



# COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES

## Criteria and Standards for Promotion – Non-Tenure Track

The standards for promotion in the College of Health Sciences (COHS) at Sam Houston State University (SHSU) reflect a commitment to academic excellence. Each faculty member in the COHS is expected to demonstrate excellence in the areas of teaching, and service, and maintain currency in the appropriate academic field through scholarship and/or engaged practice. The standards set forth in this document are consistent with and subservient to D S S O S H S D A C o d e m i c P o l i c y and the Texas [4x] Te

that hold the rank of Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Full Professor, Associate Professor of Practice, Professor of Practice, Senior Lecturer, Senior Clinical Lecturer, Associate Research Professor, Research Professor, Associate Professor (tenured), or Full Professor (tenured). Those non-tenured faculty seeking promotion to Clinical Professor, Professor of Practice, or Research Professor will be

that demonstrates a sustained pattern of performance. ~~More~~ ~~track~~ faculty candidates for promotion will develop a teaching narrative addressing their approach, preparation, and performance of the practice of teaching, including outcomes. A candidate will address their strengths as a teacher, areas needing improvement, results of student, peer, and chair evaluations, how these results have enhanced teaching, and any relevant information deemed important for documenting and supporting teaching effectiveness. In the case of teaching scores below the departmental, college/university average, the candidate should address these occurrences in the narrative, taking care to note problems, actions to rectify them, and extenuating circumstances that may have led to lower than expected scores. In the case of higher scores, the candidate should likewise identify strengths to retain, successful teaching strategies, training that contributed to success, and fortuitous circumstances.

Student evaluation scores/ratings are generally expected to show growth or maintenance as appropriate over time. While global ratings from the student evaluation instrument provide a good overview of teaching effectiveness, the ~~DE~~ members, department chair, and dean should consider other data included in the evaluation system. In addition, information about course characteristics (e.g., class size, required/elective, lower/upper division) should be considered when reviewing evaluation results.

While student evaluations are a valuable source of information, scores should be interpreted in the context of other materials documenting pedagogical achievement. Per APS, Section 4.01, "No more than 50% of the teaching evaluation may be based on surveys of student perceptions of teaching." The department chair, through annual evaluation of the candidate during the probationary period, will address additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. Faculty are in a unique position to evaluate and provide specific feedback on aspects of teaching that are beyond the expertise of, ~~student~~ ~~peer~~ evaluations are a key component of the teaching evaluation. ~~A candidate has the right to nominate to the chair/director the individual(s) providing the peer evaluation. However, the chair/director will make the final selection of the reviewer(s). The evaluator(s) will use the department's/school's peer evaluation form.~~

Demonstration of effective pedagogy may also include: contributions to curriculum; participation in curriculum planning, course development, or revisions; innovative use of technologies or teaching strategies; recognition of teaching expertise in the form of awards and/or honors; implementation of service-learning or Academic Community Engagement (ACE) designated coursework; participation in workshops or other professional development intended to enhance teaching; evidence of student involvement (e.g., advising, mentorship, student organizations, Honors projects, and other student activities connected with teaching and mentorship); pedagogical publications and/or presentations that demonstrate and provide evidence of teaching effectiveness.

---

The importance of scholarly activity in academia is ~~fold~~: discovery and practice. ~~Not~~ ~~more~~ track faculty should consult with their chair/director for guidance on the types of activities that fulfill their contractual requirements and therefore serve as the basis upon which a candidate is evaluated for promotion.

The scholarship of discovery, whereby new knowledge is created and disseminated. Scholarship focused on engaged practice is less prevalent, and ~~not~~ ~~in~~ the form of consulting, white papers, creative endeavors, internship/clinical placement development, and volunteer service in community organizations that require professional expertise. Participation in workshops and/or

conferences that demonstrate continuing professional education to remain current in one's field are also encouraged, as are providing clinical education units to one's field. Other examples of engaged practice include actual clinical or field-based practice, involvement in quality improvement projects, development of best practice guidelines, and more generally, leading in practice change. These forms of activity are valuable and serve the same purpose for the individual, which is to maintain currency in one's chosen academic field.

The evaluation of scholarly activity and engaged practice, that of teaching, should be holistic, drawing from a variety of sources of evidence that reflects a sustained pattern of performance. COHS faculty and academic administrators believe the best way to evaluate scholarly activity is through a narrative addressing a candidate's accomplishments and progress related to scholarship (both traditional and creative), and/or engaged practice activity. Within the narrative, candidates should describe their activity in relation to the discipline; progress in initiating and completing projects; methodological approaches to scholarship; consulting efforts; professional development at workshops or seminars; works in progress; and self-evaluation of scholarship and/or engaged practice. Sources contributing to a narrative include but may not be limited to: (1) traditional forms of scholarship, such as peer-reviewed scholarly publications (including articles, books and chapters, and monographs), published conference proceedings, and presentations at international, national, state, and regional conferences; (2) creative scholarship, such as visual essays, demonstrations/displays, design portfolios, commissioned works, and exhibitions; and (3) engaged practice examples, including presentations of clinical education hours/units, invited publications, published white papers, external and internal grants, consulting contracts, clinical or field practice and/or evidence of leadership in practice change; certificates of completion, licensures and other professional credentials within the field, advanced training, and other indicators addressed in this section. It should be noted that the examples provided above are not exhaustive and not tenure track faculty members are encouraged to visit with their Chair / Director and/or the COHS Dean should there be a question about a faculty member's cited example(s) of scholarship.

