

## Non Tenure Track Portfolio Guide for Promotion

### PROCEDURE:

1. NTT faculty seeking advancement will submit their letter of intent for advancement to their department head (CD) in the Fall Semester, by October 1st.
2. The candidate will submit their application to the CD by December 1st.
3. The CD will respond to the candidate no later than January 1st.
4. The candidate shall have the portfolio for review to the committee by February 1.
5. The department review committee shall make recommendations to the department head (CD) by March 1.
6. The CD will make a recommendation to the Dean by April 1st.
7. The dean will make a final decision and notify the candidate by April 30th.

This guide is arranged to assist Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty through the promotion process. Prior to completing the portfolio, faculty must provide written *notification of intent* to the Campus Director (CD).

This formal letter of intent should include: the desire to advance, a philosophy of teaching statement, future goals, reason for seeking promotion, and a brief summary of qualifications for the level of promotion. Additionally, the faculty candidate must submit the names of two faculty members familiar with his/her work who will be providing letters of peer review to the CD.

In this guide faculty will find a checklist of documents recommended to be included in the portfolio. While it is expected applicants will follow the table of contents specified in this guide when constructing their portfolio, the applicant is encouraged to create a unique document that accurately reflects their teaching/learning materials, style, and accomplishments. Examples of recommended documents are provided, these are not exhaustive lists, the applicant is encouraged to include appropriate materials as they see fit. To assist in the preparation process there are several appendix accompanying this document, these should all be reviewed/utilized before submission.

Faculty Candidates are encouraged to utilize the NTT promotion policy, current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), and College of Nursing (CON) matrix along with this guide as the portfolio is created.

The NTT promotion policy and CBA will identify a timelines for the faculty candidate.

## **NTT Portfolio Preparation Checklist**

### **Items Added to Before Submission to Department Head**

#### **Responsibility: Candidate**

- Cover Sheet
- Table of Contents
- Curriculum vitae
- Materials Indicative of Teaching Performance and the Scholarship of Teaching
  - Peer Evaluation Forms
  - Summary from the last three years of each course taught
  - Sample of Teaching Materials (as appropriate to level of promotion)
  - Annual CD Evaluation Summary for 150 workload units, or in accordance with the current CBA\* (see page 3)
- Materials Indicative of Evidence the Scholarship of Practice/Application
  - As appropriate to level (example, Clinical Professor conducts, designs, and implements clinical projects)
- Materials Indicative of Performance in Outreach/Service-The Scholarship of Integration
- Summary Indicative of Professional Development
  - Examples:
    - Continuing Education
    - Certifications

### **Items Added Promotion Portfolio Before NTT Committee Review**

#### **Responsibility: Campus Director**

- Letter from CD Recommending Review
- Two letters of Review from Colleagues submitted to CD

### **Items Added to Portfolio During Review Process**

#### **Responsibility: NTT Review Committee**

- Evaluation summaries added as reviews are completed
- Decision and vote tally added to cover sheet as each review is completed

## Guide

### Items Added Before Submission to the CD:

Cover Sheet (Appendix A)

Candidates are encouraged to use the NTT promotion policy, CBA, and College of Nursing (CON) matrix to determine their promotion level.

### Table of Contents

- A. Curriculum vitae
- B. Materials Indicative of Teaching Performance and the Scholarship of Teaching
- C. Materials Indicative of Evidence the Scholarship of Practice/Application
- D. Materials Indicative of Performance in Outreach/Service-The Scholarship of Integration
- E. Summary Indicative of Professional Development
- F. Letter from CD Recommending Review
- G. Letters of Review from Colleagues submitted to CD
- H. Evaluation summaries added as reviews are completed by NTT Review Committee

### A. Curriculum Vitae

Up to date CV downloaded from Activity Insight.

