Introduction

The Policy and Organizational Manual describes how Indiana University Southeast School of Education (SOE) functions and how it carries out the policies outlined in the Academic Handbook and other policy manuals specific to Indiana University Southeast. It is to be reviewed regularly and revised as necessary to meet the changing needs and requirements of the School, University, and state regulatory bodies. Indiana University Southeast School of Education policy manual includes policies pertinent to the School. Policies in the manual were approved by the School of Education faculty and are the latest/most recent policies. Other documents (non-policy) adopted by School are included to provide guidance. Additional Rules regarding the School of Education are in the most recent IUS Bulletin. Historical policies are archived in the main office of the School. Information about Indiana University Southeast policies is available on Indiana University Southeast website: www.ius.edu/acadaffairs/facultymanual.cfm
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Section I: Organizational Structure

The School is administered by a Dean supported by Program Coordinators, Director of Graduate Studies and the School Council. The professional staff of the School consists of Licensing Advisors.

Mission

The mission of the Indiana University Southeast School of Education is to develop high quality, caring professionals who are leaders in the continuous transformation of schools within a diverse society. In recognition of the demographic shifts in our world, our region and our communities, the School of Education is committed to reflecting and incorporating diversity to adapt to our changing learning environment. Therefore, to prepare education professionals to meet diverse student needs we use the word “all” in our candidate outcomes. The outcomes listed below reflect the mission of the School of Education.

Candidate Outcomes

Candidates completing School of Education programs of study will demonstrate:

Knowledge of content and the use of best practices in delivering effective instruction to all students;
Dispositions necessary to help all students learn; and
Knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to participate in school transformation

The School of Education has adopted a school-wide conceptual framework based on the four themes in the mission: High Quality, Caring Professional, Continuous Transformation of Schools, and Diverse Society.

Diversity Competencies

The School of Education has adopted the following diversity proficiencies.

In keeping with these beliefs, the School of Education has adopted the following diversity proficiencies

Candidates will:

1. Learn about and respect diverse learners and their families
2. Understand social disparities that affect students and apply social justice within the classroom and the school
3. Create an inclusive learning community where differences are respected
4. Adjust lessons, educational materials, resources, guidance, and other materials to accommodate needs of all students
5. Examine and reflect on personal practice to reduce bias and stereotypes within their work.
Accreditation

The School of Education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The review occurs every seven years. The last Institutional Report is located at www.ius.edu/education.

Most professional education licensure programs are approved by Specialized Professional Associations (first submissions fall, 2011) and others by Indiana Department of Education.

Academic Structure

Academic programs are organized into undergraduate and graduate programs. Program coordinators are appointed by the chancellor, upon recommendation of the dean and vice chancellor of academic affairs to facilitate the work of the programs. Undergraduate programs include three areas, secondary education (math, science, social studies, and language arts), special education (mild intervention) and elementary education. The undergraduate program offers alternative teacher certification at the secondary and elementary levels with appointed coordinators. Under the leadership of a Graduate Studies Director, the Graduate Studies program offers MS degrees in Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Counseling (has its own coordinator). Additional licensing areas at the graduate level include education leadership, reading, computer technology, special education, gifted and talented, and English as a New Language (in partnership with Indiana University (Bloomington) School of Education. Licensing areas have coordinators who serve as the primary advisor. Program coordinators meet monthly with assigned program faculty.

Governance of the School of Education

The School Council serves as the leadership team for the SOE providing input into the long-term planning and other relevant issues for the improvement of the school. The Council membership includes program coordinators from each program in the SOE and Professional Staff. The School Council serves as an agenda-building committee for school/faculty meetings and determine whether items are ready for action or discussion, or if a subcommittee needs to gather further information on a given topic. The Council meets monthly. The school faculty and professional staff meet monthly with the dean to discuss school needs, concerns and approve items for the improvement of the school. Each program area faculty work from an annual action plan aligned with NCATE standards, school strategic plan and the mission of the school. Coordinators work under the supervision of the Dean. Job descriptions for faculty, dean and program coordinator are located in the IUS Faculty Manual.

School of Education Budget

The state of Indiana operates on a biennial budgeting cycle which means that each budget cycle results in appropriations that cover two years. The Commission for Higher Education
The School of Education budget also includes funds generated from external grants and funds raised through alumni. The School of Education has an IU Foundation account to receive donations. The IUS campus also provides opportunities for units to apply for funds through the Degrees of Excellent Funds. The Dean, in collaboration with the Budget Analyst, allocates funding to each program area to support faculty in their teaching. Travel funds are distributed or a priority bases. New tenure track faculty presenting at a conference are first priority and remaining funds are then given to other faculty presenting at conferences.

Section II: School of Education Team, Councils and Boards

The School of Education has ten standing committees - six quality teams, merit and school review. Two additional standing committees, promotion and tenure are required to facilitate the tenure and promotion process for the university. The quality teams serve as vehicles for school improvement, implementing the School of Education Strategic Plan, and the work necessary to fulfill the requirements for accreditation at the state and national level. The Merit committee provides recommendations for merit consideration to the Dean and the school review provides recommendation for promotion and tenure to the dean and the vice chancellor for academic affairs.

Curriculum Development Quality Team

The team is responsible for insuring that proposed changes in the unit’s curriculum and conceptual framework are data driven decisions and that proposed curriculum and conceptual framework changes are in the best interest of the unit. Therefore, this committee reviews new and revised programs and courses changes and changes to the conceptual framework before they are brought to the faculty for discussion and/or voting. Provides follow-up to faculty on changes approved at all levels (SOE faculty, APC, Faculty Senate) and other levels and monitors candidate performance for the unit.

Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation Quality Team

The team is responsible for maintaining an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its program. The team oversees stakeholder involvement in unit assessment system (UAS); ensures that the School of Education conceptual framework themes are incorporated into programs through coursework and summative assessment points; identifies and reviews major assessments for each program (dispositions, portfolios, etc.); monitors processes for candidate review and remediation and rater reliability and candidate success indicators; documents and monitors data collection and systematic review or programs; oversees the compliance of UAS plan with campus assessment initiative; alerts programs and
Field Experience and Clinical Practice Quality Team

The team is responsible for making sure the unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. The committee monitors appropriate training and compensation for field placement supervisors.

Diversity

The team designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools. The committee monitors the SOE diversity plan.

Faculty Performance and Development/Student Support and Recognition

The team ensures faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development. It provides best practices in the use of technology. Additionally this team facilitates the awarding of scholarship to candidates, selection and awarding of SOE awards, and plans the honors program.

Unit Governance and Resources

The team ensures that the school has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources including information technology, for preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. It monitors policies and procedures which affect governance and resources of the unit.

Merit Committee

The Merit Pay Committee is designed as an advisory committee to the dean of the SOE and makes recommendations to the dean regarding merit for the faculty. The committee collects and reviews annual reports to make recommendations. Merit Pay Committee membership and Guides located in appendix.

School Review Committee

The committee reviews the mini-dossier of faculty member’s progress toward promotion and/or tenure and makes a final evaluation including important strengths and areas of concerns. The committee reviews and makes recommendation of reassigned time for each faculty member at least every three years unless the faculty member has been reviewed for promotion during that
period. The committee reviews and makes recommendation for tenure and promotion of faculty. Further description of this committee is in the IUS Faculty Manual.

**Campus Review-Promotion Committee**

Description of this committee is in the IUS Faculty Manual

**Campus Review-Tenure Committee**

Description of this committee is in the IUS Faculty Manual

**Other School of Education Advisory Boards and Councils**

**School of Education Advisory Board**

The advisory board consists of representatives from area school districts who meet with the school’s dean and program coordinators once a year. The board provides updates on issues faced by the school district, teacher employment needs, and suggestions for program improvement.

