Agenda
EPSY Department Meeting
February 1, 2013
9:30 to 11 a.m.
Gentry 142 (NOT THE ROOM CHANGE ANNOUNCED EARLIER)

1. Review December Faculty Meeting Minutes (see attachment)
2. Announcements
   a. Sabbaticals (Bray and O'Neil away; Swaminathan, Little, and Madaus returned)
   b. Cancel EPSY 6601 Change (McCoach)
   c. Proposed EPSY 4010/4015 (Assessment of Learning) Change (Welsh)
   d. 10% Indirect PI Research Allocations Awarded (Siegle)
   e. Harris Kahn Dissertation Award (Siegle)
   f. PTR/Promotion Guidelines (see attachment to be voted on in March – Siegle)
   g. Faculty Large Grant Deadline (see attachment – Siegle)
   h. Other
3. Committee Issues
   a. Update on Proposed Merit Guidelines (Brown)
   b. Other
4. Other Issues
   a. Work in Program Groups to Discuss Program Mission, Goals, & Objectives
   b. Return to Reports on Program Work Progress (10:45)
5. Adjourn

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT
FACULTY MEETING MINUTES
December 7, 2012

Attendees: M. Bray, S. Brown, R. Colbert, M. Coyne, M. Faggella-Luby, K. Gavin, J. Gubbins, O. Karan, T. Kehle, B. McCoach, N. Olinghouse, J. O'Neil, R. Perusse, L. Sanetti, D. Siegle, M. Yakimowski, M. Young, C. Rhoads, J. Goldstein, A. Lombardi, S. Patwa, J. Plucker, and S. Ware

1. **Welcome**
   The meeting commenced at 9:35 am.

1. **Changes to the Minutes**
   There were no corrections to the November meeting minutes. They will stand as presented.

2. **Announcements**
   a. **J. O'Neil and M. Bray will be on sabbatical for the spring semester. J. Madaus will be returning as well as H. Swaminathan and C. Little.**

   J. Stephen has been granted an additional year for his leave in New Zealand.

   b. **K. Gavin is retiring at the end of December. J. Gubbins reviewed Gavin's many accomplishments. Gavin came to the university 10 years ago. During her time at UConn, she brought in over $6 million in grant monies and other support. Her primary grants were with the JAVITS program and NSF. J. Renzulli and S. Reis will give K. Gavin a retirement party at their home. While at the university, she has also worked hand-in-hand with T. Casa. Gavin expressed her thought on her retirement and thanked everyone for their support.**

   c. **There has been a new form from the graduate school that gives student's permission to defend their dissertations. It has been placed on the graduate school website. Associate advisors no longer need to sign the form. Forms need to be faxed to the graduate school two weeks before the defense. All copies need to be sent to the committee members.**

   d. **Travel Policy**
   Travelers need to provide receipts for specific items and everything needs to be itemized. Tips cannot be over 20%.

Faculty lunches at Chuck and Augie's that are charged to university accounts should be infrequent.

e. Research Course Sequence
B. McCoach proposed possible changes regarding EPSY 6601 and the prerequisites. Faculty provided her with feedback, and she will make a formal proposal at the February meeting.

f. Climate Survey
M. Yakimowski recommended that the climate survey be completed and that responses were anonymous.

g. Summer Consulting
Faculty whose summer time is 100% on grants cannot consult in the summer. If they wish to consult, they should not buy their time at 100% on grants. This policy may change in the future.

h. Pre-Doctoral In-Resident Fellowships
D. Siegle described the university's new predoctoral fellowship program. NSoE is participating. There will be approximately four (4) individuals selected university-wide each year. The purpose is to attract people here and also encourage them to stay.

i. Salary Savings Accounts
There will no longer be any expiration dates on these accounts.

3. **Committee Issues**
   a. **MEA search** – there are presently three (3) candidates who have been here to do presentations and interview for the position. T. DeFranco has not yet made an offer. There will probably be an offer made next week.

   b. **Proposal Merit Guidelines** – A gentle reminder that the categories have not been changed. Scholarship continues to be first. The committee is looking for more bullet items from the faculty. By February or March, there will be a formal proposal from the committee.

   c. D. Siegle recommended that if anyone had not been to a search training that they attend the training which was to be given on January 17, 2013. The training takes approximately one (1) hour. Anyone can attend the trainings.

   We have three (3) cluster positions (out of the 7 cluster searches being conducted this spring).

Each of the seven (7) cluster committees will be chaired by the department chair. It is recommended that we start recruiting with an effort to increase diversity. We should be keeping a log of the contacts.

4. **Other Business**
Nothing to report.

5. **Adjournment**
Motion to adjourn was proposed by M. Bray and it was seconded by T. Kehle. Meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.

CURRICULA ACTION REQUEST FORM

NEAG School of Education
Curricula and Courses Committee

All parts of this form should be completed for all course action requests. Submit ONE ELECTRONIC copy to the Chair, Curricula and Courses Committee, *only **after** the required Departmental approval is secured*. On separate pages provide **all** the information requested in the **Curricula Action Request Form that apply to the requested action(s)**. Submit materials electronically to the Chair, Curricula and Courses Committee, at the published date prior to the committee meeting at which you want them reviewed.

COURSE NUMBER ___EPSY 4010_____ X Current □ Proposed

COURSE TITLE __Assessment of Learning _____

INITIATING DEPARTMENT __Educational Psychology_____

CONTACT PERSON _Megan Welsh_____ U-BOX__2064____

PHONE__6-6125_____ E-MAIL_megan.welsh@uconn.edu_____

PROPOSED COURSE INSTRUCTOR(S) _Megan Welsh _____

ACTION REQUESTED (check all that apply)

Course: □ new □ experimental X revision X dropping course

Program/concentration: □ new □ revision

DATE OF DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL: _____2/1/2013_____

Departmental Minutes (must be included electronically)

DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON APPROVAL (attach ALL Depts electronically):
 [EPSY; EDLR; EKIN; EDCI]

PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE: Semester: __Fall_____Year: ___2013____

INTERNAL USE ONLY:
DATE ENTERED INTO NSOE DATABASE _____
DATE FORMS SENT TO REGISTRAR _____

Complete the following sections if you are proposing a:

NEW COURSE, WORKSHOP & EXPERIMENTAL COURSE

PROPOSED TITLE AND COMPLETE CATALOG COPY:
(Include course credits and restrictions for registration)

RATIONALE FOR ACTION REQUESTED (Use additional sheets as necessary):

Course Syllabus including course description and course outline. (include as email attachment)

Supporting documentation that MUST be provided at the time of submission:
   a. Departmental minutes
   b. Department chairperson's (all departments) approval (email)
   c. PeopleSoft form (if undergraduate course)
   d. Graduate School Transmittal form (if graduate course)

Complete the following sections if you are proposing:

<u>**COURSE REVISIONS**</u>

EXISTING TITLE AND **COMPLETE CATALOG COPY**:

4010. Assessment of Learning I

(252) First semester. One credit. Prerequisite: Open only to students in the Integrated Bachelor's/Master's Teacher Preparation Program.

Theory and practices of the assessment of learning.

4015. Assessment of Learning II

(253) First semester. One credit. Prerequisite: Open only to students in the Integrated Bachelor's/Master's Teacher Preparation Program.

Theory and practices of the assessment of learning.

PROPOSED TITLE AND COMPLETE CATALOG COPY:
    (Include course credits and restrictions for registration)

4010. Assessment of Learning

(252) First semester. Two credits. Prerequisite: Open only to students in the Integrated Bachelor's/Master's Teacher Preparation Program.

Theory and practices of the assessment of learning.

RATIONALE FOR ACTION REQUESTED (Use additional sheets as necessary):

EPSY 4010 and 4015 are two one-credit courses offered in the first and second half of the Fall semester. This action clarifies the true nature and intent of the courses; they will be correctly identified as one full-semester course in the Integrated Bachelor's/Master's Teacher Preparation Program.

Course Syllabus including course description and course outline. (include as email attachment)

Supporting documentation:
- a. Departmental minutes
- b. Department chairperson's (all departments) approval (email)
- c. PeopleSoft form (if undergraduate course)
- d. Graduate School Transmittal form (if graduate course)

Complete the following sections if you are proposing to:

<u>DROP A COURSE</u>

COURSE TITLE AND NUMBER

EPSY 4015 Assessment of Learning II

RATIONALE FOR DROPPING THE COURSE

The material will be incorporated into EPSY 4010. EPSY 4010 and EPSY 4015 have functioned as one course for many years, with each earning one credit and lasting for half a semester. EPSY 4015 will be eliminated and EPSY 4010 will expand from a one credit to a two credit course and will run for a full semester.

Supporting documentation:
- a. Departmental minutes
- b. Department chairperson's (all departments) approval (email)

Complete the following sections if you are proposing:

PROGRAM/CONCENTRATION CHANGES

CURRENT PROGRAM/CONCENTRATION NAME:

RATIONALE FOR ACTION REQUESTED (Use additional sheets as necessary):

CURRENT EIGHT SEMESTER SEQUENCE (attach electronically)

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION
   a. Old eight semester sequence
   b. Departmental minutes
   c. Department chairperson's (all departments) approval (email)
   d. PeopleSoft form (if undergraduate course)
   e. Graduate School Transmittal form (if graduate course)

EPSY 4010: ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING
Fall Semester 2013
Neag School of Education, University of Connecticut

Tuesdays (Section 1) or Thursdays (Section 2) 8:00-9:20
Gentry 119E
Instructor: Megan Welsh
Office: Room 335 Gentry
Office Hours: Mondays   12:30-3:00
                Tuesdays   12:30-3:00
Phone: 486-6125
Email: megan.welsh@uconn.edu

Course Description

Assessment of Learning is designed to introduce you to the foundational theory and practice of classroom, large-scale and standardized educational assessment. In the broadest sense, the scope of this series will focus on the *central* role of assessment within the teaching-learning dynamic. More concretely, you will develop an understanding of how assessment techniques can generate a positive feedback loop, wherein information is continually collected, leading to more accurate evaluation decisions and a constructive teacher-learner dialogue. During the semester you will gain an understanding of topics such as reliability, validity, norm- and criterion-referenced assessments, achievement testing, and special issues surrounding the assessment of students with special needs. Additionally, you will explore the basic principles of classroom assessment design and planning.