### B. Materials Indicative of Teaching Performance and the Scholarship of Teaching

- Peer evaluations of teaching (Appendix B)
- Student evaluations summary for *each* course taught (see documentation categories)
- Sample of Teaching Materials (as appropriate to level of promotion)
  - Syllabus for each course taught
  - Clinical Evaluation Tool
  - Innovative integration examples
    - Simulation
    - Concept mapping
    - TED TALKS
    - Flipping the classroom
    - Overall KNAPP evaluation rating
- Annual CD Evaluation Summary of 150 workload units, or in accordance with the current CBA.

### Documentation Category-Competence and Effectiveness in Teaching at the Rank of Assistant Teaching/Clinical Professor:

To determine Candidate effectiveness in Teaching, the NTT committee member will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews (last three years) from the Campus Director that addresses the

reviewee's teaching and advising activities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of effectiveness in teaching.

2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from Two (2) faculty colleagues that addresses the reviewee's teaching abilities. This input must be related to teaching criteria and standards of effectiveness. Overall, the input must address both classroom and clinical teaching and at least one of the faculty colleagues providing input must be in the same clinical specialty area as the faculty member (Appendix B).

3. Student evaluations of courses taught at MSU during the three years (3 years) preceding the review. In those instances when the individual has done a substantial amount of guest lecturing, evaluative data which have been solicited appropriately and anonymously from students may be included [FH 610].

4. Student evaluations of advising during the previous two years.

5. In depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee's strengths and limitations in relation to teaching and advising; analyzes previous evaluative input from student, peers, colleagues, and supervisor; discusses rationale for any identified teaching problems; and identifies specific strategies to improve areas of weakness in teaching. Include a "vision" statement of the reviewee's teaching with a specific plan for sustaining effectiveness in teaching.

**Documentation Category: Proficient and Effective in Teaching at the rank of Associate Clinical/Teaching Professor**

To determine a faculty member's Proficiency and Effectiveness in teaching, the NTT committee will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews (last three years) from the Campus Director that address the reviewee's teaching and advising activities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in teaching.

2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from two (2) faculty colleagues that addresses the reviewee's teaching abilities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in teaching. Overall, the input must address both classroom and clinical teaching as appropriate to the reviewee's teaching assignment. At least one of the faculty colleagues providing input must be in the same clinical specialty area as the faculty member (Appendix B).

3. Written evaluative input from two (2) professional colleagues outside the College of Nursing that addresses the reviewee's teaching abilities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in teaching and should address competence in clinical teaching if appropriate to the reviewee's assignment.

4. Student evaluations of courses taught at MSU during *all years* preceding the review. In those instances when the individual has done a substantial amount of guest lecturing, evaluative data which has been solicited appropriately and anonymously from students may be included.

5. Student evaluations of advising during *all years* prior to the review.
6. Written evaluative reviews from students (internal review letters) or graduates taught or advised by the reviewee that address the reviewee's teaching abilities.
7. In-depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee's strengths and limitations in relation to teaching and advising; analyzes previous evaluative input from students, peers/colleagues, and supervisor; discusses rationale for any identified teaching problems; and identifies specific strategies to improve areas of weakness in teaching. Include a "vision" statement of the reviewee's teaching with a specific plan for continuing effectiveness or promise of excellence in teaching.

**Documentation Category: *Expertise and Effectiveness in Teaching* at the rank of Full Clinical/Teaching Professor**

To determine a faculty member's sustained effectiveness in teaching, the NTT committee will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews (last three years) from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee's teaching and advising activities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of excellence/potential for excellence in teaching.
2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from two (2) faculty colleagues that addresses the reviewee's teaching abilities. This input must be related to teaching criteria and standards of excellence or potential for excellence. Overall, the input must address both classroom and clinical teaching as appropriate to the reviewee's teaching assignment. At least one of the faculty colleagues providing input must be in the same clinical specialty area as the faculty member (Appendix B).
3. Student evaluations of courses taught at MSU during *all years* preceding the review. In those instances when the individual has done a substantial amount of guest lecturing, evaluative data which have been solicited appropriately and anonymously from students may be included.
4. Student evaluations of advising during *all years* prior to the review.
5. Written evaluative reviews from students (internal review letters) or graduates taught or advised by the reviewee that address the reviewee's teaching abilities.
6. In-depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee's strengths and limitations in relation to teaching and advising; analyzes previous evaluative input from students, peers/colleagues, and supervisor; discusses rationale for any identified teaching problems; and identifies specific strategies to improve areas of weakness in teaching. Include a "vision" statement of reviewee's teaching with a specific plan for continuing excellence in teaching.

