

Standards of Evidences for Curriculum and Instruction

The standards identified here represent types of evidence that will be considered in a promotion and tenure review in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. Productivity in the areas of research, teaching, and service should be consistent with identified percentage allocations for activities in a faculty member's Distribution Of Effort document. The percentage of distribution in the DOE for Assistant Professors should reflect a primary focus on research and teaching. As a matter of policy, the University of Kentucky designates a 2(fall) /2(spring) teaching load as a 50% allocation.

Research and Scholarship:

A. Promotion from Assistant to Associate

The standards of evidence in this Research and Scholarship section are listed in order of priority for expectations in promotion and tenure decisions.

Standard 1. Refereed Journal Publication

1. Faculty should have approximately two articles per year accepted in high impact refereed journals (as determined by field-appropriate criteria such as, but not limited to, impact factor, acceptance rate, or professional organization affiliation).
2. Quality of a journal is considered based on evidence such as its impact factor, acceptance rate, and sponsorship by a major professional organization.
3. It is expected that these publications should be original disciplined inquiry reflecting theoretical perspectives that incorporate established research methodologies.
4. The trajectory of publications should provide strong evidence for a record of relatively consistent or increasing research productivity during the probationary period. The trajectory should also demonstrate a coherent program of research with publications that translate findings for the broader audiences served by a curriculum and instruction department in a land grant university context.

Standard 2. Additional Scholarly Publication

1. Additional evidence of scholarly activity may include publications resulting from interdisciplinary research, books and/or book chapters, conference proceedings, and funded grants or grant submissions that lead to published journal articles, books, and book chapters.
2. If additional scholarly publications are subjected to blind peer review (for example, refereed conference proceedings), this should be indicated.

Standard 3. Professional Presentations

1. Refereed presentations at national, international, regional, and state professional conferences are an expected indicator of scholarly activity (i.e. evidence of scholarly discourse that may lead to publication).

B. Promotion from Associate to Full

Standard 1. Publication

1. Faculty should maintain a consistent record of publication that will include a broad range of highly regarded publication outlets which demonstrate an established national reputation in the area of specialization, including continued refereed journal publication, books and/or book chapters, edited volumes, research handbook chapters, etc.

2. It is expected that the publication record will continue to include original disciplined inquiry reflecting theoretical perspectives and the use of established research methodologies.
3. Evidence should include a shift towards a broader range of professional discourse including guest edited journals, books, book series, etc.

Standard 2. Grants

1. Additional evidence of scholarly activity may include funded grants or grant submissions reflecting a focus in programs of research.

Standard 3. Professional Presentations

1. Refereed presentations at national and international professional conferences, including invited presentations, refereed presentations, keynotes, etc., may provide supporting evidence of scholarly activity (i.e. evidence of scholarly discourse that may lead to publication.)

Teaching and Advising:

A. Promotion from Assistant to Associate

1. Faculty in C& I are encouraged to document teaching effectiveness using multiple data sources including student, peer, and self evaluations. For data collected, faculty will demonstrate how sources of evidence are leading to formative improvement in their teaching over time. While student evaluations of faculty teaching are required, they should be contextualized in relation to category of student (undergraduate or graduate), and other factors that might impact ratings (such as an online course or a first time course offering, etc.). The rigor in teaching should be evidenced by syllabi containing clear expectations for students and appropriate readings and assignments that reflect the scholarship, research, and accepted practice in the field. The table below provides samples of types of data that may be collected in each of the three areas for teaching. In addition to the required university course evaluation, faculty are encouraged to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness using additional data sources suggested below.

Peer	Student	Self
Peer observations of teaching over time with consistent focus	University course evaluations	Participation in professional development experiences
Peer review of syllabi	Interviews and/or letters with randomly selected students conducted by a third party	Acquisition of grants related to instruction
Peer review of teaching assignments/materials	Solicited or unsolicited feedback from students	Implementation of teaching innovations
Invitations to speak and conduct workshops	Co-authoring with students	Publications related to or supportive of teaching
Evaluations of conference presentations generated by the conference organizers	Evidence of student learning /performance. Student able to demonstrate process leading to prototype instructional materials development. (e.g., end of course comprehensive project, unit plan, artifacts, feedback from mentor teachers, peer feedback, etc.)	Reflection on teaching experiences and student feedback with documentation of response.
Teaching awards, nominations, and recognitions	Teaching awards, nominations, and recognitions	How is my research reflected in my instruction?
	Undergraduate vs. graduate instruction	

2. Faculty should provide evidence of service on doctoral committees and master's level committees where applicable, and advising students. Faculty at this level may co-chair a doctoral committee but do not have the option to serve as sole chair.

B. Promotion from Associate to Full

1. All of A 1 and 2 above plus demonstration of research-based leadership:
 - a. Effective mentoring of doctoral students as evidenced by the number of doctoral committees served on as chair, or member, advisees, completion rates, and their subsequent success.
 - b. Additional documentation of teaching or advising activities warranting promotion from associate may include, but that is not limited to nor required, program development, and new coursework that reflect current disciplinary scholarship etc.

Service

A. Promotion from Assistant to Associate

1. Evidence of excellence in service may include reviewing for journals and conference review committees or establishing collaborative projects.
2. Active participation in national professional organizations (i.e., committee assignment, program review committee, editorial board member, etc.).
3. Similar participation in local and state professional organizations where appropriate.
4. Assistant professors primary focus should be on research and teaching. Service on Departmental, College, and UK committees is expected but should reflect a lower percentage on the DOE.
5. Community engagement (i.e., service to schools and/or community organizations via workshops, presentations, professional development, etc.) should be consistent with the faculty members program of research and departmental objectives.

B. Promotion from Associate to Full

1-5 as listed above plus

1. Take on a more prominent role on the national and/or international level as demonstrated by leadership service to a professional organization(s), manuscript reviewing for refereed journals, serving as editor or as editorial board member for journals, etc.
2. Assume leadership positions within the department, college, and/or university.