Course Objectives

Objectives are based on the *Standards for Teacher Competence in Educational Assessment of Students,* developed in collaboration among the American Federation of Teachers, the National Council on Measurement in Education, and the National Education Association. These include that students will be able to…

- Choose assessment methods appropriate for instructional decisions
- Develop assessments to inform instruction
- Administer, score and interpret the results of externally developed tests and of teacher developed assessments.
- Use assessment results to make decisions about students, to plan instruction, to develop curriculum and to make school improvement recommendations.
- Develop valid grading procedures.
- Communicate assessment results to students, parents, and others.
- Recognize unethical or inappropriate assessment methods and uses of assessment information, including issues related to test fairness and bias

Course Relationship to State and NCATE Expectations of Teacher Candidates

State of Connecticut CCT: II.7
Teachers use various assessment techniques to evaluate student learning and modify instruction when appropriate.

State of Connecticut CCT: Domain 5 Assessment for Learning
Teachers use multiple measures to analyze student performance and to inform subsequent planning and instruction by:

5.1 Understanding the different purposes and types of assessment that capture the complexity of student learning across the hierarchy of cognitive skills;

5.2 Using and/or designing a variety of formative and summative assessments and criteria that directly align with the learning objectives and value the diversity of ways in which students learn;

5.3 Using a comprehensive set of data that provides depth and breadth of understanding of student achievement at a particular point in time and over time;

5.4 Collaborating with colleagues to review and interpret assessment data to monitor and adjust instruction to ensure students' progress;

5.5 Providing students with assessment criteria and individualized, descriptive feedback to help them improve their performance and assume responsibility for their learning;

5.6 Supporting students' progress by communicating academic and behavioral performance expectations and results with students, their families and other educators;

5.7 Understanding the role that lack of opportunity to learn, lack of effective instruction, and assessment bias can play in the overrepresentation in special education of students with cultural, ethnic, gender and linguistic differences; and

5.8 Using academic, behavioral and health data to select and/or design interventions, and assist in the development of individualized education programs for students with disabilities.

NCATE Standard I: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions
Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet national, state, and institutional standards.

Course Expectations
Students are expected to attend all class sessions and to submit all assignments on time, unless arrangements are made with the instructor in advance in cases of special circumstances. All assignments must be submitted in hard copy.

Course Format
Class sessions will consist of lectures on assigned material and activities where you will get "hands on" experience in assessment methods and of online activities designed to deepen your knowledge beyond what we learn in class.

While I will spend part of our time together supplementing your text, learning is best accomplished when we share information through open classroom discussions and activities. Therefore, I expect you to come to class having read the assigned pages and bringing any related documents (specified in the syllabus or in previous class sessions) with you. Our time together will be more beneficial and

interesting if you come prepared with questions, issues, concerns, and reactions based upon your reading and, where appropriate, your own experiences. I welcome all questions and comments!

Learning, Leading and Lighting the Way
This course is designed to give you a basic knowledge of large scale assessments and how they are used to inform classroom decisions. Also, the class will serve as sort of a "how-to" to create and judge classroom level assessments for use in informing instructional decisions. You should be able to serve on your future campuses as leaders in appropriate uses of assessments and model good assessment practices.

Assessment of your learning

1. **In-class activities (30 points)** I will regularly conduct formative assessment during class time to gauge your current understanding of course content. You will be asked to submit these assessments at the end of class. Each activity will be worth a maximum of 5 points. You need to submit enough formative assessments to earn 30 points (e.g., six assignments to earn full credit, or more if you receive partial credit on some assessments).

2. **Parent Project (25 points).** You will create an information sheet that people might use to better understand a standardized test currently in place in a real school district or state.
   Your group will prepare something you could give to parents to explain the test in jargon-free language. You may choose to create a pamphlet, brochure, brief article, or web page. The project will be graded on accuracy, completeness, and the ease with which a non-educator could understand the information (see attached rubric). Students will work in teams of 2-3 on this assignment. Everyone should submit separate reflections of the project.

3. **Classroom Assessment Project (25 points).** For this assignment, you will create an assessment that could be administered to students in your current placement in approximately 30 minutes. You may elect to create a traditional test or a performance assessment and must arrange to administer it to at least three students so that you can reflect on how it works. Further detail, including a scoring plan for this assignment is attached.

4. **Final (20 points).** The final exam can be taken as a take-home test or during the official final exam period for the course. The final will be handed out to all students during the last class meeting and will be available online. The final must be submitted by the end of the official exam administration period as posted on the registrar's website.

Grading Guidelines

A	($\geq$93%)	B-	(80-82%)	D+	(67-69%)
A-	(90-92%)	C+	(77-79%)	D	(63-66%)
B+	(87-89%)	C	(73-76%)	D-	(60-62%)
B	(83-86%)	C-	(70-72%)	F	(<59%)

The fine print….

I look forward to a productive semester together and am committed to helping all students improve their understanding of assessment issues. A few reminders toward that end…

ALL ASSIGNMENTS MUST BE SUBMITTED IN HARD COPY.

Special needs. Students who think that they may need accommodations because of a disability are encouraged to meet with me privately in the first two weeks of class. Students should also contact the Center for Students with Disabilities as soon as possible to verify their eligibility for reasonable accommodations. For more information, please go to http://www.csd.uconn.edu/.

Academic misconduct. Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to, providing or receiving assistance in a manner not authorized by the instructor in the creation of work to be submitted for academic evaluation (e.g. papers, projects, and examinations); any attempt to influence improperly (e.g. bribery, threats) any member of the faculty, staff, or administration of the University in any matter pertaining to academics or research; presenting, as one's own, the ideas or words of another for academic evaluation; doing unauthorized academic work for which another person will receive credit or be evaluated; and presenting the same or substantially the same papers or projects in two or more courses without the explicit permission of the instructors involved. See the Student Code (http://www.dos.uconn.edu/student_code.html) for more details and a full explanation.

A student who knowingly assists another student in committing an act of academic misconduct shall be equally accountable for the violation, and shall be subject to the sanctions and other remedies described in The Student Code. Depending on the act, a student could receive an F grade on the test/assignment, F grade for the course, and could be suspended or expelled from the University.

Course Schedule

Tuesday Section	Thursday Section	Topics and Activities	Textbook Readings
8/28	8/30	Course Overview Why Assess???	Ed Leadership article Ch 1 of McMillan
9/4	9/6	Learning Targets	Ed Leadership article #2 Ch 2 of McMillan
9/11	9/13	Interpreting Standardized Tests and Communicating Results	Ch 14 of McMillan CMT website
9/18	9/20	Using assessment results in planning	30 minute meeting overview Data Meeting Videos Review Student Work
9/25	9/27	Grading	Chapter 13 McMillan
10/2	10/4	Determining Test Quality	Ch 3 of McMillan
10/9	10/11	Development and scoring of selected-response items	Chapters 6 & 7 of McMillan
10/16	10/18	Development and scoring of constructed-response items **Parent Project Due**	Chapter 8 of McMillan
10/23	10/25	Development and scoring of performance assessments	Chapter 9 of McMillan
10/30	11/1	Formative Assessment	Ch 4 of McMillan Stiggins & Chappius paper
11/13	11/15	Feedback Using Rubrics Formatively	Ch 5 of McMillan Andrade paper
11/20	11/22	**Thanksgiving Break**	
11/27	11/29	Assessing students with special needs **Classroom Assessment Project Due**	Ch 12 of McMillan
12/4	12/6	Accountability	Web search:, Teacher Evaluation System, NCLB Accountability Requirements

Parent Project Details

Working in teams of 2-3, create an information sheet that people might use to better understand a standardized test currently in place in a real school district or state.
Your group will prepare something you could give to parents to explain the test in jargon-free language. The information sheet should include:

1. A definition of standardized tests, how they should be used, and how they differ from classroom tests
2. An overview of the assessment itself: what it measures, the scores generated, when it is administered and when results are available
3. Evidence of test quality to support the tests' use (including reliability, validity, and lack of bias)
4. How parents can get more information about the test

The information sheet can take many forms, such as a pamphlet, brochure, brief article, or web page. Please have a non-educator review the information sheet and provide feedback to you about it, in particular how clear it is and how it might be strengthened.

Each group should submit (1) one copy of the assignment, (2) a note from the reviewer indicating that they read the information sheet and provided feedback, and (3) multiple one-page reflection papers generated independently by each group member (e.g., if John and Mary work together, they would submit one information sheet PLUS two reflection papers--one written by John and one written by Mary. John's and Mary's reflections should not be the same).

Reflection papers should answer the following questions…

1. Think like an assessor for a moment. What aspects of your work do you think best reflect your understanding of course content? Where do you think your project is especially strong in showing that you have mastered course content?

2. What parts of your work do you think could be improved?

3. Now think like a student, what questions did this assignment raise for you?

4. How could the assignment be improved to better gauge your understanding?

Scoring
The information sheet will be graded using the attached rubric. The rubric counts for 90% of the grade and the reflection paper counts for 10% of the grade.