**C. Materials Indicative of Evidence the Scholarship of Practice/Application (*Last 150 workload units*)**

As appropriate to level (example, Clinical Professor conducts, designs, and implements clinical projects)

- DNP Project and or Master’s Thesis committee member
- Conference presentations
  - Poster
  - Podium presentation
- Abstract submissions to either journals or conferences
- Successful and unsuccessful publication and funding submissions

**Documentation Category: Effectiveness in the Scholarship of Practice/Application at the level of Assistant or Associate Teaching/Clinical Professor:**

To determine a faculty member’s effectiveness in research/creative activity the NTT will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews (last three years) from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee’s EBP and Scholarship of Practice Activities.
2. The candidate shall have one or more externally peer-reviewed scholarly product published or accepted for publication in a refereed journal.

Candidates shall submit for review any articles, publications, proposals submitted or funded, or other creative endeavors that, in their judgment, represents their best efforts to advance the profession.

3. In-depth self-evaluation that addresses the candidate’s effectiveness and promise of continuing effectiveness. The self-evaluation should include a discussion of strengths and limitations and a statement of the reviewee’s “vision” for sustained scholarship of practice/application as a NTT faculty member in the College of Nursing.

**Documentation Category: Effectiveness in the Scholarship of Practice/Application at the level of Full Teaching/Clinical Professor:**

To determine a faculty member’s effectiveness in research/creative activity the NTT will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews (last three years) from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee’s EBP and Scholarship of Practice Activities .
2. The candidate shall have one of the following: 1) One or more externally peer-reviewed scholarly product published or accepted for publication in a refereed journal; or 2) One submitted grant proposals; or 3) Candidates shall submit for review a set of articles, publications, proposals submitted or funded, or other creative endeavors that, in their judgment, represents their best efforts to advance the profession.
3. In-depth self-evaluation that addresses the candidate’s effectiveness and promise of continuing effectiveness. The self-evaluation should include a discussion of strengths and limitations and a statement of the reviewee’s “vision” for sustained scholarship of practice/application as a NTT faculty member in the College of Nursing.

**D. Materials Indicative of Performance in Outreach/Service-The Scholarship of Integration**

When preparing data for demonstration of effectiveness and excellence in outreach and public service, all review letters from students, faculty, peers, and professional colleagues must be

requested by the Chair of the College of NTT Committee and must not be solicited by the reviewee.

The College of Nursing has identified the following materials as useful for evaluating performance in outreach/service. This list is meant to be informative: you do not have to include every item on this list, nor are you limited to listed items.

- Memberships in professional societies
- Leadership roles in professional societies
- Conference chair positions
- Service on University, College, department committees
- Service on advisory boards
- Nonprofit or Community Based organizations
- Consultation services
- Editorial and textbook reviews

**Documentation Category: *Effectiveness* in Outreach/and Service at the level of Assistant Clinical/Teaching Professor**

To determine a faculty member's effectiveness in outreach/public service, the NTT will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews (last three years) from the Campus Director that address the reviewee's contributions and/or potential for future contributions in outreach and public service. Input must be related to the College criteria and standards of effectiveness in outreach and public service.
2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from two (2) faculty colleagues that addresses committee work, or work in the faculty organization. Input must be related to service criteria and standards of effectiveness in outreach and public service.
3. Written evaluative input from a professional colleagues (internal or external review letters) that addresses the reviewee's outreach and public service. Input must relate to the College criteria and standards of effectiveness in outreach and public service.
4. In-depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee's strengths and limitations in relation to outreach and service. Include a "vision" statement of reviewee's outreach/public service activities with a specific plan for sustaining effectiveness in outreach and public service.

