

CEPSE Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

This document provides guidelines to evaluate tenure-system faculty from the Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology, and Special Education (CEPSE) for reappointment, promotion to associate professor with tenure, and promotion to professor. The intended audiences for these guidelines are any tenure-stream faculty member in CEPSE and those in evaluator positions at all levels of MSU's RPT process. By design, these guidelines are therefore general and should not be used as a rubric for evaluating an individual's RPT materials.

Whether and to what extent the specific examples of achievement listed below apply to a given candidate's application will be represented in the Chairperson's annual review letter, feedback from the Personnel Committee, the candidate's narrative, and evaluation from external faculty in the candidate's specific field. Ultimately, the faculty candidate's narrative and presentation of their materials should contextualize their work within their specific field. Each case will be evaluated based on the judgment of the Personnel Committee, Chair, and College RPT in light of these guidelines.

This document requires a 2/3 majority vote by CEPSE tenure-system faculty for adoption. This vote was conducted and the document accepted on 11/22/2024.

This document can be amended by a 2/3 majority vote of CEPSE tenure-system faculty.

The relevant statements and University documents regarding policies, procedures and criteria for reappointment, promotion and (RPT) are:

- MSU Provost Memorandum on the University Philosophy and Guiding Policies on Faculty Tenure and Promotion ([LINK](#))
- MSU Policies on RPT ([LINK](#))
- College of Education's Resources ([LINK](#)) and Documentation ([LINK](#)) on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Review for Candidates

Broad Considerations Regarding RPT Evaluation Criteria

To accomplish its mission, it is the expectation of CEPSE that every faculty member shall be engaged in research, teaching, and service. We recognize that the proportion of time given to activities will vary among faculty members and specific faculty load agreements will be reflected in each individual's application materials.

Although not listed for each review phase below, CEPSE values diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts as indicated in the Provost's 2024 RPT memo: "*Whenever applicable,*

faculty commitment to learning and engaging in DEI efforts will be recognized and considered in the RPT process” (p. 6).

The following document is organized into three major review sections: 3rd year review for reappointment, promotion to associate professor with tenure, and promotion to full professor. Each section begins with statements from the Provost’s Fall 2024 RPT Memorandum; then outlines the general expectations in CEPSE in the areas of research, teaching, and service; and concludes with exceptions to the general expectations that are important for each discipline (i.e., program area) within CEPSE. Due to interdisciplinary differences for each program area within CEPSE, **it is very important that reviewers incorporate program area expectations, in addition to broader department criteria, into their evaluation of candidates at given levels.**

Reappointment to a Second Probationary Appointment: Third-Year Review

“Each reappointment recommendation should be based on clear evidence that a record is being established of progress toward becoming an expert of national and/or international stature, a solid teacher, and a contributing member of the unit, college, University, and/or discipline.” (p. 4, Office of the Provost, Fall 2024 RPT Memorandum)

Research:

Successful candidates for reappointment will demonstrate consistent progress toward establishing a productive, systematic, sustainable, and high-quality program of research at MSU. Candidates must address how their work is significant, what impact it makes on their field, and to what extent it is consistent with the University's mission statement.

Evidence of establishing a record of progress toward becoming an expert in one's discipline in CEPSE includes but is not limited to publishing manuscripts in peer-reviewed national and/or international journals, practitioner-oriented journals, and book chapters, as well as giving conference presentations. Faculty are expected to publish annually, but the number of publications in peer-reviewed outlets may vary. Impact ratings will vary across disciplines within journals (see individual program exceptions below). For example, CEPSE values publications related to community-engaged scholarship (particularly co-authorship with community partners) that are published in broadly distributed outlets that may not yield traditional academic impact ratings.

It is expected that candidates will serve as both a lead and co-author on publications during this phase of their career. Being the lead author is important evidence of the candidate's trajectory toward leadership in the field. Although the candidate may have some publications with former PhD or post-doc advisors at this stage, there should be a reduction in publishing with prior mentors during the review period.