Parent Project Rubric

OVERVIEW	ACCURACY		COMPLETENESS		AUDIENCE APPROPRIATENESS	
Identify assessment and what "standardized" means for that assessment	0: Inaccuracies or excessive vagueness in explanation of standardization	1: Accurate explanations given for standardization (must include stand. of admin.)	0: Missing from the project	1: Project addresses what "standardized" means	0: Some explanations contain un-explained jargon	1: Educational language limited to key terms and all key terms are explained in lay language
Explain the purpose of the assessment and how scores may be used	0: Inaccuracies or excessive vagueness in explanation of purpose or score use	1: Accurate explanations given for purpose and score use	0: Missing from the project	1: Project addresses the purpose of the assessment		
Explain how standardized assessments (and this one in particular) are different from regular classroom assessments	0: Some vagueness or error in explanation	1: Clear and accurate distinctions made, including at least two of these: purpose, development, and use	0: Missing from the project	1: Project addresses how stand. assessments are different from classroom assessments		

ASSESSMENT CONCEPTS	ACCURACY		COMPLETENESS		AUDIENCE APPROPRIATENESS	
Discuss evidence of reliability	0: Inaccuracies or excessive vagueness for reliability; OR too much information with little connection to test discussed	1: Accurate explanations given for reliability, including specific evidence related to the test discussed- at least 2 types (or more depending on the assessment)	0: One or more key assessment concepts are missing	1: All three identified assessment concepts are included	0: Some explanations contain unexplained jargon	1: Educational language limited to key terms and all key terms are explained in lay language
Discuss evidence of validity	0: Inaccuracies or excessive vagueness for validity; OR too much information with little connection to test discussed	1: Accurate explanations given for validity, including specific evidence related to the test discussed- at least 2 types (or more depending on the assessment)				
Explain how the assessment strives to eliminate bias	0: Inaccuracies or vagueness in discussion of bias or	1: Accurate explanation of at least one bias issue with specific explanation of how addressed				

USE/APPEARANCE	ACCURACY		COMPLETENESS		AUDIENCE APPROPRIATENESS	
Provide details on how parents can get more information	0: Sources are absent or irrelevant	1: Details provided for two or more sources that provide relevant info	0: No info sources provided; OR source mentioned without direct contact info	1: At least two info sources noted with direct contact info	0: Sources are inappropriate to all but other educators in parent audience or only duplicate info	1: Info sources add to project by providing info appropriate. to varied back-grounds
Be sure that the project is neat, mechanically correct, and designed in a format accessible and appropriate for the intended audience	0 Some mechanical errors that detract from reading or convey unprofessionalism	1: Minimal errors; professional appearance	0: Evidence of incompleteness in one or more sections- still requires work before being ready for an audience	1: Project is complete and in an audience-ready form		
Non-educator review of project			0: Did not submit note	1: Submitted note verifying review		

Classroom Assessment Project Details

Develop an assessment, either a performance assessment or a traditional test, which can be administered in about 30 minutes. Have at least three students take the assessment and score them. Use these results to reflect on what worked or should be changed, what feedback to provide, and how results can be used to guide instruction. The project will be scored slightly differently depending on the type of assessment you choose (Scoring related to the Structure of the Assessment differ for traditional tests and performance assessments).

In addition to developing, administering, and scoring the assessment, you need to write about this experience. You should describe (1) the skills or concepts the assessment is designed to measure, (2) the process of developing the instrument and/or procedures, (3) how it can be used as a part of the feedback loop, and (4) the strengths and weaknesses of the final product.

Your work should be organized into five sections, listed below and should be submitted in a folder which includes a Table of Contents and tabs for each section.

1. Purpose and use of the assessment
2. Structure of the Assessment
3. Scoring and feedback procedures
4. Process and reflection
5. Assessment Instrument and the scoring guide

Scoring criteria are included on the following page

Classroom Assessment Project Scoring Details

Name		Section
	Points Given	Points Possible

Purpose and use of the assessment
  o Describe what skills and objectives you assessed and how they relate to the instruction happening in the classroom.
  o Explain how assessment results will be/could be used.
		15

Structure of the assessment
  o Provide a table of specifications (blueprint) demonstrating how the assessment was structured to represent the assessment domain (use specific objectives if possible). Your table of specifications *must* demonstrate the percentages of weight (or number of items) given to different objectives and also illustrate distribution of *type* and *cognitive level* of items.
  o Provide an outline of the number, type, and cognitive levels of the items included in the assessment.
  o Explain how the test instructions were provided to students.
		30

Scoring and feedback procedures for the assessment
  o Explain how the assessment was scored. As relevant, discuss point distribution per item type, holistic versus analytic scoring, and any decisions regarding curving or item elimination.
  o Explain how students were given feedback about their performance on the assessment.
  o Describe the instructional decisions that were made based on student performance on the assessment.
		25

Process and reflection
  o Briefly describe the timeline and order of steps followed in constructing and using the assessment
  o Discuss the reasoning related to key decisions made throughout the process
  o Discuss the degree to which you feel the assessment fulfilled its intended purpose.
  o Discuss the use of Bloom's Taxonomy to create the assessment. Evaluate the assessment and its use.
  o What were its strengths and weaknesses? What mistakes did you make in this process? What did you learn as a result?
  o Reflect briefly on how the entire process influenced your own thinking on assessment and on teaching and learning.
		15

Include a copy of the assessment itself and the scoring guide.		10
Format for submission: Submit the project in a folder with a table of contents and each section separated by tabs (purpose, structure, scoring, process/reflection, assessment)		5
Final Grade		
Comments:		

NEAG SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Policy, Procedures, and Criteria

Re-appointment, Review, and Promotion of
Tenure Track Faculty

Overview of the Neag School of Education

The Neag School of Education (NSOE), the professional school of education at the University of Connecticut, is comprised of four departments: Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Leadership, Educational Psychology, and Kinesiology. These departments are responsible for fulfilling the mission of the Neag School of Education and that of the University of Connecticut. As such, the NSOE faculty has diverse responsibilities that include preparing leaders in the field of education, providing service to practitioners, providing service to clients, and conducting research to inform policy and practice. Meeting these responsibilities requires differentiated faculty, including both tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments. Although there is expectation for high achievement and excellence across all appointments within the NSOE, it is acknowledged that the very nature of these appointments precludes the application of a uniform set of rules for reappointment and promotion. The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines for the reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty members who hold tenure-track appointments in the Neag School of Education.

Introduction to PTR Procedures

The Neag School of Education endorses the general university criteria of teaching, scholarship, and research as stated in the University Policy on faculty professional responsibilities. According to University policy:

> "The University serves as a center for research, dedicated to excellence in higher education, and fulfillment of its land grant status. The University is committed to meeting the educational needs of its undergraduate, graduate, professional and continuing education students, and gives its faculty the means to employ and develop their intellectual

capacity through teaching, research, and interaction with society.
Through the integration of teaching, research, and service, the faculty
provides an outstanding educational experience for each student. The
University serves the state and its citizens in a manner that enhances the
social, cultural, and economic well being of its communities. It gives
leadership in the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge to all its
constituents, recognizing that the continual creation and transmission of
knowledge and lifelong learning are essential to Connecticut's future in
a global context." (University Policy: Policy on Faculty Professional
Responsibilities, preamble, introduction, effective 1/2/2004, available at
http://www.policy.uconn.edu/)

The policies and guidelines developed by the NSOE and detailed in this document reflect this
University policy.

I. Re-appointment, Tenure, Promotion

In accordance with University of Connecticut policy, the granting of tenure and the
promotion of a professor in rank are based in part on an individual's scholarly distinction and
promise. Therefore, the evaluation process must confirm that the faculty member has
established and is likely to maintain a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the
foundation of the candidate's national and/or international reputation. It is also expected that the
candidate will have distinguished him/herself in teaching and in service to the University, the
School, the Department, and the profession.

Evaluations at all levels are judged on their merit and in relation to School and University
expectations and not in comparison to others in the Department or School with tenure. Within
the criteria for earning tenure is recognition of the diverse contexts and disciplines within which
scholars in the Neag School are establishing their reputations. It is further noted that: "Specific
evidence of superior performance in scholarship and in teaching is of primary importance. As a
minimum standard for tenure and/or promotion, there must be evidence of strong performance in

both scholarship and teaching and superior achievement in at least one of these areas. In addition, other contributions to the University will be considered. "In individual cases where it is demonstrated that there has been meritorious professional service through which the faculty member has achieved distinction in the profession, such service may also received significant weight" (University Bylaws, 2011, p. 30).   Distinguished service, although an important and required component, will not result in promotion and tenure without the expected performance in teaching and scholarship.

A. Tenure with Promotion to Associate Professor

To be considered for tenure with promotion in rank, a faculty member must have demonstrated research ability and commitment to ongoing research, have a strong teaching record, and be recognized as a helpful and valued colleague who has conscientiously performed needed service within the academic and professional communities. Only those persons showing promise of continuing achievement in all three areas of research, teaching, and service will be tenured.

Tenure for a new hire in the Neag School of Education with no prior credit in rank is expected to become effective in the fall of the seventh year. This follows the evaluation of the candidate's application for tenure conducted during the sixth year of service at the University. Therefore, the evaluation process for the tenure decision is initiated at the beginning of the candidate's sixth year.

For a new hire with no prior credit in rank, promotion from the rank of Assistant to Associate Professor occurs concurrently with the awarding of tenure.

The timing of promotion in rank for faculty hired with prior experience is discussed and determined with the Dean at the time of hiring. Credit for time in rank must be specified in the candidate's offer letter.

B. Promotion to Professor

The candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor must have a scholarly record of national/international distinction and a commitment to ongoing research in his/her field. In addition, he/she must be an effective teacher and advisor and have a record of continuous service to the University, the School, and the profession as a mature scholar. Ordinarily, promotion to

the rank of Professor follows a minimum of five years of service in the rank of Associate at this university or elsewhere. The application for promotion to the rank of Full Professor may be submitted in either the fifth year as an Associate or in a subsequent year as determined by the candidate in consultation with the Department Head.

II. Annual Re-Appointment Review

A. Years 1 – 5, Annual, One-Year Reappointments - Prior to Applying for Tenure and Promotion in Rank

The annual, re-appointment review of non-tenured faculty in a tenure track position provides indication of the candidate's progress in meeting expectations for tenure with promotion at the University of Connecticut. The goal of the annual review is to facilitate faculty development and progress, and the content of the PTR forms are cumulative and submitted during the fall semester of each pre-tenure year. During the first, second, fourth, and fifth years, the annual review is conducted within the Neag School of Education. The reviews conducted during the third and sixth years are conducted at both the School and Provost's levels.

For the third year review, candidates may be asked to prepare a dossier, or portfolio, that contains the completed PTR form and a file containing all supporting documentation organized to reflect the content of the form in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

For the sixth year review, candidates must prepare a dossier that contains the completed PTR form and a file containing relevant documentation of the content of the candidate's form in all areas, Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

III. General Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion

The criteria for earning tenure and promotion are based on understandings of the different contexts and disciplines within which NSOE scholars are establishing their reputations. The criteria for evaluation detailed here are offered as guidelines only; each case is considered individually. Presented below are descriptions of expectations in relation to Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. Following this set of descriptions are more specific indicators for tenure and promotion reviews.