**School of Education Student Advisory Board**

The mission of the School of Education Student Advisory Board is to connect candidates with today’s educational issues and to inform the unit about concerns from a student perspective. The board’s purpose is to also advance lifelong learning and cultivate the unique contribution of its members. The board is open only to undergraduate students who are nominated by the faculty and appointed by the dean.

**Council on Preparing Education Professionals (COPEP)**

The Council on Preparing Education Professionals (COPEP) shall advise the Dean and faculty of the School of Education on matters pertaining to preparing professional educators. The council will provide a forum for communication of information, coordination of efforts related to educator preparation, discussion and recommendations with respect to programs that prepare licensed educators for preschool through high school settings. The council shall review and advise on curricular and other academic changes which directly impact educator preparation. The council may suggest initiatives that have cross disciplinary impact on the preparation of licensed educators.

**Indiana University Education Council**

The Council serves as a framework for university-wide cooperation with the intent to ensure that Indiana University Schools of Education professional education programs best serve the interest of the students for whom they were designed, that the traditions of local campus autonomy and faculty governance of academic programs are preserved and promoted, and that
all Schools of Education programs, wherever housed or delivered, meet relevant state and national accreditation standards. IUS School of Education has one representative on this system-wide council. (See Appendix for additional information)

Section III: POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

The School of Education has established certain policies, procedures and guidelines to inform our practice and to ensure fairness. General Rules for Undergraduate and Graduate programs can be found in the most recent IUS Bulletin. The changing needs, requirements at the school, university and state regulatory bodies will necessitate revisions regularly.

Section A. General School Policies and Guidelines

Procedures for Sponsorship and Memberships in External Organizations for the SOE

Approved 5/9/11

In order to facilitate School of Education sponsorship and membership in external organization the request will forwarded to Governance and Resources and through the Office of Vice President for Public Affairs at IU. The guidelines are in the appendix.

Procedures for Program/Curriculum Initiation and Revisions

Policies and procedures for planning, establishing or discontinuing academic degree programs are prescribed under University Academic Planning and Policy Academic Program Development guidelines located at http://www.iu.edu/~uapp/AcadProgDev/index.shtml

Academic Approval Process

The sequence of events for planning and approval of new and other changes with School of Education includes the following: (a) new degree proposals are generated by a faculty group in consultation with the School Dean and the VC for Academic Affairs; (b) faculty group submits proposal to the appropriate program team; (c) program team votes on the proposal. If approved, then the CDQT chair submits the proposal to the School Dean as an action item for the next School of Education (SOE) faculty meeting. If approved then the proposing school team coordinator submits the proposal to the campus Academic Policies Committee (APC) as an action item for the next APC meeting and to the campus representative of the Indiana University Education Council for submission to the agenda committee as action item for the next Education Council meeting. (See appendix for further details)
Online Teaching
Approved 3/11/11

Online courses are those courses which meet either 100% online or are hybrid meeting 75% or more online and meet partially face-to-face. The discussion forums and Oncourse email of delivery of assignments do not constitute an online course. Once the course has been approved it is then listed as an online or hybrid course in the university schedule. In order to better facilitate the online environment for the School of Education the following procedures need to be followed.

Self-assessment
- The professor uses the ILTE check off rubric for online courses to review their own skills to professionally create and implement an online course to a high quality level.
The syllabus and ILTE rubric will be submitted at least one week in advance prior to the Program Team for review.
- The syllabus will then either be approved or denied.
- Once approved the syllabus will advance to the Curriculum Quality Team (1).
The syllabus and check off rubric will be submitted one week in advance prior to the Curriculum Quality Team (1) for approval.
- The syllabus will then either be approved or denied.
- If denied the syllabus will be sent back to the Program team to address issues and can then be resubmitted to the Curriculum Quality Team (1)
Once approved by all teams, it is then listed in the schedule as either online or hybrid. This policy is effective fall 2011.

Writing Style (APA)
The School of Education has adopted the American Psychological Association (APA) style and that appropriate steps be taken by instructors to use in their courses the form and style of APA.

Adopted 10/1997
Syllabus Guidelines

The School of Education adopted guidelines/format for syllabus development requiring instructions to include certain components. **Adopted March 1998**

**SYLLABUS GUIDELINES**
Educators Engaged In Growth
Mission Statement
Selected Belief Statements
Course #/Title
Semester/Year/Section #
Instructor, Office, Office Hours, Telephone, Course type (lecture, discussion, lab, etc.),
Required text(s), Catalog Description, Course Objectives/Application of the knowledge base, Relate to INTASC Standards and DOE Standards, Requirements/Assessment Measures, Grading System, Statement for Student with Disabilities, Knowledge Base, Books and Articles, Journals, and Calendar.

**Section B: Faculty**

The School of Education follows the policies regarding faculty matters located in the IUS Faculty Manual [www.ius.edu/acadaffairs/facultymanual.cfm](http://www.ius.edu/acadaffairs/facultymanual.cfm). Other policies specific to faculty in SOE are listed in this document.

**Faculty Program Reassignment policy**
Approved 5/9/11

The purpose of this policy is to address the reassignment of faculty to different educational programs within the School of Education. The School of Education supports the reassignment of faculty to other programs when necessary and when such a move is not detrimental to another program. Such a move within the School of Education shall only be undertaken or considered when the move benefits the unit’s mission. Reassignment can be initiated by the Dean, faculty, or a program may request a reassignment. Reassignments must follow procedures approved by the faculty. Procedures are in the appendix. Effective fall 2011.

**Diversity Questions for Job Candidates**

Each candidate applying for a faculty position in the School of Education will respond, either in an interview or in writing, to the following questions:
a) What would you include in your curriculum that would contribute to student understanding of diversity?
b) What knowledge bases and conceptualizations do you use that support diversity in your teaching?
c) What proficiencies would you expect from students that would contribute to their knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity?

All future job descriptions shall include a statement informing job applicants of the School of Education’s belief in the integration of diversity issues into course content. Each job description shall list as a REQUIREMENT the candidate’s willingness to include diversity in the course contents.

Approved 4/18/2001

Mentoring Policy
Approved by SOE faculty 4/15/11

Mentoring new faculty is an activity the SOE strongly encourages and values. Therefore, all new faculty will have a mentor. A transition mentor will serve in that capacity until a long-term mentor is assigned. The success of mentoring is the responsibility of each individual engaged in the experience. Responsibilities of each role are described in the Mentoring Guidelines.

Full Time Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Evaluation Policies

The School of Education follows the policies regarding full time faculty, lecturers, and part-time faculty matters located in the IUS Faculty Manual www.ius.edu/acadaffairs/facultymanual.cfm.

Criteria for Promotion and Tenure for the School of Education

The School of Education had adopted a set of guidelines for Tenure Track Faculty and a separate set of guidelines for Lecturers in addition to what is located in the IUS Faculty Manuel. The two documents are located in the appendix of SOE Policy Manual.

Adjunct Faculty Appointment and Promotion and Evaluation Policies

The School of Education follows the policies regarding Adjunct Faculty located in the IUS Adjunct Faculty Manual located at www.ius.edu/acadaffairs/facultymanual.cfm.
Section C: Undergraduate Student Guidelines, Policies and Procedures

Academic Appeal
All SOE Programs
Approved 4/29/2005

Purpose: When candidates disagree with an awarded grade, a program action such as the denial of an exception, petition, an unfavorable summative decision point decision, or establishment of a professional improvement or remediation plan, they may initiate an academic appeal which is outlined below.