**Documentation Category: *Effectiveness* in Outreach/Service at the Associate or Full Teaching/clinical Professor Level:**

To determine a faculty member's sustained effectiveness in outreach/public service, the NTT will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews (last three years) from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee's contributions and/or potential for future contributions in outreach and public service. This input must be related to the College criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in outreach and public service.

2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from two faculty colleagues that addresses the reviewee's leadership in the College of Nursing and/or University through committee work and/or participation in related work of the faculty organization.
3. Written evaluative input from two professional colleagues (internal or external review letters) that addresses the reviewee's contribution to a professional organization and the community. Input must be related to College criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in outreach and public service.
4. In-depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee's strengths and limitations in relation to outreach/public service. Include a "vision" statement of reviewee's outreach/public service activities with a specific plan for sustaining effectiveness in outreach and public service.

#### E. Summary Indicative of Professional Development

This summary is to include a short paragraph of the various ways you have continued professional development. It is recommended to include a summary of CE topics, certifications, courses taken, private practice etc... Repeating the information in your CV should be avoided, this section should summarize all activity in one paragraph

#### **Items Added Promotion Portfolio Before NTT Committee Review by the CD**

Letter from CD to the Review Committee

Two letters of Review from Colleagues that were submitted to CD

#### **Items Added to Portfolio During Review Process**

NTT Committee Rubric for candidate Evaluation (Appendix C)

Two letters of peer review by identified faculty submitted to the CD



**APPENDIX A**  
**Cover Sheet**

## NTT Promotion Cover Sheet

Faculty Name:

Current Position:

Position Sought:

Date:

Tally: In Favor: \_\_\_\_\_

Not in Favor: \_\_\_\_\_

Candidate Meets Conditions for Promotion. NTT Review Committee Votes In Favor of Promotion

Candidate Does Not Meet Conditions for Promotion at This Time. NTT Review Committee Votes that Candidate Continues in Current Position.

**APPENDIX B**  
**Peer Evaluation of Teaching**  
**(on-line and face-to-face forms)**

## Classroom Peer Observation Rating Form

**Instructor:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Course:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Number of Students Present:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator:** \_\_\_\_\_

**INSTRUCTIONS:** You may want to focus your attention on a few of the lecture skills which are listed below under the appropriate category. Select one or more to concentrate on while you observe or view the videotape.

Respond to each of the statements below by circling the number which most closely corresponds to your observation.

- 1 = Excellent
- 2 = Very Satisfactory
- 3 = Satisfactory
- 4 = Needs Improvement
- 5 = Poor
- NA = Not Applicable

### **I. Importance and Suitability of Content**

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. The material presented is generally accepted by colleagues to be worth knowing.    | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 2. The material presented is important for this group of students.                    | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 3. Students seem to have the necessary background to understand the lecture material. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 4. The examples used drew upon students' experiences.                                 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 5. When appropriate, a distinction was made between factual material and opinions.    | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

6. When appropriate, appropriate authorities were cited to support statements.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
7. When appropriate, divergent viewpoints were presented.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
8. A sufficient amount of material was included in the lecture.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
9. Content represents current thinking in the discipline.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
10. Lecture material is relevant to course objectives and assigned readings. Circle one if appropriate: a. too much material was included. b. not enough material was included.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

**Other Comments:**

**II. Organization of Content  
Introductory Portion**

1. Stated the purpose of the lecture	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2. Presented a brief overview of the lecture content.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. Stated a problem to be solved or discussed during the lecture.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. Made explicit the relationship between today's and the previous lecture.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

**Body of Lecture**

5. Arranged and discussed the content in a systematic and organized fashion that was made to the explicit to the students.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
6. Asked questions periodically to determine whether too much or too little information was being presented.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

7. Presented information at an appropriate level of “abstractness.”	5	4	3	2	1	NA
8. Presented examples to clarify very abstract and difficult ideas.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
9. Explicitly stated the relationships among various ideas in the lecture.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
10. Periodically summarized the most important ideas in the lecture.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
11. Had a formal way of assessing student learning during lecture	5	4	3	2	1	NA