A. Teaching and Advisement

1. Effective Teaching and Advisement. Effective teaching and advising are fundamental responsibilities of each faculty member. Effective teaching involves a number of dimensions, including designing challenging courses, stimulating intellectual curiosity and a sense of inquiry in students, and motivating learners. Important factors for teaching in a research university are the integration of research and teaching, the inclusion of the latest research findings, and the ability to balance theoretical aspects with practical applications.

2. Indicators/ Evidence Effectiveness.   Superior teaching and academic advisement at all instructional levels are essential criteria in tenure and promotion decisions. The general assessment to be applied is that the faculty member is engaged regularly and effectively in teaching and advisement activities of high quality and significance. The responsibility for the evaluation of teaching performance rests on the academic department of the faculty member. The evaluation of teaching and advising should include formal university evaluations completed by students and evaluations of the Department Head and/or other supervisors or peers who observe the faculty member's teaching and interactions with students and provide written comments following class observations.

B. Scholarship

The University of Connecticut is a research university, and consequently, scholarship is a highly valued factor in awarding tenure and promotion. Scholarship and research are defined as creating and disseminating new knowledge. High quality scholarship makes a significant contribution to the knowledge base that informs policy, practice, teaching, and/or research in a field of study. Faculty members are expected to produce a body of work that reflects a defined and coherent research focus, and it should reflect the candidate's unique contributions. In addition, because of the importance of external

funding in promoting research in the School, efforts and success in securing grants, and/or other forms of external funding, are also considered highly important. If funding sources in a given area are limited, it is anticipated that the faculty member will seek collaborative opportunities for grant funding.

1. Publication expectations vary among the disciplines represented in the Neag School, and therefore, the nature and importance of the candidate's scholarship are considered from both a qualitative and quantitative perspective. Likewise, the quality of grant proposals, the number of grants submitted and/or secured, the agencies to which proposals are submitted, and the amount secured are considered in the context of the candidate's discipline and available opportunities.

2. Indicators/Evidence of Research and Scholarship. The primary indicators of scholarly products include publications of monographs, books, textbooks, edited books, book chapters, and papers in scholarly, refereed, professional journals of high quality; the development of software, products, or electronically published material reflecting quality scholarship; and distinguished performances in the creative arts. Research grants solicited and those awarded on the basis of scholarly merit are also considered indications of scholarship.

   a. The quality and influence of a candidates' scholarship is of utmost importance in assessing scholarly potential. The academic reputation of the journal (or other dissemination outlet) is a key indicator of quality and influence. The dossiers of successful tenure candidates should contain a reasonable proportion of single or lead author pieces in highly respected journals in the field. Specific indicators of demonstrable influence may be found in sources such as Scopus, Google Scholar, the Social Sciences Citation Index, PubMed, and assessments of scholarship by external reviewers.

   b. The scholarship must cohere around a distinct area, or related areas, of study, and this work should reflect the candidate's unique contributions. This coherence will be

described in the candidate's discussion of scholarly goals and activities (PTR form).

c. Other evidence of research and scholarship include, but are not limited to: presentations and papers delivered at academic meetings, published conference proceedings, invited presentations for academic audiences, invited book chapters or similar contributions, publications in non-refereed sources serving significant audiences, special awards, or recognition for scholarship or creative productions.

d. The candidate's report of external funding (proposed and /or secured) will be considered in the context of the candidate's discipline and available opportunities. Grants and external funding resulting from individual and/or collaborative efforts are desired and valued activities.

e. The cumulative scholarly work should provide evidence that the faculty member is a scholar in his/her field gaining national and/or international recognition. Therefore, the Department Review Committee, the Department Head, the Dean's Advisory Review Committee and the Dean should base their annual reappointment feedback and decision on evidence that the faculty member's scholarly productivity is on a trajectory to attain national prominence within the five year probationary period.

C. **Service**

Faculty members who are candidates for promotion should have an established record of commitment to the University, the School, the Department, the profession, and the field through participation in service activities.

1. Service Activities
   a. Service to the University, the School, and the Department is deemed essential to develop and maintain a high quality professional school and premier university. Hence, all faculty members are expected to share responsibilities and perform competently in such functions.

b. Professional service refers to the contributions that faculty members make to the functions of the professional societies to which they belong and to the profession more broadly. Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to, offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies, contributions to the organization and presentation of professional conferences, editorships and the review of manuscripts for an association's publications, review of grant applications, memberships on panels, or the elected member of committees. Service activities that enhance the candidate's national reputation in scholarship include editorial boards and grant review panels.

c. Service to the field and society involves the application of professional skills and knowledge to benefit communities, schools, related educational agencies, and the public. Relevant public service activities include, but are not limited to: presentations/workshops for educators and related service providers; participation on advisory boards; presentations/workshops for parents or community groups; consultation and technical assistance, performance of clinical activities in related settings (e.g., hospitals and clinics).

d. Meritorious professional service through which the candidate has achieved distinction in the profession may receive considerable significance in the review.

2. Indicators/Evidence of Service Contributions.
   a. Every faculty member is expected to participate in the conduct of his/her department, the Neag School, and the University; in appropriate professional organizations in his/her academic field; and in professional service to schools and other agencies of the community. Evidence of a faculty member's productivity is manifested by the extent to which he/she participates on standing committees at the department, college, and university levels; contributions to professional associations; provides service to the broader field and society.
   b. The level, frequency and stature of participation will be considered.

IV. Criteria Applied for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure Review

A. Teaching

1. Criteria

(a) **High quality teaching** as evidenced on university-administered student evaluations of teaching and/or direct observations of instruction by administrators or peers. Student ratings are expected to meet, or exceed, the criteria established for the Neag School of Education faculty (8+ on the current system; benchmarks will be establish for the new system once it is operational and results can be reviewed) . The judgment of teaching performance may be flexible and take into account such factors as the type of course and the number of class participants. For example, university studies have revealed that lower evaluations may be expected from large, undergraduate classes (Institute for Teaching and Learning). In the case of a history of low teaching evaluations, the faculty member should present documentation of steps taken to improve his/her teaching (e.g., working with the Teaching and Learning Center) and show improvement in student ratings over time.

(b) **Student Advisement.** Faculty members are expected to advise students at all levels. Effectiveness involves the ability of the faculty member to develop collaborative relationships with students, respond to questions and provide information, and help students with a range of academic issues such as developing a plan of study, selecting an advisory committee, negotiating the degree completion process, or applying for an academic job. Faculty members are also expected to chair and direct committees as appropriate for their program (e.g., doctoral, master's, honor's). Department Heads provide evidence of effectiveness in academic advising by seeking feedback from students and by asking faculty members to describe the academic advising they provide students.

(c) **Teaching Innovation and/or Curriculum Development** activities as appropriate, e.g., original and/or unique innovations to enhance teaching and content in an existing

course, the enhanced use of technology, development of new courses, or contributions to the revision of programs (including clinical/patient activities) and related curricula. Evidence of quality in curriculum innovation and development is shown by program or department review of course syllabi and external reviews of programs by experts in the field (e.g., an accrediting body).

2. **Candidate's Documentation of Teaching and Advising Performance**

    Suggested types of evidence the candidate may present include the following.

    (a) The University's formal evaluations of teaching collected over time and presented chronologically.

    (b) Written statement of philosophy of teaching and goals relative to instructional responsibilities with reference to course development and instructional activities, including independent studies, as appropriate (presented in the Provost's PTR form).

    (c) Description of any activities undertaken to enhance instruction.

    (d) Description of any original and/or unique innovations developed to enhance the delivery, the content, or the evaluation of an existing course; or description of the development of new courses designed to meet the demands in the field or contribute to the revision of programs or curricula.

    (e) Course syllabi with indication of innovations/curricula enhancements, etc.

    (f) Written summaries of observations of teaching conducted by administrators, supervisors, or peers.

    (g) Published materials related to instruction, e.g., instructional strategies, course design, curricula.

    (h) Evidence of special recognition from within or beyond the University for teaching.

    (i) Counts of advisees as indicated on the PTR form; evidence of successful mentoring and advising of advisees, including participation on doctoral committees as the major advisor.

    (j) Evidence of special recognition from the University for outstanding advisement activities.

B. **Scholarship**

1. **Criteria**

The primary criterion for assessing scholarship is the contribution made by the candidate
To his/her discipline and the development of an emerging national reputation.

(a) **Publications.** Peer-reviewed publications in reputable journals or books in the
candidate's field are the most important indicators of scholarship. Normal
expectations for a faculty member are to produce, on average, two refereed journal
articles per year published, or verified in-press, when reviewed for tenure and
promotion to Associate Professor (typically in the sixth year). Co-authored work is
valued; additionally, there is an expectation that the candidate will be the first author
on half of the articles and will be striving to publish in the most highly regarded,
peer-reviewed journals in the candidate's field. Faculty research will be evaluated on
its quality as well as its quantity. The quality of the journal will be confirmed at the
department/program level with appropriate indicators identified.

(b) **Coherent Focus.** The scholarship must cohere around a distinct area, or related
areas, of study and reflect the candidate's unique contributions.

(c) **National Prominence/ Scholarly Influence.** Total number of publications
notwithstanding, the quality and influence of a candidate's scholarship is of utmost
importance in assessing scholarly potential. The academic reputation of the journal,
or other dissemination outlet, is a key indicator of quality and impact. The dossiers
should include a reasonable proportion of single or lead author pieces in highly
respected journals in the field. In addition, publications (e.g., books, edited books,
chapters in influential books, articles in non-refereed sources, etc.) that have
documented and significant impact on policy and practice and presentations at
reputed national or international conferences constitute evidence of scholarship as
well as evidence of an emerging national reputation.

(d) **External Funding.** Research grants solicited (individually and/or collaboratively)
and those awarded on the basis of scholarly merit will also be considered indication
of scholarship. The candidate's record of external funding will be considered in the
context of the candidate's discipline and available opportunities.

(e) Other. Other evidence of scholarship includes presentations and papers delivered at academic meetings (refereed), published conference proceedings (refereed) invited presentations for academic audiences, invited book chapters, and special awards or special recognition for scholarship or creative productions.