Steps
To appeal a grade the candidate should first discuss the grade with the instructor. If unresolved, the candidate may proceed through the following steps, stopping at any point if s/he is satisfied or wishes to withdraw the appeal.

Step 1 The candidate submits a written appeal to the coordinator of the appropriate program team.
Step 2 Within 10 working days* of receiving written appeal, or as soon as all relevant information have been provided, the Program Coordinator will convene the program team relevant to the appeal. The candidate has the option to speak to the appeal in person.
Step 3 The candidate may appeal in writing to the Dean of Education (Hillside Hall 20) within 5 working days after receiving the decision in Step 3. Within 10 working days after receiving the written appeal or as soon as all relevant information has been provided, the Dean will render a written decision. (Grade Appeals decisions are final at the Dean’s Level).
Step 4 The candidate may appeal in writing to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs within 5 working days after receiving the Dean’s decision. The Vice Chancellor will provide written notification of the decision to the candidate after all relevant information has been provided.
Step 5 The candidate may appeal in writing to the Chancellor within 5 working days after receiving the decision in Step 4. The Chancellor will provide written notification of the decision to the candidate and the Dean after all relevant information has been provided.

*The guidelines for the number of days for processing appeal apply except when the university is not in session and during summer school.
Appeal Process
Elementary/Special Education/Secondary
Undergraduates in Education
Field Experience Appeal
Approved 9/2000

Step 1  Student and University Supervisor
University Supervisor and student will confer and a decision is recorded. Student may appeal in
writing to the Team Coordinator within 5 working days of decision in Step 1.

Step 2  Elementary/Special Education or Secondary Team chaired by the Team
Coordinator
Within 10 working days of receiving written appeal to the Coordinator of Elementary/Special
Education/Secondary team. Team members will convene and make a decision. Student may or
may not be present.

Step 3  School of Education Field Experience Committee chaired by the Coordinator of
Field Experiences.
Student may appeal in writing to the Coordinator of Field Experiences within 5 working days
after receiving decision in Step 2. The Coordinator of Field Experiences will convene the
committee within 10 working days of the appeal and make a decision. Student may or may not
be present.

Step 4  Dean, School of Education
Student may appeal in writing to the Dean of the School of Education within 5 working days
after receiving decision in Step 3. The Dean will make decision within 10 working days after
receiving written decision.

Step 5  Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Student may appeal in writing to Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs within 5 working days
after receiving decision in Step 4.

Step 6  Chancellor
Student may appeal in writing to the Chancellor within 5 working days after receiving decision in Step 5.
Appeal Process
Elementary/Special Education/Secondary
Undergraduates in Education
Academic Appeal

Step 1  Elementary/Special Education/Secondary  Student and Academic Advisor
Student must submit written appeal within 5 working days after Step 1 to the Coordinator of
Elementary/Special Education/Secondary Team.

Step 2  Coordinator of Elementary/Special Education/Secondary Education
Within 10 working days of receiving written appeal, Coordinator will convene
Elementary/Special Education/Secondary Team. Student may or may not be asked to be present
based on decision of Team.

Step 3  Dean, School of Education
Student may appeal in writing to the Dean of Education within 5 working days after receiving
decision in Step 2. Dean will make decision within 10 working days after receiving written
decision. Appeal ends with the dean. (IUS approved 2011)

Policy regarding award of bachelor’s degree to individuals in the School of Education who
do not meet graduation/certification requirements for teacher education.
Approved 4/19/1991
Such students will be declared ineligible for a B.S. in Education at IUS and advised of due
process for petitioning reinstatement. Students not wishing reinstatement will be advised of
options available elsewhere at the university for completing the bachelor’s degree.

Transfer to SOE Guidelines for determining course petitions for transfer credit and
courses Ten Years Old and Older.

Limitation: These guidelines apply only to students enrolled in UNDERGRADUATE
and BASIC PROGRAMS for initial certification in a specific area. The guidelines do not apply
to students in ADVANCED PROGRAMS, SECOND DEGREES, MASTERS LEVEL
ENDORSEMENTS, or those who are working off STATE CERTIFICATION requirements.

In concurrence with course transfer and ten-year policies from accepting credits toward
graduation and certification in the School of Education, IU System policy statement and
proposed guidelines are to be considered in advising the student to petition for exceptions to
requirements and in making the final approval for the course substitutions. Details regarding
transfer can be found at the most recent IUS Bulletin and the http://www.transferin.net
The School of Education accepts courses completed at other accredited institutions of higher education to meet graduation and certification requirements (See IUS Bulletin Credit Transfer Policy for Bachelor’s Degree” or university policy on transfers). Although grades do not transfer and are not computed in a student’s IU Southeast grade point average (GPA), the School uses transfer grades to determine eligibility requirements, including the GPA for admission to teacher education. Transfer grades are also used to determine graduation and licensing eligibility in academic plans and areas.

The time passed since a course was completed, whether taken at IU Southeast or transferred from any other institution, will be considered in relation to the student’s projected date of graduation, as determined at the initial advising session and reevaluated at each subsequent advising session and reevaluated at each subsequent advising session. Thus, it is imperative for the student to see that the advisor records the date on the student’s check sheet and/or reviews the student’s electronic degree audit. If a student deviates from progress toward the projected date of graduation in the course of his/her studies, the life span of a course may be reassessed.

All course listed in the Professional Education Block must be completed within a 10-year period before graduation. Area requirements outside of education must also be completed within a 10-year period unless a waiver is granted by the program’s coordinator and the dean. Approval would be based on the significance of changes in the particular content area.

Students requesting a variance from course or program requirements may petition for an exception. Exception forms are available in the School of Education. Students will receive written notification of the decision and appeals process.
Section D: Student policies (Graduate)

Time line on course work
Revised 12/6/92

All Course work (including transfer-credit courses) to be applied toward a Master’s Degree must be completed within six years from the beginning of the first course counted toward the degree.

Residency Requirement
Revised 12/6/92

The residency requirement for the degree Master of Science in Elementary or Secondary Education at IUS may be met by completing the last 21 credit hours of course work toward the degree from IUS and by completing all the coursework for the degree within a six year period.

MEST GPA Policy Revision
Approved 4/18/2008

The candidate must have a grade of B (3.00) or better in core courses, education content and cognate components, C(2.00) or better in electives; and overall GPA of at last 3:00. Applicable to candidates admitted on or after 8/1/2009
Section IV - Appendix
Documents Adopted and/or Approved by School of Education

Procedures for Sponsorship and Memberships in External Organizations for the School of Education

In order to facilitate School of Education sponsorships and memberships in external organizations the following procedures need to be followed:

• Once the Dean of the SOE has received a request from any entity outside of the SOE and IUS which is relevant to the mission and goals of the SOE, IUS, and IU, the request will be forwarded to the Governance and Resources Committee.

• The Governance and Resources Committee will then review the request and level of funding desired and vote on the request.

• The Governance and Resources Committee will then inform the SOE Dean as to the results of the vote.

• The Dean will then complete the Sponsorship/Membership Data Collection form and submit it to the Office of the Vice President for Public Affairs and any further action by Indiana University no later than 14 days prior to the event sponsorship and 48 hours prior to membership deadlines.