**Conclusion of Lecture**

12. Summarized the main ideas in the lecture.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
13. Solved or otherwise dealt with any problems deliberately raised during the lecture.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
14. Related the day’s lecture to upcoming presentations.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
15. Restated what students were expected to gain from the lecture material.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

**Other Comments:**

**III. Presentation Style**

**Voice Characteristics**

1. Voice could be easily heard.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2. Voice was raised or lowered for variety and emphasis.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. Speech was neither too formal nor too casual.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. Speech fillers, for example, “okay now,” “ahmm” were not distracting.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

5. Rate of speech was neither too fast nor too slow.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Nonverbal Communication**

6. Established eye contact with the class as lecture began.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

7. Maintained eye contact with the class.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

8. Listened carefully to students comments and questions.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

9. Wasn't too stiff and formal in appearance.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

10. Wasn't too casual in appearance.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----

11. Facial and body movements did not contradict speech or expressed intentions. (For example, waited for response after asking for questions).	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**General Style**

12. Demonstrates enthusiasm for subject matter.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

13. Demonstrates command of subject matter.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

14. Where appropriate, models professional and ethical behavior.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

15. Uses instructional aids to facilitate important points.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Interactive Learning Techniques**

16. Utilized three or more interactive learning techniques	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

17. Spaced interactive techniques out evening through lecture	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

18. Interactive techniques were well received by the audience.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

19. Transitioned smoothly between interactive techniques and content	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

20. Manages electronic equipment effectively	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

**IV. Clarity of Presentation**

1. Stated purpose at the beginning of the lecture.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

2. Defined new terms, concepts, and principles.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

3. Told the students why certain processes, techniques, or formulae were used to solve problems.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

4. Used relevant examples to explain major ideas.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

5. Used clear and simple examples.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----

6. Explicitly related new ideas to already familiar ones.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

7. Reiterated definitions of new terms to help students become accustomed to them.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

8. Provided occasional summaries and restatements of important ideas	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

9. Used alternate explanations when necessary.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

10. Slowed the word flow when ideas were complex and difficult.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

11. Did not often digress from the main topic.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

12. Talked to the class, not to the board or windows.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

13. The board work appeared organized and legible.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Other Comments:**



## V. Questioning Ability

1. Asked questions to see what the students knew about the lecture topic.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2. Addressed questions to individual students as well as the group at large.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. Used rhetorical questions to gain students' attention.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. Paused after all questions to allow students time to think of an answer.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
5. Encouraged students to answer difficult questions by providing cues or rephrasing.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
6. When necessary, asked students to clarify their questions.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
7. Asked probing questions if a student's answer was incomplete or superficial.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
8. Repeated answers when necessary so the entire class could hear.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
9. Received student questions politely and when possible enthusiastically.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
10. Refrained from answering questions when unsure of a correct response.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
11. Keeps questions focused on content	5	4	3	2	1	NA
12. Asked a variety of types of questions (rhetorical, open- and closed ended).	5	4	3	2	1	NA
13. Addressed questions to volunteer and non-volunteer students.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
14. Adjusted questions to the language ability and level of the students.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

### Other Comments:

**VI. Establishing and Maintaining Contact with Students**

**Establishing Contact**

1. Greeted students with a bit of small talk.						
2. Established eye contact with as many students as possible.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. Set ground rules for student participation and questioning.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. Used questions to gain student attention.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
5. Encouraged student questions and contributions.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

**Maintaining Contact**

6. Maintained eye contact with as many students as possible.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
7. Used rhetorical questions to re-engage student attention.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
8. Asked questions which allowed the instructor to gauge student progress.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
9. Was able to answer students' questions satisfactorily.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
10. Noted and responded to signs of puzzlement, boredom, curiosity, and so on.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
11. Varied the pace of the lecture to keep students alert.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
12. Spoke at a rate which allowed students time to take notes.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