(f) External Review. The written evaluations secured by the Department Head from recognized scholars in the field are critical in the assessment of scholarship and national reputation. (Procedures for securing these external reviewers are detailed below.)

2. **Candidate's Documentation of Scholarship**

(a) Suggested types of evidence the candidate may present include all categories of Scholarship and Creative Accomplishments included on the Provost's PTR form, entered in reverse chronological order.

(b) When compiling a file of scholarship, include one copy of each entry, or publication, organized by category.

C. **Service**

1. **Criteria**

Faculty members are expected to engage in service to the Department, the School, and the University, and the profession.

(a) Service to the University. Evaluation of service to the Department, School, and University will include the type of committee, role of the candidate, amount of time serving, and the quality of contributions. Evidence of a faculty member's productivity is manifested by the extent to which he/she participates on standing committees (e.g., the Curriculum Committee) at the department, college, and university levels. The level, frequency and stature of participation will be considered.

(b) Service to the Profession. Evaluation of service to the profession will take into account the type of work, level of commitment, time requirements, and role of the individual. In some cases, service to the profession may be viewed as evidence of an emerging national reputation (e.g., being appointed as an editor or associate editor of a prominent journal).

(c) Service to the Field and Society. Evaluation of service to the field and/or society will account for the type of contribution, time commitments, and contributions resulting from engagement in service activities benefitting entities beyond the university.

2. **Candidate's Documentation of Service Contributions**

   Expected evidence of quality service contributions will include the following.

   (a) Participation as requested on committees at the Department, School, and University levels.

   (b) Contributions to the professional community as evidenced by committee work, conference contributions, editing work, and/or elected offices as appropriate for an individual's professional affiliations.

   (c) Contributions to the professional and public communities beyond the Univesity reflecting the individual's professional expertise.

V. Criteria Applied to the Review for Promotion to Professor

In general, promotion to the rank of Professor requires consistent, high levels of performance and productivity in the key areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, as outlined above. The candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor is expected to present evidence that he/she has gained national/international visibility and respect for excellence in scholarship. This will result from a sustained body of scholarly accomplishments and ongoing contributions to the profession.

A. Teaching

Maintain superior teaching and academic advising.

(a) **High quality teaching** of undergraduate and graduate courses, seminars**,** or practicums as evidenced on university-administered student evaluations of teaching and/or direct observations of instruction by administrators or peers. Student ratings are expected to

consistently meet, or exceed, the criteria established for the Neag School of Education faculty (8+ on the current system; benchmarks will be establish for the new system once it is operational and results can be reviewed).

(b) Student advisement that is responsive to and supportive of students at all academic levels will be demonstrated by the Department Head's documentation of feedback from students as well as from the candidate's description of advising activities. Ordinarily, an additional expectation will be the completion of doctoral students as the major advisor while at this university.

(c) **Teaching Innovation and/or Curriculum Design** demonstrating commitment to developing current and relevant courses informed by the literature and meeting the needs of the profession.   Evidence may include visionary contributions that involve the design of new courses or series of courses, development of on-line courses or programs, or innovations that enhance academic programs.

B. Scholarship

Engaged continually and effectively in scholarly and/or creative activities of distinction, the candidate will be expected to present a sustained body of scholarly accomplishments garnering a substantial, respected national/international reputation.

(a) Publications.   Scholarly products that are published following rigorous peer-review processes are the most highly valued forms of scholarship in the promotion review process. As a guideline, candidates are expected to publish, on average, two peer-reviewed articles in premier journals, or books in their field, including several that are recognized to have been major contributions to the literature in the candidate's field. Other indicators of productivity include a substantial number of first-authored publications (articles, authored/edited books, textbooks, or book chapters).

(b) Scholarly Influence. The scholarly influence of the candidate will be confirmed by written evaluations of scholarship secured by the Department Head from recognized scholars in the candidate's field.

(c) External Funding. The candidate will have secured grant funding and/or external support for the candidate's scholarly work. The candidate's record of external funding will be considered in the context of the candidate's discipline and available

opportunities..

(d) Other. Other evidence of scholarship may include presentations and papers delivered at academic meetings (refereed), published conference proceedings (refereed) invited presentations for academic audiences, invited book chapters, and special awards or special recognition for scholarship or creative productions.

C. Service

Faculty members are expected to have established records of sustained, important service to the Department, the School, the University, the profession, and society. At this level, candidates will be expected to have been actively engaged in a wide range of service activities with more prominent leadership roles in all undertakings (University, School, Department, state, national, international, professional, field based).

D. Significant/Diverse Roles

Decisions about promotion to professor should take into account any special circumstances that may result from the faculty member's role(s) as an administrator/manager of programs in his/her academic area and the demands of these programs. However, this work alone (e.g., administrative responsibilities) will not qualify a faculty member for promotion to Professor in the absence of substantial accomplishments in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service as discussed above.

Preparation for Review

The preparation for promotion and tenure is described in *University Policy: Policy on Faculty Professional Responsibilities* and the Provost's Office guidelines *Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment (PTR).*

Materials for the progress toward tenure are cumulative and submitted yearly in all pre-tenure

years.

The third year review is designed to provide a cumulative and comprehensive review of the faculty member at the beginning of the third year as a way to monitor prospects for success with the tenure process. The primary focus of the third year review is the annual report completed by the faculty member presenting evidence confirming substantial progress in the evaluation criteria (Teaching, Scholarship, Service).

The sixth year review of tenure-track faculty is the tenure/promotion decision year.

The Formal Review Process

Following is an abstracted overview to inform faculty members of the steps and specific committees involved in the annual review process. For a more complete set of procedures and details of the process, see the Provost's website for Promotion, Tenure & Reappointment Procedures (provost.uconn.edu/ptr).

- The candidate completes the University's PTR form and submits this form with supporting documents by the published deadline (established annually by the Provost). These documents become the faculty member's dossier. (See suggestions for this file of materials, below.)
    - The Department Head secures external references when this is appropriate (i.e., during the tenure and promotion decision year).
    - The faculty member creates a file to display a comprehensive set of materials supporting his/her tenure and/or promotion review. Contents are organized to reflect the faculty member's evidence in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.
    - The faculty member may add to his/her PTR file at any time during the reviews by the Department Committee and the Dean's Advisory Committee by bringing materials to the department head who will inform the committees of new materials in writing; no materials may be removed from the file.
- The PTR form for each individual is reviewed by the Department PTR Advisory Committee, which advises the Department Head on promotion, tenure, and

- reappointment and submits a letter summarizing the Committee's evaluation and vote on the faculty member's candidacy (for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion).

- The Department Head completes his/her evaluation and submits the candidate's PTR file and related materials to the Dean's office.

- The Dean's Advisory Council on PTR reviews the faculty member's PTR file and appraises the performance and potential for teaching, scholarship, creative accomplishments, and service of the individual under consideration. The Council's evaluation of each individual is summarized for the Dean in a written report that includes the Council's vote.

- The Dean writes his/her evaluation and submits all necessary forms and supporting documents to the Provost for his/her consideration and final determination.

- The Provost's decisions are communicated to and acted upon by the Board of Trustees annually.

- The University also has a Faculty Review Board that is asked by the Provost to consider individual, specific cases on PTR. The composition and work of the Faculty Review Board is detailed in the Provost's document on PTR.

- The Provost determines specific timelines annually in accordance with the date of presentation to the Board of Trustees.

- Under Connecticut Freedom of Information statues, candidates have access to their files and to the recommendation letters.

External Letters

Four or more, preferably six, external letters from individuals of national stature in the candidate's area of expertise who do not have a conflict of interest with the candidate (e.g., former mentor, frequent collaborators) are required for those pursuing tenure and/or promotion in rank at any level.

These letters should be solicited by the Department Head and should be from individuals who hold professorial rank at or above that to which the candidate aspires. In no case should letters be sought from individuals who served as faculty advisors, teachers, or mentors during a candidate's program of graduate or undergraduate study. Although candidates may be asked for

names of professional colleagues who might serve as evaluators, candidates should not contact potential reviewers directly and should not reveal to the potential reviewers that they have been recommended to the Department Head. The Department Head is free to contact 2 persons recommended by the candidate, and he/she chooses an additional 4 or more.

Dossier of Materials

The faculty member's PTR dossier consists of his/her PTR form and all supporting documents. When a candidate prepares a file of supporting materials for the years when tenure and/or promotion decisions are considered, the content will ordinarily consist of documents related to the following:

- o Personal Information
    - Candidate's curriculum vita
    - Candidate's written statement
- o Teaching
    - University student evaluation reports
    - Special teaching awards
- o Scholarship
    - Copies of all published materials listed on the form (books, book chapters, monographs, articles, curriculum materials, etc.)
    - Manuscripts in-press
    - Manuscripts submitted for review or in preparation
- o Service
    - Special accomplishments
    - Special projects

Special Policy

The University has an established policy of adjusting the tenure clock for individuals taking a leave for a FMLA-qualifying event (birth, adoption, foster placement of a child; a faculty member's serious illness or injury; a serious illness or injury to the faculty member's child, spouse, or parent). The tenure clock is automatically adjusted by one year based on the leave paperwork indicating the qualifying event. The tenure clock will be automatically stopped no more than twice for qualifying events. More specific information is found at www.uconn.hr.edu.

NEAG SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Policy, Procedures, and Criteria

Appointment, Review, and Promotion of
Non-Tenure Track Faculty

INTRODUCTION

The contractual specifications for the employment of non-tenure track faculty are detailed in the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University of Connecticut Board of Trustees and the University of Connecticut Chapter of the AAUP. The Neag School of Education's non-tenure track faculty includes both In-residence staff with the contractual privileges specified in Article 13, Members of the Unit Not in a Tenure Track, and staff members hired with the contractual privileges detailed in Article 26, Temporary Employees (see the Collective Bargaining Agreement).

These individuals are integral to the development and presentation of high quality programs for the preparation of pre-service educators and professionals in education, kinesiology, and physical therapy at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. In addition, they are essential to the development and outreach of the School's premier programs and delivery of special service to the Neag School, to clients (e.g., through the Nayden Clinic), and to school systems with which they liaison (e.g., Professional Development Schools). The guidelines for the appointment, review, and promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty reflect the mission of the NSOE.