Approved 5/19/11
Procedures for Faculty Members to Switch Programs

Approved 5/9/11

a) Faculty Initiated Action
   A School of Education faculty member requesting a change from a current appointment to a specific program to a new program will follow these steps.
   1. Inform his/her current program team two semesters in advance of the proposed change.
   2. If the current team expresses agreement with the faculty request by consensus, the respective coordinator will send a recommendation to the dean.
   3. The dean will invite the members of the receiving program team for input.
   4. If both teams and the dean agree with the faculty member request, the change will be granted.
   5. The dean will ensure that no harm will be done to either program team.
   6. If the current program team does not agree with the faculty member request, the faculty member can appeal to the dean who will make the final decision following steps 3-5.

b) Dean Initiated Action
   Under exceptional circumstances, the dean may initiate a change action of a faculty member. In that case, the dean will follow these steps:
   1. Inform the faculty of the particular need for this/her services in another program team or duty.
   2. Inform the current program team ahead of time (two semesters in advance if possible) of the proposed change.
   3. Inform the receiving program team ahead of time (two semesters in advance if possible) of the proposed change.
   4. The dean will ensure that no harm will be done to either program team and will take concrete provisions for it.
School of Education Academic Approval Procedures

Revised & Approved by SOE Faculty 2/20/09

Approval Process for New Degree Programs

1. New degree proposals are generated by a faculty group in consultation with the School Dean and the VC for Academic Affairs.

2. Faculty group submits proposal to the appropriate program team.

3. Program team votes on the proposal. If approved then the program team coordinator submits the proposal to the Curriculum Development Quality Team (CDQT) as an action item. If disapproved or tabled then the program coordinator sends proposal with comments back to faculty group.

4. The CDQT votes on the proposal. If approved then the CDQT chair submits the proposal to the School Dean as an action item for the next School of Education (SOE) faculty meeting. If disapproved or tabled then the CDQT chair sends proposal with comments back to program team.

5. The SOE faculty votes on the proposal. If approved then the proposing school team coordinator submits the proposal to the campus Academic Policies Committee (APC) as an action item for the next APC meeting and to the campus representative of the Indiana University Education Council for submission to the agenda committee as action item for the next Education Council meeting. If disapproved or tabled then the Dean of SOE sends proposal with comments back to either the CDQT, program team or the proposing faculty group.

6. Campus Action IU Action

APC votes on the proposal. If approved then APC submits proposal to Indiana University Southeast Faculty Senate as an action item for the next Faculty Senate meeting. If disapproved then APC sends the proposal with comments back to the originating faculty group. The chair of the agenda committee of the Indiana University Education Council forwards the proposal to each campus representative.

Faculty Senate votes on the proposal. If approved then the proposal is recommended to the Chancellor for approval. If disapproved then Faculty Senate president sends the proposal with
comments back to the originating faculty group. Each campus representative checks with the appropriate faculty members in their schools. Indiana University Education Council votes on the proposal. If disapproved then the campus education council representative brings the proposal with comments back to the SOE Dean and the proposing faculty group.

Chancellor acts on the proposal, either

a. Returning the proposal to the Senate for further revisions, explaining why the proposal should not go forward at this time; or

b. Recommending the proposal to the Academic Leadership Council (ALC).

If approved by the ALC, the proposal is sent to the President who decides when to present it to the Indiana University Board of Trustees.

7. If the IU Board of Trustees approves the proposal, then the proposal is submitted to the Indiana Commission for Higher Education as an action item.

8. If a new teaching license is involved then the proposing group must also follow the guidelines for new licenses.

**Approval Process for Major Changes in Degree Programs and Licensing Areas**

Major Changes [See Faculty Senate Constitution, By-Law No. 2 * explanations]. These changes would include: changing the number of credit hours (or any other changes that has this effect indirectly); changing the structure of the degree requirements; and creating new options within the degree (tracks, concentrations, etc.) if those involve adding courses to the set of program offerings or creating new patterns of course requirements.

1. Proposed changes are generated by faculty group in consultation with the program team coordinator.

2. Faculty group submits proposal to the appropriate program team.

3. Program team votes on the proposal. If approved then the program team coordinator submits the proposal to the CDQT as an action item. If disapproved or tabled then the program coordinator sends proposal with comments back to faculty group.

4. The CDQT votes on the proposal. If approved then the CDQT chair submits the proposal to the Dean of Education as an action item for the next School of Education (SOE) faculty meeting. If disapproved or tabled then the CDQT chair sends proposal with comments back to program team.

5. The SOE faculty votes on the proposal. If approved then the proposing school team coordinator submits the proposal to the campus Academic Policies Committee (APC) as an action item for
the next APC meeting and to the campus representative of the Indiana University Education Council for submission to the agenda committee as action item for the next Education Council meeting. If disapproved or tabled then the Dean of SOE sends proposal with comments back to either the CDQT, program team or the proposing faculty group.

6. **Campus Action IU Action**

APC votes on the proposal. If approved then APC submits proposal to Indiana University Southeast Faculty Senate as an action item for the next Indiana University Southeast Faculty Senate meeting. If disapproved then APC sends the proposal with comments back to the originating faculty group. The chair of the agenda committee of the Indiana University Education Council forwards the proposal to each campus representative.

Faculty Senate votes on the proposal. If disapproved then Faculty Senate president sends the proposal with comments back to the originating faculty group. Each campus representative checks with the appropriate faculty members in their schools. Indiana University Education Council votes on the proposal. If disapproved then the campus education council representative brings the proposal with comments back to the SOE Dean and the proposing faculty group.

Changes in the name of a degree require following the guidelines for degree proposals.

**Approval Process for Minor Changes in Degree Programs and Licensing Areas**

Minor Changes [See Faculty Senate Constitution, By-Law No. 2 * explanations]. These changes are defined as substituting one required course for another; creating options within the course offerings and degree structure, especially where these are primarily intended to allow students to pursue individual interests within the structure of the major.

1. Proposed changes are generated by faculty group in consultation with the program team coordinator.

2. Faculty group submits proposal to the appropriate program team as an information item.

3. If program team agrees that this is a minor change then the program team coordinator submits the proposal to the CDQT as an information item. If program team determines that this is a major change then the program coordinator sends proposal back to faculty group and informs them to follow the guidelines for major changes.

4. If CDQT agrees that this is a minor change then the CDQT submits the proposal to the Dean of Education as an information item for the next School of Education (SOE) faculty meeting. If CDQT determines that this is a major change then CDQT sends proposal back to program team and informs them to follow the guidelines for major changes.

5. If the SOE faculty agrees that this is a minor change then the proposing school team coordinator submits the proposal to the campus Academic Policies Committee (APC) as an
information item for the next APC meeting. If SOE determines that this is a major change then
the Dean sends proposal back to program team and informs them to follow the guidelines for
major changes.

6. If APC agrees that this is a minor change then APC submits proposal to Indiana
University Southeast Faculty Senate as an information item for the next Indiana University
Southeast Faculty Senate meeting. If APC determines that this is a major change then APC votes
on the proposal. If approved then APC submits proposal to Indiana University Southeast Faculty
Senate as an action item for the next Indiana University Southeast Faculty Senate meeting. If
disapproved then APC sends the proposal with comments back to the originating faculty group.

7. If Faculty Senate agrees that this is a minor change then proposed minor changes are
approved. If Faculty Senate determines that this is a major change then Faculty Senate votes on
the proposal. If approved then the proposal is recommended to the Chancellor for approval. If
disapproved then Faculty Senate president sends the proposal with comments back to the
originating faculty group.

Approval Process for New Licensing Areas

1. New licensing proposals are generated by a faculty group in consultation with the School
Dean and the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB).

2. Faculty group submits proposal to the appropriate program team.

3. Program team votes on the proposal. If approved then the program team coordinator
submits the proposal to the CDQT as an action item. If disapproved or tabled then the program
coordinator sends proposal with comments back to faculty group.

4. The CDQT votes on the proposal. If approved then the CDQT chair submits the proposal
to the School Dean as an action item for the next School of Education (SOE) faculty meeting. If
disapproved or tabled then the CDQT coordinator sends proposal with comments back to program team.

