveness.

b. Serving on active, college committees.

c. Service on active University committees.

d. Unpaid community involvement using the professional skills, knowledge, or expertise of Social Work. This could include annual board membership, developing cooperative service grants, consulting, presentation, clinical work, or other community service.

e. Unpaid, service to the profession, including service to professional organizations, associations or advocacy groups.

f. Service awards.

g. Other: This is an open category related to service. The individual should submit a written description of the activity.

In the area of Service, performance standards are defined as follows:

Good is defined as all activities in section 1; and, sustained involvement in 4 activities (total) across all categories 2a through 2d, and 1 additional activity in any category 2a through 2g.
Superior is defined as all activities in section 1; and sustained involvement in 5 activities (total) across all categories 2a through 2d, and at least 2 additional activities (total) in any category(s) 2a through 2g.

Outstanding is defined as all activities in section 1; and, sustained involvement in 6 activities (total) across all categories 2a through 2c, and at least 2 additional activities (total) in any category(s) 2a through 2g. Candidate must also demonstrate sustained leadership in categories 2a through 2e.