The purpose of this document is to present the Neag School of Education's evaluation procedures for all non-tenure track faculty. More specifically, this document details the procedures and criteria for non-tenure track faculty to secure both reappointments and promotions.

PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

<u>Members of the Unit Not in a Tenure Track, Article 13 and Temporary Employees, Article 26</u>

Per Article 13, titles for staff members in non-tenure tracks include

Extension Professor	Lecturer	Academic Assistant
Associate Extension Professor		
Assistant Extension Professor		
Extension Instructor		

Faculty with In-Residence Titles:
        Professor in Residence
        Associate Professor In Residence
        Assistant Professor In Residence
        Instructor In Residence

Per Article 26, titles used for temporary, non-tenure track faculty in the NSOE include:

Research Professor	Visiting Professor	
Associate Research Professor	Visiting Associate Professor	
Assistant Research Professor	Visiting Assistant Professor	
Research Instructor	Visiting Instructor	
Clinical Professor	Research Scientist	Research Scholar
Associate Clinical Professor	Associate Research Scientist	Associate Research Scholar
Assistant Clinical Professor	Assistant Research	Assistant Research Scholar
Clinical Instructor	Senior Research Scientist	Senior Research Scholar

Position Descriptions

Members with the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Lecturer:

Non-tenure track employees with these ranks have the contractual privileges detailed in Articles 13 and 26 and are required to complete one probationary year of employment followed by five years of annual review and one-year reappointment. Following this initial six years of annual, one-year reappointments, multi-year appointments are offered, and these are ordinarily reappointments of three to five years. Each faculty member with the rank of Assistant, Associate, or (Full) Professor holds a doctoral degree in an area appropriate for the position and is assignment to a department appropriate for his/her academic and service responsibilities. The individual's rank is based on both years of service and an established record of accomplishments in relation to the position. The term visiting signifies the temporary nature of the position and most often relates to the temporary duration of funding.

An example of the reappointment schedule for all non-tenure track faculty members eligible for more than three years of employment is as follows:

Year 1	2012-2013	Probationary Year
Year 2	2013-2014	1st Reappointment Year
Year 3	2014-2016	2nd Reappointment Year
Year 4	2015-2016	3rd Reappointment Year
Year 5	2016-2017	4th Reappointment Year
Year 6	2016-2017	5th Reappointment Year
Year 7	2017	Begin a multi-year appointment (ordinarily 3 to 5 years;

		3 years in this example; 2017-2020)
Year 10	2019 -2020	Submit papers for review for the next multi-year appointment (3 years in this example)
Year 1	2020	Begin a multi-year reappointment (ordinarily 3 to 5 years; 3 years in this example; 2020-2023)

Clinical Faculty Members

Clinical Instructor: A non-tenure track employee granted the contractual privileges detailed in Articles 13 and 26. Each clinical instructor is expected to complete an initial probationary year of employment followed by five years of annual review and reappointment. Following this initial six years of annual one-year reappointments, a three-year appointment is ordinarily offered. The term clinical faculty identifies the instructors on staff who serve as clinicians at the Nayden Rehabilitation Clinic as well as instructors teaching courses for any other NSOE department. This instructor holds a Master's degree. In most fields in education, the clinical instructor does not hold a terminal degree in an academic area appropriate for the School of Education position.

Assistant/Associate/Full Clinical Professor: A temporary, non-tenure track employee granted the contractual privileges detailed in Articles 13 and 26. Each clinical professor (all ranks) is required to complete an initial probationary year of employment followed by five years of annual review and reappointment. Following this initial six years of one-year appointments, a multi-year appointment is offered, and these are ordinarily for three years. This faculty member holds a doctoral degree in an area appropriate for the position and is assignment to a department appropriate for his/her academic responsibilities. The individual's rank is based on both years of service and an established record of accomplishments in relation to the position. *In general, Clinical faculty (all ranks) most often have defined responsibilities that do not parallel the responsibilities of tenure track faculty.*

Appointment of Non-Tenure Track and Temporary Faculty

At hiring, each non-tenure track faculty member receives written documentation of position responsibilities in a letter of appointment. Because the responsibilities of these faculty members vary greatly from individual to individual and from department to department, the letter of appointment delineates the terms and conditions of the position, the job load, and the expectations of the faculty member. The roles of non-tenure faculty, for example, may include, but are not limited to: research activities; undergraduate and graduate instruction; clinical instruction/education; director of programs; director of field placements for teacher education programs; supervisor of student teaching; internship coordination; physical therapy classroom instruction; physical therapy clinical instruction and service, including patient care. It is noted

that position responsibilities may be modified through an amendment approved by the Dean, the Department Head, and the non-tenure track faculty and attached to the faculty's letter of appointment.

Reappointment in the Neag School of Education

Appointments are renewable depending on successful, formal, ongoing review and available funding. Reviews are conducted according to the University's established PTR schedule and review processes (i.e., at the Department and School levels) as determined by NSOE Dean and Department Heads.

Reviews are conducted annually for the first six years of employment; and thereafter, reviews are conducted to coincide with the renewal of reappointment year.

University Procedures Guiding the Reappointment Process of Non Tenure-Track and Temporary Faculty/Staff

The following policies and procedures guide the Neag School of Education's process for conducting evaluations of non-tenure track faculty.

Annual reappointment reviews of non-tenure track faculty are conducted within the Neag School of Education at the department and school levels.

The Provost does not review the annual reappointment of non-tenure track faculty, except for those faculty members not in the tenure track solely due to immigration restrictions. Formal review of non-tenure track faculty is conducted by the school/college, with reappointment determined by satisfactory performance and the availability of funding. Appointment letters should be issued annually upon confirmation of support for the next fiscal year. (See the Provost's Official Website, http:// www.provost.uconn.edu/ptr):

Promotion of Non-tenure Track Faculty Members

The promotion of non-tenure track faculty requires a review and recommendation at all levels including the Provost.

Non-tenure track faculty who are evaluated for promotion and reappointment do so with the understanding that such procedures do not lead to tenure.

Overview of the Reappointment Process

Reviews for reappointment and/or promotion of non-tenure track faculty are based on the *terms of the appointment as indicated in the individual's offer letter*. In general, the criteria for

reappointment reflect expectations that include considerations of teaching, scholarship, service, and administrative duties. The expectations and criteria are adjusted as applicable.

Greater responsibility is given to the Department Heads to work with the individual faculty to develop goals and criteria for advancement within the position. This results from the diverse range of responsibilities and activities observed across the School. For example, many Clinical Professors (all ranks) have primary responsibilities in areas of teaching (i.e., 4 courses per semester), and their reviews should focus more intensely on the criteria for teaching performance. Some Research Professors focus exclusively on activities related to research and may not have teaching responsibilities. Therefore, the evaluation of their performance will focus specifically on research/scholarship with the exclusion of all criteria for teaching. Clinical Instructors provide direct supervision to students giving care to patients (Nayden Clinic) or have productivity expectations while delivering the highest quality care (Nayden Clinic); their evaluations should focus on related criteria.

Although adjustments may be expected for individuals, the following criteria are detailed in relation to teaching, research, service, and administration/management – the broad categories of evaluation considered for tenure track faculty – in order to accommodate the diverse range of job responsibilities assumed by the non-tenure track faculty employed in the Neag School of Education.

One note is that the expectations for scholarship among temporary faculty reflect unique, job-related considerations. For example, it is anticipated that clinical faculty will be engaged most often in scholarship related to practice (defined as professional scholarship) rather than in research conducted to create new knowledge, although temporary faculty may certainly engage in such scholarship.

It is also noted that non-tenure track faculty with teaching loads adjusted to allow for research and service (e.g., a 2 – 2 teaching load) will be evaluated across all areas of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, service).

General Guidelines for the Review of Non-tenure Track Faculty

The following guidelines are intended to serve for both the annual re-appointment reviews and the promotion in rank decisions.

The candidate will follow the process for submission of materials detailed in the Provost's guidelines, *Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment* (PTR) *Procedures,* and complete the University's PTR form adhering to the annually posted timelines for submission of materials for each annual review, each multi-year reappointment, and/or a review for promotion in rank.

Reviews include considerations of teaching, scholarship, service, and administrative duties *as appropriate to the candidate's job description and responsibilities*. Therefore, it is anticipated

that candidates will have varying profiles and perhaps limited performance indicators for areas that are not considered their primary responsibility. Excellence in performing all job responsibilities is expected. The following outline presents general expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and administration.

I. TEACHING

Teaching Expectations/Criteria

Effective teaching is a fundamental responsibility of each faculty member assigned teaching responsibilities. Effective teaching involves a number of dimensions, including designing challenging courses, stimulating intellectual curiosity and a sense of inquiry in students, and motivating learners. Important factors for teaching in a research university are the integration of research and teaching, the inclusion of latest research findings, and the ability to balance theoretical aspects with practical applications. Suggested teaching criteria include the following:

(a) High quality teaching is expected in all contexts, including academic classrooms and clinical settings (e.g., the Nayden Clinic). It is expected that all course related materials (syllabi, grading, etc.) are completed in a timely manner and are consistent with Department and NSOE Standards.

(b) Student Advisement expectations are set by Department Heads. Non-tenure track faculty with the ranks of Assistant/Associate/Professor may serve on Master's and Ph. D. committees and such appointments must follow the guidelines of the University of Connecticut Graduate School.

(c) Teaching Innovation and/or Curriculum Development activities as appropriate (e.g., original and/or unique innovations to enhance teaching and content in an existing course (e.g., enhanced use of teaching technology), development of new courses, or contributions to the revision of programs (including clinical/patient activities) and related curricula.

Evidence of Teaching Performance and Related Activities

Suggested types of evidence the candidate may present include:

(a) Formal evaluations of teaching, including university-administered student evaluations of teaching that meet, or exceed, the criteria established for Neag School of Education faculty (overall ratings at or above the School mean) and any direct observations of instruction by peers or administrators. Some adjustments in student evaluation scores (i.e., the numerical score) may be expected for class settings that include large numbers of participants (50+).