5. The SOE faculty votes on the proposal. If approved then the proposing school team
coordinator submits the proposal to the campus Academic Policies Committee (APC) as an
action item for the next APC meeting and to the campus representative of the Indiana University
Education Council for submission to the agenda committee as an action item for the next
Education Council meeting. If disapproved or tabled then the Dean of SOE sends proposal with
comments back to either the CDQT, program team or the proposing faculty group.

6. **Campus Action** .... **IU Action**

APC votes on the proposal. If approved then APC submits proposal to Indiana University
Southeast Faculty Senate as an action item for the next Indiana University Southeast Faculty
Senate meeting. If disapproved then APC sends the proposal with comments back to the originating faculty group. The chair of the agenda committee of the Indiana University Education Council forwards the proposal to each campus representative.

Faculty Senate votes on the proposal. If disapproved then Faculty Senate president sends the proposal with comments back to the originating faculty group. Each campus representative checks with the appropriate faculty members in their schools. Indiana University Education Council votes on the proposal. If disapproved then the campus education council representative brings the proposal with comments back to the SOE Dean and the proposing faculty group.

7. If both the IU Southeast Faculty Senate and the IU Education Council approve the proposal, then the IUS SOE Dean submits the proposal to the IPSB of the Department of Education as an action item.

8. If a new degree program is involved then the proposing group must also follow the guidelines for new degree programs.

Approval Process for New Courses* and Course Change Requests

1. Course syllabus developed by faculty member(s)

2. Faculty group submits proposal to the appropriate program team.

3. Program team votes on the proposal. If approved then the team follows the following guidelines:

   a. For a new course, the New Course Request Form is completed by the program team.

   b. For course changes the Course Change Request form is completed by the program team.

4. Program Team coordinator submits required form and syllabus to the CDQT as an action item.

5. CDQT reviews the form and syllabus especially as it addresses SOE themes, technology, program standards and SOE mission.

   a. If CDQT approves proposal, then CDQT submits the proposal to the Dean of Education as an action item for the next School of Education (SOE) faculty meeting.

   b. If the proposal is disapproved or tabled, then CDQT coordinator sends proposal with comments back to program team.

6. SOE faculty reviews the form and syllabus especially as it addresses SOE themes, technology, program standards and SOE mission.
a. If SOE faculty approves proposal, then the Dean and the VC for Academic Affairs sign form and Academic Affairs submits proposal to APC as an action item. Program Team submits proposal to the campus representative of the Indiana University Education Council for submission to the agenda committee as an action item.

b. If the proposal is disapproved or tabled, then Dean sends proposal with comments back to program team.

**Campus Action IU Action**

APC reviews the form and syllabus. If APC approves proposal, then APC submits the proposal to the Indiana University Southeast Faculty Senate as an action item for the next Indiana University Southeast Faculty Senate meeting. If the proposal is disapproved, then APC returns proposal to the originating faculty group. The campus representative of the Indiana University Education Council forwards the proposal to each campus representative.

Faculty Senate reviews the form and syllabus.

If Faculty Senate approves proposal, then Faculty Senate President submits proposal to the Chancellor for approval. If the proposal is disapproved, then Faculty Senate returns proposal to the originating faculty group. Each campus representative checks with the appropriate faculty members in their schools. Indiana University Education Council votes on the proposal. If disapproved, then the campus education council representative brings the proposal with comments back to the SOE Dean and the proposing faculty group.

7. If IU Education Council and Chancellor approve proposal, then the VC for Academic Affairs and/or IU Education Council sends the Request to comparable academic units throughout the Indiana University system for a 30-day remonstrance period.

8. If there is no remonstrance, the request goes to University Enrollment Services for entry into the Master Course Inventory.

*Faculty member(s) developing new courses may use temporary course numbers, such as EDUC E490, etc., a maximum of two times before starting the Approval Process for New Courses. Off-campus workshops should continue to use the graduate workshop numbers listed in “Guidelines for Graduate Credit Hour Generation in IU Education Workshops Offered by External Agencies” (April 2001).

**Offering an existing course on the Masters Course Inventory List that has not been taught at Indiana University Southeast**

1. Course syllabus developed by faculty member(s)

2. Faculty group submits course request proposal and syllabus to the appropriate program team.
9. Program team votes on the proposal. If approved then the program team coordinator submits course request and syllabus to the CDQT as an action item. If disapproved or tabled then the program coordinator sends proposal with comments back to faculty group.

3. CDQT reviews course request and syllabus especially as it SOE themes, technology, program standards and SOE mission.
   a. If CDQT approves proposal, then CDQT chair submits the course request proposal and syllabus to the Dean of Education as an action item for the next School of Education (SOE) faculty meeting
   b. If the proposal is disapproved or tabled, then CDQT chair sends proposal with comments back to program team.

4. SOE faculty reviews the course request and syllabus especially as it addresses SOE themes, technology, program standards and SOE mission.
   a. If SOE faculty approves proposal, then the program team coordinator submits course request proposal and syllabus to the Dean of Education’s office at Indiana University Bloomington.
   b. If the proposal is disapproved or tabled, then Dean sends proposal with comments back to program team.

5. Dean of Education’s office at Indiana University Bloomington sends the request to Education Council representatives throughout the Indiana University system for a 2-week remonstrance period.

6. If there is no remonstrance, then the course request is submitted to the Academic Affairs office and the Academic Affairs office is informed that the course has cleared remonstrance.
School of Education Dispositions

The items below are the standards for dispositions expected of students and faculty in the School of Education. Each standard is accompanied by a short list of behavioral indicators that the committee feels are associated with the standard. These lists are not exhaustive. They are included only to enlarge upon the intent and scope of each standard. These standards are the framework of dispositions expected within the unit. Each program is to develop a system tailored to its curriculum and needs that will (a) ensure that the standards are disseminated and explained to all students in the program; (b) ensure that standards are infused throughout the program; (c) hold students accountable for expected dispositions through ongoing assessment and scheduled reviews by faculty; (d) provide for action should a student’s behavior be inconsistent with these dispositions, including provisions for remediation, suspension, or termination from the program; (e) ensure that due process is accorded in any such actions; and (f) provide the program and unit with meaningful data regarding student compliance with these standards. The nature of these data will be determined by the individual programs in consultation with the Unit Assessment Quality Team.

Students and faculty in an IU Southeast Program in the School of Education...

1. ...respect the accepted legal and ethical norms and values of education. Examples of associated behaviors include, but are not limited to:
   1. Maintaining confidentiality of student records, parent communications, and private professional communications
   2. Using language free of profanity and derogatory statements toward any individual or groups
   3. Knowing and complying with legal requirements of the education profession
   4. Adhering to high standards of truthfulness and honesty
   5. Showing respect for the ethical and moral values and concerns of the school, students and community

2. ...effectively interact and collaborate with others and foster similar behaviors among students. Examples of associated behaviors include, but are not limited to:
   1. Willingly and actively participating in group assignments, projects or activities
   2. Contributing positively and equitably to projects involving others
   3. Seeking membership on collaborative projects
   4. Leading projects or activities in a fair and equitable manner
   5. Facilitating the functioning of all group members in a shared project
   6. Designing and using collaborative activities and assessments.

3. ...are committed to diversity through equitable treatment and respect for all individuals. Examples of associated behaviors include, but are not limited to:
   1. Being sensitive to the varying needs and dispositions of others
   2. Accepting and adapting to differences in learning styles and individual capabilities
   3. Facilitating learning by those with disabilities or with exceptional capabilities
4. Examining diverse values, languages, and traditions in a respectful manner
5. Giving thoughtful consideration to alternative and contradictory opinions

...exhibit personal management behaviors valued by the professional education community. Examples of associated behaviors include, but are not limited to:
1. Being present and punctual for professional activities and assigned duties
2. Being prepared for professional engagements
3. Completing assigned work on time
4. Showing leadership, self-respect and a willingness to take responsibility
5. Fostering a sense of self-respect and self-control in others
6. Respecting the intellectual property of others
7. Maintaining the confidentiality of private records and meetings
8. ...are committed to inquiry and application of the knowledge base of education.