In summary, the body of work is expected to show that the overall composite of the candidate's scholarly or practice activity is substantial, balanced

For Award of Promotion from Clinical Lecturer to Senior Clinical Lecturer

Per [APS 890301](#), Section 5.02, “the candidate must have served at least (5) years in the rank of Clinical Lecturer of Practice. During these years, the candidate must have demonstrated sustained excellence based on department and college criteria for teaching/librarianship/scholarly/creative activities, and/or service, in accordance with the faculty member’s annual departmental offer letters. Excellence in any one area will not compensate for lack of sustained effectiveness in other assigned areas.” Guidelines for consideration for promotion to Senior Clinical Lecturer include:

Quality teaching, with diversity in styles, methods, and settings, is central to the COHS mission. As a craft, teaching is a continuous process. Each year, the faculty member should demonstrate a commitment to the craft, teaching, and service to the community.



---

Professional service is essential to the success of each department/school and the COHS as a whole. As in the case of teaching, and scholarly activity, the faculty member should include a ~~representative~~

While student evaluations are a valuable source of information, scores should be interpreted in the context of other materials documenting pedagogical achievement. Per [APS 890301](#), Section 4.01, “No more than 50% of the teaching evaluation may be based on surveys of student perceptions of teaching.” The department chair, through annual evaluation of the candidate during the probationary period, will address additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. Faculty are in a unique position to evaluate and provide specific feedback on aspects of teaching that are beyond the expertise of students, and peer evaluations are a key component of the teaching evaluation. A candidate has the right to nominate to the chair/director the individual(s) providing the peer evaluation. However, the chair/director will make the final selection of the reviewer(s). The evaluator(s) will use the department’s/school’s peer evaluation form.

36zctnt;rrre a2 (on )TJ c1 (n)1 (2(r)-2(i)-2 (on )5 (of)-2 ( e)-1 (.004 Tc 03 Tw 7.1-1 9.6 (vi)0)1 o)5 [-1 (d on



scholarly publications (including articles, books and chapters, and monographs), published conference proceedings, and presentations at international, national, state, and regional conferences; (2) creative scholarship, such as visual essays, demonstrations/displays, design portfolios, commissioned works, and exhibitions; and (3) engaged practice examples, including presentations at clinical education hours/units, invited publications, published white papers, external and internal grants, consulting contracts, clinical or field practice and/or evidence of leadership in practice change; certificates of completion, licensures and other professional credentials within the field, advanced training, and other indicators addressed in this section. It should be noted that the examples provided above are not exhaustive and not tenure track. Faculty members are encouraged to visit with their Chair / Director (2rir enip Td 9(2dur.Ba1 ( e)1 (n)2 (c)1 hyre ehei1 (c)511 (( )5 (a)c (s)1 (u)lty); ireueschedenamples (ro)72', eaions5

will develop a teaching narrative addressing their approach, preparation, and performance of the practice of teaching, including outcomes. A candidate will address their strengths as a teacher, areas needing improvement, results of student, peer, and chair evaluations, how these results have enhanced teaching, and any relevant information deemed important for documenting and supporting teaching effectiveness. In the case of teaching scores below the departmental, college, or university average, the candidate should address these occurrences in the narrative, taking care to note problems and actions to rectify them and extenuating circumstances that may have led to lower than expected scores. In the case of higher scores, the candidate should likewise identify strengths to retain, successful teaching strategies, training that contributed to success, and fortuitous circumstances.

Student evaluation scores/ratings are generally expected to show growth or maintenance as appropriate over time. Per [APS 890301](#), Section 4.01, "No more than 50% of the teaching evaluation may be based on surveys of student perceptions of teaching." While global ratings from the student evaluation instrument provide a good overview of teaching effectiveness, the DPAC members, department chair/school director, and dean should consider other data included in the evaluation system. In addition, information about course characteristics (e.g., class size, required/elective, lower/upper division) should be considered when reviewing evaluation results.

While student evaluations are a valuable source of information, scores should be interpreted in the context of other materials documenting pedagogical achievement. The department chair, through annual evaluation of the candidate during the probationary period, will address additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. Faculty are in a unique position to evaluate and provide specific feedback on aspects of teaching that are beyond the expertise of students, and peer evaluations are a key component of the teaching evaluation process.

development of best practice guidelines, and more generally, leading in practice change. These forms of activity are valuable and serve the same purpose for the individual, which is to maintain or enhance one's chosen academic field.