(b) Evidence of the specific nature of teaching activities (seminars, lectures, laboratories, workshops, other) and a written statement detailing teaching philosophy (presented in the formal PTR form).

(c) Evidence of any steps individuals have taken to improve their instructional effectiveness (e.g., participated in development programs for faculty).

(d) Description of the integration of any teaching innovations (e.g., technology), development of new courses, or contributions to the revisions of programs.

(e) Documentation of the dissemination of instructional innovations (e.g., presentations at conferences) or specific materials developed by the individual for the benefit of the program (e.g., new program evaluation forms, a new student handbook, etc.).

(f) Communications from students regarding courses.

(g) Nominations and/or conferrals of teaching awards.

II. SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship Expectations/Criteria

(a) Contributions that may be regarded as professional scholarship are expected. Professional scholarship is defined as intellectual/creative/scholarly accomplishments and leadership related to the individual's teaching or professional practice (teacher education or physical therapy). Examples include teaching materials, technology, program evaluation reports, technical reports (often data-based), or strategies developed by the individual that make a special contribution to the field. Such products must be accessible to the larger educational/physical therapy community and must have impact on the field.

(b) Any contributions to grant development, writing, and implementation (given that these are applicable to the mission of the School) are also considered important indicators of scholarship.

(c) Any contributions to the Neag School that involve any type of data collection and analyses and that result in providing information beneficial in program evaluation (for local and national reports), in seeking student/alumni/faculty input (or satisfaction), or in guiding decision-making.

(d) The quantity of scholarly products will be impacted by the faculty member's job responsibilities (i.e., teaching 4 courses a semester, assuming extensive clinical supervision, administering program components, etc.). Therefore, a specific number cannot be pre-determined. Rather, progress and promise in scholarship will be judged by the Department Head with input from the Department Review Committee. For those individuals with 2/2 teaching loads, it is expected that the research and scholarship productivity will match the expectations of tenure track faculty.

Evidence of Scholarship

Suggested types of evidence the candidate may present include:

(a) Publication, or presentation, in either peer or non-peer reviewed outlets/sources:
   a. Authored/co-authored articles in practitioner or research journals;
   b. Authored/co-authored textbooks, books, chapters relevant to the job description;
   c. Peer-reviewed manuscripts published in respected electronic journals, or presented at conferences (including poster presentations);
   d. Dissemination of materials, methods, or procedures relevant to the job description (e.g., web or video-based);
   e. Presentations at local, state, national, international conferences;
   f. Invited presentations;
   g. Collaborative research and grant writing activities;
   h. Grant development, or application for external funding opportunities, as appropriate;
   i. Technical reports.
(b) Fellowship in a professional organization.

III. SERVICE

<u>Service Expectations/Criteria</u>

The expectations for participation in service at the Clinic, Department, School, and University levels by non-tenure track faculty are circumscribed by the role and responsibilities of each individual and are specified on an individual basis by the Department Head.

(a) Generally, participation on one committee/working group at the Clinic, Department, School, or University level when requested by an administrator is expected.

(b) Service to the profession is valued and may include participation on state, regional, or national committees, editorships for journals, peer reviewing activities for conference programs, journal publications, grant reviewing panels, participation on State Department of Education committees, chairing sessions at conferences, and other similar responsibilities.

(c) Service may also include special support offered to the professional and public community beyond the University. Examples of such activities include special projects with public schools or community outreach.

(d) Collaborations between non-tenure track faculty and tenure track faculty that produce substantive delivery of service are also valued.

Evidence of Service Contributions

Although dependent upon the position and job responsibilities, expected evidence of quality contributions will include the following:

(a) Participation as requested on committees/working groups at the Clinical, Department, School, or University level.

(b) Contributions to the professional community as evidenced by committee work, conference contributions, editing work, and/or elected offices as appropriate for the individual's professional affiliations.

(c) Contributions to the professional and public communities beyond the University reflecting the individual's professional expertise.

IV. **Administrative/Management Responsibilities**

Expectations/Criteria for Administrative/Management Responsibilities

The non-tenure track faculty member whose responsibilities include administrative and/or management activities will be evaluated in relation to criteria such as the following. These criteria may be modified on the basis of specific job responsibilities, which may be unique and individual.

(a) Administration and management of clinical education and instructional initiatives directly tied to academic progress of students.

(b) Administration and management of clinical/teacher education involving coordination of staff, coordination of activities (teacher education meetings), assignment of staff (student teaching supervisors), supervision of activities (assignment of internships).

(c) Administration and management of NSOE outreach initiatives or administration and management of grant-related initiatives.

(d) Contributions to activities related to program reviews, department reviews, and accreditation reviews.

Evidence of Administrative/Management Accomplishments

(a) Documentation of program/unit activities and accomplishments.

    a. Reports of clinical and instructional initiatives and impacts on students.

(b) Development and direction of any procedural activities (e.g., materials assisting schools and supervisors with student teacher placements, evaluation, etc.).

(c) Documented results of outreach initiatives.

(d) Specific contributions to program reviews, department reviews, accreditation reviews.

Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor (Temporary, Non-tenure Track Faculty)

Evaluations at all levels are judged on their merit and in relation to School and University expectations and not in comparison to others in the Department or School. Within the criteria for earning promotion is recognition of the different contexts and disciplines within which the non-tenure track faculty in the Neag School are establishing their reputations.

The individual faculty member being considered for promotion in rank must have served at least six full years in rank to be promoted – with the review usually coming after the fifth year. The review for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor (Clinical Associate Professor, Associate Extension Professor, Visiting Associate Professor) is expected to occur during the sixth year of university employment; however, it could come during a subsequent year.

In calculating years of service, allowances for leaves of absence are to reflect the University's policies. In some cases faculty with prior, relevant service at another university may be promoted before accruing six full years in rank at the University of Connecticut. This determination is established at the time of hiring.

To be considered, the candidate will complete the Provost's official PTR form, prepare a PTR file as described by the Provost and in consultation with the Department Head, and adhere to the annually posted timeline.

Reviews for promotion of non-tenure track faculty are based on the terms of the appointment. In general, the criteria for promotion include the candidate's cumulative record in relation to the general areas of Teaching, Scholarship, Service, and Administration. The evaluation of each candidate will be guided by careful consideration of *the individual's terms of employment (the primary responsibilities) and the candidate's record in meeting all terms with evidence of productivity and promise*.

The evaluation process will include securing written evaluations/letters from professionals who are appropriate assessors of the candidate's contributions, including field-based practitioners and/or administrators.

While each of the primary areas evaluated have been detailed above (Section 1), an abbreviated outline of criteria follows.

An important consideration for this promotion in rank is evidence of continued productivity and development, and the emergence of national contributions and presence.

Teaching

- High quality teaching as evidenced by formal, university-administered, student evaluations that meet, or exceed, the criteria established for NSOE faculty.
- High quality student advisement and/or supervision as appropriate for the candidate's position and responsibilities (not all are required to serve as advisors).
- Documentation of teaching innovations and/or curriculum development as appropriate for the position and individual's responsibilities. These innovations or development projects are expected to contribute to the profession broadly (regionally or nationally) as evidenced by publication or presentation in appropriate, academic outlets (peer reviewed or other).

Scholarship

- Evidence of professional scholarship, defined as intellectual/creative/scholarly accomplishments and leadership related to the individual's teaching or professional practice. Authorship/co-authorship of articles published in professional, non peer reviewed journals or other academic venues/ outlets.
- Authorship/co-authorship of peer-reviewed manuscripts, grant applications, books, and book chapters in respected publications or outlets (conferences and electronic journals). Peer-reviewed professional presentations (including poster presentations) and invited presentations at national, regional, state, international venues.
- Collaborative research and grant writing activities.
- Any contributions to the Neag School that involve any type of data collection and analyses that result in technical reports or summaries that inform decision-making, including program evaluation activities, and student and alumni surveys.
- Grant development, or application for external funding opportunities as appropriate, and implementation.

The quantity of such products will be impacted by the faculty member's job responsibilities (i.e., teaching 4 courses a semester, assuming extensive clinical supervision, administering program components, etc.). Therefore, a specific number cannot be pre-determined. Rather, progress and promise in scholarship will be judged by the Department Head with input from the Department Review Committee.

Service

- Participation as requested on committees/working groups at the Clinical, Department, School, or University level.

- Contributions to Neag School programs, e.g., development and/or maintenance of clinical opportunities and experiences for Neag students.
- Contributions to the professional and public communities beyond the University reflecting the individuals professional affiliations.
- Contributions to the professional community as evidenced by committee work, conference contributions, editing work, and/or elected offices as appropriate for the individual's professional affiliations.

Administration/Management

- Administration and management of clinical education and instructional initiatives directly tied to academic progress of students.

- Administration and management of clinical/teacher education involving coordination of staff, coordination of activities (teacher education meetings), assignment of staff (student teaching supervisors), supervision of activities (assignment of internships).

- Administration and management of NSOE outreach initiatives.

- Contributions to activities related to program reviews, department reviews, and accreditation reviews.

Promotion in Rank to Professor (Temporary, Non-tenure Track Faculty)

The candidate for promotion to Professor must present an exemplary record of performance in all areas relevant to the candidate's primary area(s) of responsibility. The candidate is expected to demonstrate that he/she has acquired a national reputation, or recognition within the larger educational/professional community, in his/her principal area(s) of responsibility.

Teaching

- The candidate for promotion to Professor must have an established record of excellence in teaching, as evidenced by the range of indicators for teaching and advisement detailed above, over time.
- Documentation of teaching innovations and/or curriculum development must confirm that the candidate's primary focus (e.g., on teaching or clinical practice) and demonstrated excellence (e.g., in teaching or in clinical practice) have resulted in contributions to the profession at a regional/national level.

Scholarship

- The candidate for promotion to Professor must have established a national reputation through scholarly endeavors.
- This may include professional scholarship. Professional scholarship is defined as intellectual/creative/scholarly accomplishments and leadership related to practice (teacher education or physical therapy). This scholarship must be available to the larger educational community and must have impact on the field.

Service

- The candidate for promotion to Professor must have evidence of sustained and ongoing service contributions to the academic, professional, and public communities.