Examples of associated behaviors include, but are not limited to:
1. Adopting contemporary modes of practice based on research and demonstrated best practices of the profession
2. Maintaining an analytical openness to new ideas expressed in the professional literature
3. Reading and learning continuously from the professional literature and professional development activities
4. Participating regularly and enthusiastically in professional development activities
6. ...exhibit enthusiasm and respect for education as a practice and a profession. Examples of associated behaviors include, but are not limited to:
1. Expressing positive attitudes and a commitment to quality education
2. Seeking opportunities to build positive relationships with others in the profession
3. Participating in the meetings and activities of local, state and national professional associations and organizations
4. Pursuing personal goals for professional development
5. Exhibiting care for quality in the preparation and implementation of educational activities
6. Being energetic and proactive in professional activities
7. Listening and responding to others with enthusiasm and care
8. Exhibiting positive leadership in professional activity
7. ...are committed to data-based decision-making and fair practices. Examples of associated behaviors include, but are not limited to:
1. Using data-based assessments to improve practice
2. Engaging in action research to test and evaluate new ideas and recommendations
3. Sharing the results of research with others
4. Collecting data to understand a situation before taking or recommending action
5. Ensuring that all problems are addressed with due process for all
6. Listening to children and families to ensure that their ideas and opinions are considered
8. ...are committed to continuous self-evaluation and personal improvement. Examples of associated behaviors include, but are not limited to:
1. Engaging in meaningful continuous reflective self-assessment and showing such assessment leads to plans for change
2. Demonstrating positive changes in educational practices or personal behaviors over time
3. Responding analytically and proactively to assessments by supervisors or others and making changes to address legitimate concerns
4. Actively seeking ways to solicit feedback for purposes of making quality improvements in practice
Merit Pay Committee

Charge to Committee: The Merit Pay Committee is designed as an advisory committee to the Dean of the SOE. The Dean is also encouraged to consult with coordinators regarding faculty contributions. Final decisions on merit pay remain with the Dean.

Suggested Infrastructure for Merit Pay Committee

There will be one committee with two subcommittees. One subcommittee will be tenure track and one lecture track. Tenure track will review tenure track annual review forms and lecturers will review lecture track annual review forms. Membership on the committee will be voluntary. Each faculty rank (lecturer and tenure track) will choose its own representatives by vote. No one may serve a second term until everyone in his/her rank has served at least once.

Lecture track members:

There will be two lecture track professors on the subcommittee. At least one will have at least three years experience. For the first cycle, the three-year person will serve two years. The other member will be replaced after one year. Following the initial year, all members will have a two-year commitment. One tenure track committee will read the evaluations of the two lecture committee members.

Tenure track members:

There will be one full professor, one associate professor and one assistant professor on this subcommittee. The terms for the first members elected to the committee will be as follows: associate, one year; full professor, two years; assistant professor, three years. Following the initial year, all newly elected members will have a three-year commitment.

Clarification

In the first year, the elected committees will develop the actual ratings process and bring it back to the faculty for discussion and vote before the process is implemented.

Copied from C:documents/merit pay 4.03
Mentoring Guidelines

Indiana University Southeast School of Education

All new faculty members will have a mentor. Mentoring new faculty is an activity the SOE strongly encourages and values. The unit is also supportive of mentoring that continues through appointment to full professor. Therefore, these guidelines are established to ensure a successful mentoring experience. The success of mentoring is the responsibility of each individual engaged in the experience. The SOE mentoring program involves mentor and the mentee. General guidelines for the mentor/mentee relationship are as follows.

Mentee (new faculty)

New faculty should take advantage of all opportunities associated with the SOE mentoring program and the IUS mentoring activities. Communication with the transition mentor prior to arrival through email with questions and other concerns is a good way to prepare for the upcoming academic year. Make an appointment with the Dean early in September to discuss the selection of the long-term mentor. The mentee can select the mentor. If the mentee declines, the Dean will appoint a mentor. Remember, any concerns that can not be addressed by the assigned mentor, should be directed to the Dean.

Mentee (existing faculty)

Existing faculty who have not reached the level of full professor or senior lecture have the option of requesting a mentor or continuing with an assigned mentor until he/she is appointed full professor or senior lecturer.

Transition Mentor (Temporary)

Mentoring begins the moment a candidate accepts a position in the SOE. The Dean or a designee shall serve as transition mentor until an official mentor is assigned.

Responsibilities:

1. E-mail, call and/or send correspondence at least twice before new faculty arrives on campus (i.e. IUS newsletters, copies of IUS annual reports or any other relevant material about IUS or the SOE).

2. Send information about the local community that might be of special interest to the new faculty member. The search committee could also do this.

3. Have secretary send a small bouquet of flowers to the new residence and/or welcome gift.

4. Assist new faculty with any arrangements needed for travel to the Fall SOE retreat.

5. Direct the new hire to people who can answer questions about housing or other resettlement issues.
6. Direct new faculty to program coordinator for information about syllabi, ordering textbooks, etc.

7. Offer a tour of the campus upon arrival.

**SOE Mentor**

It is preferred that the mentor not be the coordinator of the program of which the mentee was hired as to avoid conflicts of interests, however, if the mentee selects the coordinator as a mentor or if no other qualified person is willing or able to serve as a mentor, the coordinator may serve as the mentor. The new mentor will be selected by the end of September. Associate and full professors can mentor assistant professors and lecturers. Lecturers who have completed a third year review or have been named senior lecturers can mentor lecturers. The mentor should not be on sabbatical during the first year of mentorship.

**Responsibilities:**

1. There should be a minimum of two meetings per semester between the mentor and mentee.

2. The mentor will provide guidance in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship as applicable.

3. Offer assistance with
   a. Course evaluation process
   b. Assessment system
   c. Annual reporting procedures
   d. Travel and S & E funds
   e. Any other academic concerns

4. Arrange time to meet with professional staff and discuss their roles.

5. Discuss promotion and tenure (Dean will do most of this).

6. Help the mentee establish a solid foundation is most important.

7. If needed, help mentee establish contact with colleagues external to the SOE (i.e. local schools or IUS campus).

8. The mentoring relationship may end at tenure and promotion for assistants and those seeking senior lectureship. The relationship may end for lecturers after third year review, if the mentee is not seeking senior lectureship. A mentor may be appointed if senior lectureship or full professorship is pursued at a later date.

At the end of each year (spring semester) the mentee and mentor will meet with the Dean to discuss concerns or issues. The Dean will meet with each person separately to determine if the
match should continue or if there is a need for a new match. The official mentoring relationship will be re-evaluated each year.

Revised September 2003

Updated June 2004

Revised and Updated 2010-11

Approved by SOE faculty 4-15-11
The InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards (April 2011)
At A Glance

The Learner and Learning

Standard #1: Learner Development
The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

Standard #2: Learning Differences
The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

Standard #3: Learning Environments
The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

Content Knowledge

Standard #4: Content Knowledge
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.

Standard #5: Application of Content
The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.
Proposition 1: Teachers are committed to students and their learning.
Proposition 2: Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.
Proposition 3: Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.
Proposition 4: Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experiences.
Proposition 5: Teachers are members of learning communities.