The evaluation of scholarly activity like that of teaching should be holistic, drawing from a variety of sources of evidence that reflects a sustained pattern of performance. COHS faculty and academic administrators believe that the best way to evaluate scholarly activity is through creation of a narrative that addresses a candidate's accomplishments and progress related to scholarship and/or engaged practice activity. Within the narrative, candidates should describe their activity in relation to the discipline; progress in initiating and completing projects; methodological approaches to scholarship; consulting efforts; professional development at workshops or seminars; works in progress; and self-evaluation of scholarship and/or engaged practice. Other examples of engaged practice include actual clinical or field-based practice, involvement in quality improvement projects, development of best practice guidelines, and more generally, leading in practice changes contributing to a narrative include but may not be limited to:



professional development intended to enhance teaching; evidence of student involvement (e.g., advising, mentorship, student organizations, Honors projects, and other student activities connected with teaching and mentorship) and pedagogical publications and/or presentations that demonstrate and provide evidence of teaching effectiveness.

---

The importance of scholarly activity in academia is ~~fold~~: discovery and practice. ~~Non~~ ~~tenure~~ track faculty should consult with their chair/director for guidance on the types of activities that fulfill their contractual requirements and therefore serve as the basis upon which a cand (()-2 (e)-1 (.u--1 (eac5 (in)1 (s

Professional service is essential to the success of each department/school and the COHS as a whole. As in the case of teaching and scholarly activity, the faculty member should include a narrative that explains the kind of service in which they have been involved and the significance of

information about course characteristics (e.g., class size, required/elective, lower/upper division) should be considered when reviewing evaluation results.

While student evaluations are a valuable source of information, scores should be interpreted in the context of other materials documenting pedagogical achievement. The department chair, through annual evaluation of the candidate during the probationary period, will address additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. Faculty are in a unique position to evaluate and provide specific feedback on aspects of teaching that are beyond the expertise of students, and peer evaluations are a key component of the teaching evaluation. A candidate has the right to nominate to the chair the individual/s providing the evaluation. The evaluator/s will use the department's peer evaluation form.

Demonstration of effective pedagogy may also include: contributions to curriculum; participation in course development or revisions; innovative use of technologies or teaching strategies; recognition of teaching expertise in the form of awards and/or honors; implementation of service-learning or Academic Community in 3 (696-2 (t)-1 ved2) 6.167 (rds)

publications (including articles, books and chapters, and monographs), published conference proceedings and presentations at international, national, state and regional conferences; (2) creative scholarships such as visual essays, demonstrations/displays, design portfolios, commissioned works, and exhibitions; and (3) engaged practice examples, including presentations of clinical education hours/units, invited publications, published white papers, external and internal grants, consulting contracts, clinical or field practice and/or evidence of projects, etc.



The scholarship of discovery whereby new knowledge is created and disseminated is the norm. Scholarship focused on engaged practice is less prevalent, and often takes the form of consulting, white papers, creative endeavors, internship/clinical placement development, and volunteer service in community organizations that require professional expertise. Participation in workshops and/or conferences that demonstrate continuing professional education to remain current in one's field are also encouraged, as are providing clinical education units to others. Other examples of engaged practice include actual clinical or field-based practice, involvement in quality improvement projects, development of best practice guidelines, and more generally, leading in practice change. These forms of activity are valuable and serve the same purpose for the individual, which is to maintain currency in one's chosen academic field.

The evaluation of scholarly activity should be holistic, drawing from a variety of sources of evidence that reflects a sustained pattern of performance. COHS faculty and academic administrators believe the best way to evaluate scholarly activity is through a narrative addressing a candidate's accomplishments and progress related to scholarship (both traditional and creative), and/or engaged activity. Within the narrative, candidates should describe their activity in relation to the discipline; progress in initiating and completing projects; methodological approaches to scholarship; consulting efforts; professional development at workshops or seminars; works in progress; and self-evaluation of scholarship and/or engaged practice. Sources contributing to a narrative include but may not be limited to: (1) traditional forms of scholarship, such as peer-reviewed scholarly publications (including articles, books and chapters, and monographs), published conference proceedings, and presentations at international, national, state, and regional conferences; (2) creative scholarship, such as visual essays, demonstrations/displays, design portfolios, commissioned works, and exhibitions; and (3) dissemination or additional examples of scholarly activity examples, including invited publications, published white papers, external and internal grants, patents, trademarks, contracts, advanced training, and other indicators addressed in this section. It should be noted that the examples provided above are not exhaustive and not tenure track. Faculty members are encouraged to visit with their Chair / Director and/or the COHS Dean should there be a question about a faculty member's cited example(s) of scholarship.

In summary, the body of work is expected to show that the overall composite of the candidate's scholarly or practical activity is substantial, balanced, and shows future promise for continuation

---

Professional service is essential to the success of each department/school and the COHS as a whole. As in the case of teaching, and scholarly activity, the faculty member should include a narrative that explains the kinds of service in which they have been involved and the significance of their involvement. While service takes many forms and varies by department/school, candidate must have demonstrated sustained involvement in service to the department, college, university, profession, and/or community. Evidence of involvement may include, but not be limited to, the following:

assigned to service as the leader or significant contributor to program accreditation self-study and related reports.

For