## Faculty Online/Hybrid Teaching Peer Review

<b>Course Overview and Organization</b>		<b>Evident</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>A. Elements of Course Design</b>				
1	The course is easy to navigate and well organized. The course is easy to understand.			
2	The course introduction is easy to find and includes guidance on the course structure			
3	Minimum student technology and skill for the course are stated			
4	Course-specific technology requirements are stated			
5	Course offers clear instruction on where and how to seek technology help.			
6	Clear description and methods for accessing institution's academic resources (e.g. library, writing center) is provided			
7	Clear description for desired communication techniques and expectations (includes written and verbal)			
8	Other:			

<b>Course Overview and Organization</b>		<b>Evident</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>B. Elements of Teaching</b>				
	The instructor:			
1	provides an introduction and includes credentials related to the course			
2	provides the opportunity for student introductions			
3	suggests time expectations and commitments for various elements of the course			
4	clearly states the learning objectives and elements of the course to achieve those objectives			
5	other instructional course overview item not included above:			

<b>Learner Objectives and Competencies</b>		<b>Evident</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>A. Elements of Course Design</b>				
	Learning objectives/goals:			
1	are stated for each module/week			
2	are clear and easy to understand			
3	describe outcomes that are measurable			
4	address content mastery			
5	address critical thinking skills			
6	other objective/competency item not included above:			

<b>Learner Objectives and Competencies</b>		<b>Evident</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>B. Elements of Teaching</b>				
	The instructor:			
1	provides clear information about how to meet the learning objectives			
2	explanations are clear and concise			
3	fosters integration with prior knowledge			
4	other: instructional objectives/competency item not included above:			

<b>Resources and Materials</b>		<b>Evident</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>A. Elements of Course Design</b>				
	Resources/Materials:			
1	pertinent to and address course objectives			
2	appropriately cited			
3	current and/or timely			
4	prepared by qualified sources and authors			
5	appropriate format for the online environment			
6	easily accessible to the student			
7	clearly communicated how they relate to the course e.g. reading, optional, online video			
8	active links to non-institutional electronic resources			
9	include a variety of scholarly resources			
10	address diverse learning styles e.g. multimedia, text chats, voice chats, animation, discussion, simulation, examination			
11	other resource/material item not included above:			

<b>Resources and Materials</b>		<b>Evident</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>B. Elements of Teaching</b>				
	The instructor:			
1	demonstrates knowledge and mastery of the discipline/content			
2	incorporates strategies that promote progressive learning, logical progression of content			
3	provides opportunities for students to contribute to the course			
4	other instructional teaching resource/material item not included above:			

<b>Learner Interaction</b>		<b>Evident</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>A. Elements of Course Design</b>				
1	The course design prompts the instructor to be present, active, and engaged with the students (e.g. provide tools necessary)			
2	Netiquette instructions/recommendations provided regarding emails & discussion postings			
3	Guidelines for collaborative and substantive postings are defined			
4	Guidelines for communication/accountability are clearly defined			

<b>Learner Interaction</b>		<b>Evident</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>B. Elements of Teaching</b>				
	The instructor:			
1	is aware of student progress (e.g. assigned tasks) and any barriers to progression			
2	fosters interaction among constituencies inside and outside the course as appropriate (e.g. student-student, student-instructor, and with external persons or agencies)			
3	embeds learning activities (student-content interaction) that promote the achievement of stated objectives and learning outcomes.			
4	selects communication strategies to communicate appropriately with the class as a whole, student groups, and individuals			
5	promotes independent and/or shared student research, if applicable			
6	provides timely responses to student queries			
7	provides timely grading of assignments			
8	offers announcements tailored to the progress of the class			
9	models a communication style that demonstrates a positive tone			

<b>Learner Assessment</b>		<b>Evident</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>A. Elements of Course Design</b>				
1	Assessments are frequent enough to provide formative feedback			
2	Rubrics are provided ahead of time to define assessment criteria, if applicable			
3	Methods of submitting assignments are appropriate to the online learning environment			