Source: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) in What Teachers Should Know and Be Able To Do (1994).
CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION (SOE)

Adopted 3/2006

The criteria used for promotion and tenure for the School of Education are intended to guide and clarify the decisions made by the SOE Review Committee as well as any further reviews.

TEACHING

Excellence in teaching is an essential criterion for tenure and promotion in the School of Education. Therefore, a candidate for tenure and/or promotion must receive a rating of excellent in teaching by the School Review Committee. Every School of Education faculty member should serve as a role model for candidates in education. Effective teaching includes modeling best teaching practices, staying current on research in teaching, utilizing current content knowledge, being a reflective practitioner and practicing continuous renewal.

Evidence

In documenting effective teaching, the candidate for promotion and/or tenure may include the following evidence:

- Publications and/or presentations related to teaching
- Use of variety of instructional strategies
- Innovative technology such as the development of online resources and courses, electronic books, online publications about teaching, and others as documented
- Inclusion of diversity concepts in curriculum
- Development of innovative instructional support materials
- Development of new programs and courses
- Professional development in teaching
- Grants applied for/received related to teaching
- Knowledge base that reflects current research in teaching and course content
- Professional development in content area
- Course revisions based on multiple sources of feedback on effectiveness: self evaluation, candidate evaluations, peer evaluations, candidate learning, program evaluations
- Learning goals clearly established for each course
• Measure of effectiveness for each course related to course or program goals and outcomes
• Mentoring and/or collaborating with colleagues on teaching
• Student activities related to teaching

Required Evidence

• The faculty member must submit a minimum of three peer reviews of his or her teaching, one of which must be by an ILTE trained review. At least one review should be from a faculty member in another school. All should be based upon direct observation(s).

• The faculty member must show evidence that courses he/she teaches have been revised based on multiple sources of feedback.

Descriptors

For promotion and tenure from Assistant to Associate Professor, faculty are expected to establish a record of effective teaching in an appropriate range of courses that support the mission of the school.

Excellent - the candidate has developed an outstanding record of effective teaching across a range of courses that supports the mission and needs of the School. The SOE requires a rating of excellent in teaching.

Satisfactory - the candidate has developed a record of effective teaching in an appropriate range of courses that supports the mission and needs of the School. The SOE requires a rating of excellent in teaching.

Unsatisfactory - the candidate has not developed a record of effective teaching in appropriate courses.

For promotion from Associate to Full Professor, faculty are expected to establish while at the rank of Associate Professor a record of effective teaching plus evidence of functioning as a senior model and leader within the discipline, campus, university, or profession.

Excellent – the candidate has developed a consistently outstanding record of effective teaching and evidence of unusually effective functioning as a model and leader within the discipline, campus, university and/or profession. The SOE requires a rating of Excellent in teaching.

Satisfactory – the candidate has developed a consistent record of effective teaching and evidence of functioning as a model and leader within the discipline, campus, university and/or profession. The SOE requires a rating of Excellent in teaching.

Unsatisfactory – candidate has not developed a strong and consistent record of effective teaching and evidence of functioning as a model and leader within the discipline, campus, university or profession.
SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship entails systematic inquiry, attainment of a level of expertise, and communication of that expertise to others. An effective scholar has identified areas of expertise that enrich his/her teaching and service; contributes to these areas through a systematic body of work; and shares contributions with professionals beyond the campus. Because of collaborations with agencies and school districts, the School of Education faculty has a unique and appropriate opportunity to participate in applied research. Applied research may involve policy studies, research based curriculum development, best education practices and many other scholarly endeavors, which expand the knowledge based in the education profession. The School of Education faculty sees applied research as a culminating experience that allows them to bring together theory and practice in a tangible, meaningful way. Theoretical and historical studies are also encouraged.

Evidence

In documenting effective scholarship, the candidate for promotion and/or tenure should include examples from several of the following categories of evidence:

- **Publications**
  - Articles in professional journals
  - Book chapters
  - Books
  - On-line professional publications
  - Electronic Books
  - Peer reviewed conference proceedings
  - Research based curriculum materials
  - Others as documented

- **Presentations at professional meetings (state, regional, national and/or international)**

- **Scholarship-related grant applications and/or grant reports**

- **Consultations based on inquiry based expertise as defined by Boyers (will include documentation through reports or data collected)**

- **Application of expertise to applied situations (will include reports or data)**

Descriptors

For promotion and tenure from Assistant to Associate Professor, faculty are expected to establish a record of scholarship that support the mission of the school.
Excellent - has developed a post-doctoral program of scholarship and has produced an outstanding record of sharing this work within the profession.

Satisfactory - has developed a post-doctoral program of scholarship and has produced a record of successful sharing this work with professionals.

Unsatisfactory - has not developed a post-doctoral program of scholarship and/or has not produced a record of successful sharing of the work with professionals.

For promotion from Associate to Full Professor, faculty are expected to establish while at the rank of Associate Professor a record of effective scholarship plus evidence of functioning as a senior model and leader within the discipline, campus, university, or profession.

Excellent – the candidate has developed a consistently outstanding record of scholarship and evidence of unusually effective functioning as a model and leader within the discipline, campus, university or profession.

Satisfactory – the candidate has developed a consistent record of scholarship and evidence of functioning as a model and leader within the discipline, campus, university or profession.

Unsatisfactory – candidate has not developed a strong and consistent record of scholarship and evidence of functioning as a model and leader within the discipline, campus, university or profession.

To receive a rating of at least Satisfactory a candidate for promotion and/or tenure must show:

1. Publications in professional forums at least two of which must be peer reviewed.

2. Evidence of three or more peer reviewed presentations at regional, national or international meetings.

3. Evidence of variety of other scholarly work that can include research based curriculum materials, consultations, grants and applications of expertise to applied settings.

To receive a rating of Excellent a candidate for promotion and/or tenure must excel in at least two of items 1, 2, or 3.

SERVICE

Service in the School of Education includes active involvement and leadership in: the School, the campus, the university system, and the external community. Service also includes involvement and leadership in local, state, regional and national professional organizations related to one’s discipline(s) and to the education profession. Key in the evaluation of service is the worth of the contribution toward the accomplishment of the specific mission of the School of Education and the broader mission of the University.

Evidence
In documenting effective service, the candidate for promotion and/or tenure may include the following evidence.

- **Institution:** Effective membership demonstrated through active participation in and leadership of
  - the candidate’s specific discipline,
  - the School of Education,
  - IUS (campus) and IU (system) committees,
  - IUS and/or IU task forces,
  - IUS and/or IU projects.
- **Profession:** Active participation in professional organizations demonstrated through
  - attending meetings,
  - participating in the operations of the organization,
  - serving in leadership positions,
  - serving on state or national education committees,
  - mentoring of new and other professionals.
- **Candidate:** Active involvement with candidates and students as demonstrated through
  - effective candidate academic and career advising,
  - mentorship of students,
  - mentorship of candidates,
  - support for candidate organizations and other candidate activities.
- **Community:** Involvement in the community through service to the
  - local schools,
  - social agencies and governments,
  - other community organizations.
- **Recognition of service:** Recognition of service through
  - awards,
  - citations,
  - commendations
Descriptors

For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor faculty are expected to achieve a record of service to various levels of the university, to the profession, and/or to the external community.

Excellent - has developed an outstanding record of service to various levels of the unit, campus, university, the profession, and/or the external community and is a contributing member of the academic community.

Satisfactory - has developed a strong record of service to various levels of the university, the profession, and/or the external community and is a contributing member of the academic community.

Unsatisfactory - has not developed a strong record of service to the university, the profession, and/or the external community and/or become a contributing member of the academic community.