Administration/Management

(e) Administration and management of clinical education and instructional initiatives directly tied to academic progress of students.

(f) Administration and management of clinical/teacher education involving coordination of staff, coordination of activities (teacher education meetings), assignment of staff (student teaching supervisors), supervision of activities (assignment of internships).

(g) Administration and management of NSOE outreach initiatives.

(h) Contributions to activities related to program reviews, department reviews, and accreditation reviews.

General Guidelines for the Review Process

Annual Review

The process for the annual review is detailed in the Provost's Office guidelines, *Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment* (PTR) which presents specific procedures and timelines. Following is an abstracted overview to inform faculty members of the steps and specific committees involved in the review process:

- Completion of the University's PTR form by the faculty member and submission of this form with supporting documents by the published deadline (established annually by the Provost). These documents become the faculty member's dossier. The faculty

member's PTR file consists of his or her dossier plus all other written materials.

- The faculty member may add to his/her PTR file at any time by bringing materials to the department head; no materials may be removed from the file.

- The PTR form for each individual is reviewed by the Department PTR Advisory Committee, which advises the Department Head on the reappointment and/or promotion decision and submits a letter summarizing the Committee's evaluation and vote on the faculty member's candidacy (for re-appointment and/or promotion).

- The Department Head completes his/her evaluation and submits the candidate's PTR file and related materials to the Dean's office.

- The Dean's Advisory Council on PTR reviews the faculty member's PTR file and appraises the performance and potential for teaching, scholarship, creative accomplishments, and service of the individual under consideration in relation to the individual's position responsibilities. The Council's evaluation of each individual is summarized for the Dean in a written report that includes the Council's vote.

- The Dean writes his/her evaluation and when/if necessary submits all necessary forms and supporting documents to the Provost.

- Under Connecticut Freedom of Information statues, candidates have access to their files and to recommendation letters.

For Promotion

All steps detailed above pertain to the process and the preparation of materials supporting the candidate's application for promotion in rank. An additional set of materials consisting of supporting documents includes the following:

- Completion of the University's PTR form by the faculty member and submission of this form with supporting documents by the published deadline (established annually by the Provost). These documents become the faculty member's dossier. The faculty member's PTR file consists of his/her dossier plus all other written materials. These materials will ordinarily consist of materials supporting the following areas:
  - o Personal
    - Candidate's curriculum vita
    - Candidate's personal statement

- o Teaching
  - Students' written evaluations as appropriate
  - Special teaching awards
- o Scholarship
  - Copies of all published materials (books, book chapters, monographs, articles, curriculum materials)
  - Manuscripts in-press
  - Manuscripts submitted for review or in preparation
- o Service
  - Special accomplishments

- The Department Head will work with the candidate to identify potential referents (4 to 5) who will be invited to submit letters. The external referents will be chosen in light of the candidate's job responsibilities, and they will be asked to comment on the candidate's performance and contributions.

University of Connecticut
Faculty/Staff Daily Digest   *Thursday, December 27, 2012*

RESEARCH ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

Due 2/7 Spring '13 Faculty Large Grant Competition

Semi-Annual Faculty Large Grant Competition (Amounts greater than $1,500)

Guidelines and Proposal Preparation

Application Deadline via InfoEd: *4:30 p.m., Thursday, February 7, 2013*. *All large grant applications must be submitted through InfoEd. Please allow sufficient time for your application to be routed via Infoed to your department head or designee for approval. Please be sure to read Part 2. Proposal Package Preparation for Uploading to InfoEd.*

Program Goal: To assist faculty in all disciplines to better position them to apply for and receive extramural funding for their research and scholarly activities. Recipients of awards are expected to be actively engaged in submitting proposals to extramural sponsors. The applicant's record of extramural funding and relevant scholarly productivity will be considered as factors in judging the applicant's qualifications.

Applicants for second (and subsequent) awards must provide a clear statement of how the previous award was used, and what was produced, e.g., extramural grant(s), publication(s), etc. *Generally, only one award per PI, will be granted in a given fiscal year and no more than two awards made during a five year period. In addition, an individual may be the PI on no more than one proposal per cycle.*

Program Priorities: The program's primary objective is to fund proposals of high scholarly merit, as evaluated through the RAC's peer review process. The RAC encourages proposals for research projects in all areas and for a wide variety of purposes. It is especially interested in funding the following types of proposals on a priority basis:

- *Junior faculty* – proposals for "pilot" or "seed money" from newly-appointed faculty members who need initial support to begin a research program.
- *Change in direction* – proposals from established investigators who wish to change research direction or obtain pilot data.
- *Bridge funding* – proposals for interim "bridge" funding where previous support has not been renewed, where application for renewal or for alternative extramural funding has been filed, and where lack of funds would seriously hamper the established research project.
- *Sabbatical leaves* – proposals supporting sabbatical leaves pending availability of funds.

Proposals are peer reviewed within disciplinary review panels and supplemented by ad hoc reviewers when additional expertise is needed.

Eligibility: Tenured or Tenure-Track faculty members including: Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Full Professors. In addition, Associate or Full Professors in Residence, Associate or Full Research Professors, and faculty holding a Clinical rank may apply. This competition is open to Storrs and Regional Campuses.

Announcement of Awards: May for a July 1, 2013 start date.

NOTE: Training required for the Infoed system is minimal and can be obtained by clicking the following link to download a brief instructional document (*Note: must download using on-campus computer or VPN connection) http://www.osp.uconn.edu/restricted /proposal_development_instruction_manual_internal_funding.pdf

For more information, contact: Larisa Zagorski at Larisa.Zagorski@uconn.edu or 860-486-6378

Other stories from the Daily Digest for Thursday, December 27, 2012 >>

Degree/Certification:

Master's 6th Year PhD DPT EdD

School Year:

2012-2013 2013-2014 2014-2015 2015-2016

2016-2017 2017-2018 2018-2019

Program Leader:

Department Leader:

Months this academic year when the assessment plan will be discussed or actually discussed:

August   November February May

September December March   June

October   January   April

The **Program Mission** is a concise statement of the general values and principles which guide the program. It sets the tone and a philosophical position from which follow a program's goals and objectives. A program mission is a broad statement that:

(1) describes *what the program is,*

(2) provides a clear description of the *purpose* of the program*,*

(3) reflects how the program contributes to the education of students graduating from the program,

(4) may reflect how the teaching and research efforts are used to enhance student learning,

(5) is *aligned* with department, school, and university missions, and

(6) should be distinctive for the purpose.

@@150228 Program Mission is:

				Paragraph		Font family		Font size	

3 DMIIS

<< Back   Next >>

The **Program Goals** are broad, general statements of what the program wishes to accomplish. Goals describe broad learning outcomes and concepts. They are consistent with the mission and provide the framework for determining the more specific objectives of the program. A single goal may have, and general does, have many specific subordinate learning objectives.

The Program Goals of the @@150228 are:

Goal
#1

Goal
#2

Goal
#3

Goal
#4

Do you have another goal?

Yes No

| << Back | Next >> |

The statement of the **Program Outcomes**/**Objectives** must denote *measurable* attributes *observable*. Each objective describes what the learner will be doing when demonstrating s/he has reached the objective (What should the learner be able to do?), describe the important conditions under which the learner will demonstrate his/her competence; and, indicate how the learner will be evaluated and what constitutes acceptable performance. Because there may be an immense number of objectives, the minimum number of objectives reported for each year will be six.

Objective #1 for the @@150228 program is:

			Paragraph		Font family		Font size	

3 DWXIIS

We will use the following method to collect the data on this objective:

The following data was or will be collected: *(You may enter the data in the box provided and/or select to upload a file).*

			Paragraph		Font family		Font size	

3 DWXIIS

Browse…

Allowed file type(s): .doc, .docx, .pdf, .xls, .xlsx

Objective #2 for the @@150228 program is:

			Paragraph		Font family		Font size	

3 DMXIIS

We will use the following method to collect the data on this objective:

The following data was or will be collected: *(You may enter the data in the box provided and/or select to upload a file)*

			Paragraph		Font family		Font size	

3 DMXIIS

Browse…

Allowed file type(s): .doc, .docx, .pdf, .xls, .xlsx

Objective #3 for the @@150228 program is:

			Paragraph		Font family		Font size	

3 DMXIIS

We will use the following method to collect the data on this objective:

The following data was or will be collected: *(You may enter the data in the box provided and/or select to upload a file)*

| | | | Paragraph | | Font family | | Font size | |

3 DMIIS

Browse…

Allowed file type(s): .doc, .docx, .pdf, .xls, .xlsx

Objective #4 for the @@150228 program is:

| | | | Paragraph | | Font family | | Font size | |

3 DMIIS

We will use the following method to collect the data on this objective:

The following data was or will be collected: *(You may enter the data in the box provided and/or select to upload a file)*

| | | | Paragraph | | Font family | | Font size | |

3 DMIIS

Browse…

Allowed file type(s): .doc, .docx, .pdf, .xls, .xlsx

Objective #5 for the @@150228 program is:

			Paragraph		Font family		Font size	

3 DWXIIS

We will use the following method to collect the data on this objective:

The following data was or will be collected: *(You may enter the data in the box provided and/or select to upload a file)*

			Paragraph		Font family		Font size	

3 DWXIIS

Browse…

Allowed file type(s): .doc, .docx, .pdf, .xls, .xlsx

Objective #6 for the @@150228 program is:

			Paragraph		Font family		Font size	

3 DWXIIS

We will use the following method to collect the data on this objective:

The following data was or will be collected: *(You may enter the data in the box provided and/or select to upload a file)*

Paragraph	Font family	Font size

3 DMIIS

Browse...

Allowed file type(s): .doc, .docx, .pdf, .xls, .xlsx

Do you have another objective?

Yes No

<< Back   Next >>

Summary and Resulting Action:

Based upon this year's objectives, what did the @@150228 program discover and which evidence-based decisions were made to advance knowledge, improve teaching, and/or transform learning for this program? This could include admissions data, midterm assessments of students, completion information and/or post-graduation interpretations.

| | | Paragraph | Font family | Font size | |

3 DWIIS

<< Back | Next >>