<b>Learner Assessment</b>		<b>Evident</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>B. Elements of teaching</b>				
	The instructor:			
1	clearly describes assignments (student discussion, participation, and projects)			
2	provides formative assessment/progress feedback in accordance with the rubric (e.g. feedback that guides the student about academic performance before the end of the course)			

<b>Peer Assessor Commentary:</b>	
1	Additional comments regarding the strengths of this course and teaching:
2	Additional comments regarding recommendations for improvement:

Adapted from:

West Carolina University Faculty Fellows and Faculty Commons staff (n.d.). *Online course assessment tool (OCAT) and peer assessment process*. Retrieved from [http://www.wcu.edu/WebFiles/PDFs/facultycenter\\_OCAT\\_v2.0\\_25apr07.pdf](http://www.wcu.edu/WebFiles/PDFs/facultycenter_OCAT_v2.0_25apr07.pdf)

Adapted from:

West Carolina University Faculty Fellows and Faculty Commons staff (n.d.). *Online course assessment tool (OCAT) and peer assessment process*. Retrieved from [http://www.wcu.edu/WebFiles/PDFs/facultycenter\\_OCAT\\_v2.0\\_25apr07.pdf](http://www.wcu.edu/WebFiles/PDFs/facultycenter_OCAT_v2.0_25apr07.pdf)



## **APPENDIX C**

### NTT Faculty Candidate Evaluation Rubric

## Evaluative Rubric for NTT Promotion

Faculty Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Portfolio Review:  Promotion

Semester / Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Review: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer names: \_\_\_\_\_

College of Nursing/Campus: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	Comments
<b>Application and CV</b>	
Is there a candidate letter of intent?	
Does the letter summarize a sample of the accomplishments in the order of teaching, scholarship, and service?	
Is there a Vita?	
Is the Vita current?	
Does the Vita derive from Activity Insight at MSU?	
Are there annual review documents including CD comments for the last 150 workload units, or in accordance with the current CBA?	
Is there evidence of competency as indicated by the faculty member's annual evaluations?	
Are there two letters of recommendation from colleagues?	
Is there a letter of review from the Campus Director indicating the candidate is eligible for promotion?	

Materials Indicative of Teaching Performance	Comments
Has the candidate addressed their philosophy of teaching and learning within their letter of application?	
Is there a summary and analysis of teaching evaluations using the university evaluation instrument for the last 3 years?	
Is there evidence of competency as indicated by the faculty member's yearly course evaluations for the last 150 workload units (or according to the current CBA)?	
Is there a sampling of course syllabi?	

Are there awards, citations, and special recognitions for teaching?	
Is there evidence of using innovative integration teaching methods?	
Is there evidence of using technology to enhance learning?	
Other accomplishments related to teaching not included above?	
<b>Materials Indicative of Evidence Based Project Participation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Is there evidence of ongoing participation in EBP?	
Is there evidence of scholarly publications?	
Is there documentation of presentations or trainings conducted by the candidate to professional organizations?	
<b>Optional:</b> Is there evidence of grants or contracts that support scholarly activity?	
Is there evidence of honors and/or awards for significant scholarly activity?	
Is there evidence of participation as an editor and/or referee in support of scholarly publications, books, chapters in books?	
Other scholarly activities not included above?	
<b>Materials Indicative of Performance in Outreach/Service</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Is there evidence of other involvement in professional organizations?	
Does the faculty make an effort to be a part of the College of Nursing team by cooperating and being willing to participate in activities outside the classroom including committee work?	
Is there a willingness to act as an graduate advisor and or serve on graduate committees?	
Is there evidence of community service?	
Other types of service activities not included above?	

Summary Indicative of Professional Development	Comments
Is there documentation of continued growth as a teacher?	
Is there documentation of continued growth as a professional nurse? (certifications, CEs)	
Other types of service activities not included above?	
Supplemental Materials	Comments

Reviewers' recommendations:

- Recommend promotion
- Do not recommend promotion
- Recommend promotion to:
  - Assistant Teaching/Clinical Professor
  - Associate Teaching/Clinical Professor
  - Full Teaching/Clinical Professor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tenure/Promotion Committee Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Overall Comments:**