For promotion from Associate to Full Professor faculty are expected to establish while at the rank of Associate Professor; a record of extensive service and leadership to various levels of the university, the profession, and/or the external community.

Excellent - has developed a consistently outstanding record of service and leadership to various levels of the unit, campus, university, the profession, and/or the community and is a contributing member of the academic community.

Satisfactory - has developed an extensive and consistent record of service and leadership to various levels of the university, the profession, and/or the community and is a contributing member of the academic community.

Unsatisfactory - has not developed an extensive and consistent record of service and leadership to various levels of the university, the profession, and/or the community and/or a contributing member of the academic community.

To receive a rating of at least Satisfactory a candidate for promotion and tenure must show:

1. Evidence of membership and active participation in a variety of institutional and professional endeavors including a minimum of two leadership positions.
2. Evidence of a variety of methods of work with candidates and/or students.
3. Evidence of a variety of involvement in community service

To receive a rating of Excellent a candidate for promotion and tenure must excel in at least two of items 1, 2, or 3.

This document is effective for anyone appointed to a tenure-track position in the School of Education after April 2006.

3-06
School Criteria for Promotion from Full-time Lecturer to Full-time Senior Lecturer; and from Part-time Lecturer to Part-time Senior Lecturer

Approved February 2003

This document serves as the stated mission and the criteria to be used in the evaluation procedures for promotion from Full-time Lecturer to Full-time Senior Lecturer and from Part-time Lecturer to Part-time Senior Lecturer specific to the School of Education.

For promotion from Full-time Lecturer to Full-time Senior Lecturer in the School of Education, candidates are assessed in the areas of teaching and service to the university. While the School believes a balance should be achieved between the two categories it is expected that teaching will be a priority. Successful candidates must receive either one excellent ranking and one satisfactory ranking or two excellent rankings.

For promotion from Part-time Lecturer to Part-time Senior Lecturer in the SOE, candidates are assessed in the area of teaching. Successful candidates must receive an excellent ranking.

Mission

The mission of Indiana University Southeast School of Education is to develop high quality, caring professionals who are leaders in the continuous transformation of schools within a diverse society.

Teaching

A goal of the SOE is excellence in teaching. Every School of Education faculty should serve as a role model for both undergraduates and graduates in education. Effective teaching includes making effective use of the processes of setting course objectives, pre-assessing, designing strategies to reach the objectives, evaluating student’s learning through short and long term feedback and making subsequent course work revisions.

Items such as the following should be submitted for assessment; there is no rigid formula for evaluating or weighting them. Teaching involves activities directly related to the classroom as well as outside the classroom. In documenting effective teaching, the candidate for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer may include the following as evidence. This list should not be considered an exhaustive or preclusive list. No priority is implied by the order.

• Statement of teaching achievement in the context of teaching goals and objectives
• Information about how teaching activities relate directly to the classroom
• New courses taught
• Course development (e.g., preparation for course syllabi, development of multimedia materials for classroom use and creation of materials for student work beyond the classroom)
• Delivery of courses (e.g., integrating new knowledge and perspectives into course materials, preparing prior to each class, directing class discussion and learning groups and other
forms of active student involvement, arranging guest lectures and maintenance of scheduled office hours each week)

- Evaluations of student learning (e.g., developing standards for student performance, preparing examinations, quizzes and laboratory evaluations; preparing instructions for written and oral presentations; student conferences, reading, evaluating, and grading assignments; making written comments and suggestions on written assignments; and maintaining student records)

- Evidence that teaching effectiveness extends beyond the classroom (e.g., participating in individual student conferences; mentoring students through support of their research activities)

- Student advising (e.g., giving advice on course selection, providing career guidance, providing personal counseling and referral, writing letters of recommendation or supervising pre-professional student organizations)

- Curriculum development (e.g., serving on curriculum committees, exploring and developing new teaching approaches and technologies and participating in regional and national conferences on curriculum development)

- Program assessment activities (e.g., designing and implementing multiple strategies to assess effectiveness and student outcomes, analyzing course and departmental student outcomes to consider modification or improvement of curriculum and instruction, observing and evaluating teaching materials and performance of colleagues and addressing and meeting external accreditation and assessment requirements)

- Scholarship related to teaching (e.g., writing articles and monographs on teaching and learning theory, preparing grant proposals that support teaching-related research, implementation of new teaching approaches and sponsoring students to attend and participate in research meetings)

- Service related to teaching (e.g., recruiting, orienting and mentoring new faculty; evaluating faculty teaching; participating in professional conferences on teaching; speaking and consulting with private and community organizations concerning topics related to teaching areas; interacting with high-school administrators, teachers and students; attending student research conferences and advising student organizations)

- Evidence of the use of multiple methods of assessment that provide feedback about your efforts to enhance your teaching effectiveness and that provide information about how well students are succeeding in meeting the learning goals and objectives you have identified for your courses

- Evidence of a regular cycle of assessment that helps you improve your teaching and helps you assess the effectiveness with which course related activities contribute to students developing skills and knowledge related to course learning objectives

- Information about awards or other forms of recognition related to teaching.
Criteria for Teaching

For promotion from Full-time Lecturer to Full-time Senior Lecturer

For promotion from Part-time Lecturer to Part-time Senior Lecturer

Excellent—the candidate has developed an outstanding record of effective teaching across a range of courses that supports the mission and needs of the school.

Satisfactory—the candidate has developed a record of effective teaching in an appropriate range of course that supports the mission and needs of the school.

Unsatisfactory—the candidate has not developed a record of effective teaching that supports the mission and needs of the school.

Service

Service in the School of Education includes active involvement and leadership in the School, the campus, the university system, and the external community. Service is work that engages a faculty member’s knowledge, skills, and expertise for the benefit of students, academic units, the campus, the university, the discipline, the profession and the community. Service includes activities compensated by reassigned time. Service can be organized into four categories; service to students, service to the institution, service to the discipline/profession, and service to the community. Goals for service should be established and evidence toward those goals should be assessed by both quality and quantity indicators which enable the person to affirm and approve their work and to be rated and rewarded. Indicators of quality include: impact/significance of the service, level of intellectual contribution, importance of the role played, communication and dissemination of the product, relationship to mission and integration with personal professional development. Indicators of quantity include time spent, meetings attended and work done beyond meeting time.

The candidate for promotion should identify and describe the focus (foci) of the service activity, include evidence of both the quality and quantity of service within the areas of service to students, service to the institution, service to the discipline/profession and service to the community. In documenting effective service, the candidate for promotion may include the following evidence:

Service to Students

• Presentations to students
• Participation in orientation
• Advising or coaching student groups
• Attendance at student events
• Service on student committees

Service to the Institution
• Serving on campus and university system committees
• Serving on task forces and special work groups
• Receiving award for service

Service to Discipline/Profession
• Participating in state, regional and national professional organizations
• Serving on committees or as an officer in these organizations
• Providing leadership for the organization and implementation of conferences and publications, such as newsletters

Service to the Community
• Active participation in community organizations and youth groups
• Service as a board member or officer of these organizations
• Consulting with organizations
• Providing information or analyses for media
• Giving presentations to organizations
• Participating in collaborative endeavors with public and private agencies

Criteria for Service

For promotion from Full-time Lecturer to Full-time Senior Lecturer, and
For promotion from Part-time Lecturer to Part-time Senior Lecturer

Excellent- the candidate has developed an outstanding record of service to various levels of the university, the profession, and/or the external community and is a contributing member of the academic community.

Satisfactory-the candidate has developed a strong record of service to various levels of the university, the profession, and/or the external community and is a contributing member of the academic community.

Unsatisfactory- the candidate has not developed a strong record of service to the university, the profession, and/or the external community and/or become a contributing member of the academic community.