Establishing national visibility is critical, and presentations at national or international conferences provide some evidence of a notable research program. Invitations to speak at conferences, professional meetings, leading universities, or research organizations could also enhance a candidate's application.

CEPSE faculty are expected to pursue funding commensurate with what is necessary to conduct their research. Typically, for reappointment faculty are expected to pursue internal funding to establish their research program and may begin pursuing external funding. All candidates should situate efforts for pursuit of funding within the funding availability with their field, the nature of their work, and the extent to which their research requires funding. We recognize that funding levels vary across areas of inquiry, and therefore do not view external funding as a prerequisite for reappointment.

Other evidence that can indicate success in pursuing and/or establishing a sustainable line of research may include the candidate as a principal investigator or major collaborator (e.g., Co-PI, Co-I) on funded research grants or contracts, attempts to apply for competitive external grants (i.e., revisions to prior proposals) or obtain contracts, or successful internally funded awards combined with submissions to external agencies.

Teaching/Advising:

Faculty in CEPSE engage in a range of teaching experiences including online and in-person instruction, as well as undergraduate and graduate instruction. Due to difference in program structure, some faculty may only teach graduate courses while others may teach primarily undergraduate courses. Similar specifications can be observed in online versus in-person instruction.

Faculty should demonstrate a commitment to teaching. Evidence of success in classroom teaching could involve a variety of indicators including positive feedback from students or from another faculty member. In the case where faculty have received less positive feedback, clear evidence of how the faculty member has worked to improve their teaching should be presented. Other evidence of success can include attending college or university programs related to instruction and mentoring. Faculty can also demonstrate a commitment to teaching through the application or development of instructional technology, publications (e.g., practitioner-articles) and conference presentations (e.g., dissemination at practitioner-oriented conferences), or other innovations (e.g., materials, textbooks) to support teaching and student engagement. Finally, commitment to teaching can be demonstrated through nomination for or receipt of awards or other forms of recognition.

In addition to classroom teaching, CEPSE faculty are expected to mentor students. At the reappointment stage, candidates may not have extensive advising opportunities or show substantial evidence of success in advising, especially students at the doctoral level. Evidence of successful advising may come from the matriculation of student advisees, reviews/statements from advisees, or evidence of student advisees involved in presentations or publications. Additional evidence might be seen in involvement on graduate apprenticeship projects, guidance committees, or dissertation committees. Finally, it might also include the demonstration of success in engaging students on an individual basis (e.g., involvement in UURAF; independent study with a graduate student).

Service:

Service activities that show evidence of advancing in one's field may include serving as an ad-hoc peer reviewer for high-quality journals, reviewing grant submissions for smaller-scale grants, holding a position in a professional society or discipline-specific organization, or membership on an editorial board.

Beginning assistant professors are not expected to engage in intensive internal departmental or college-level internal service activities. Candidates can demonstrate service through participation as engaged members of their program and department, contributing to the development/revision of program policies, and contributing to the development of interdisciplinary collaborations as they arise.

Outreach/Engagement:

Although community-engaged service is highly valued in CEPSE and adds evidence of being a contributing member within a specific discipline, this type of service is not required for review and promotion decisions.

Evidence of engagement in the community might include professional development in schools or clinical sites, inclusion of site personnel in the research design process, dissemination of research findings to community audiences, and public service appointments related to one's discipline.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

“A recommendation for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor includes the award of tenure, and should be based on several years of sustained, outstanding achievements in scholarship, teaching, and service across the mission, consistent with performance levels expected for promotion to associate professor at peer universities. A reasonably long period in rank5 before promotion is usually necessary to provide a basis in actual performance for predicting capacity to become an expert of national or international stature and long-term, high-quality professional achievement and University service.” (p. 5, Office of the Provost, Fall 2024 RPT Memorandum)

The expectations for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure in CEPSE involve a demonstration of excellence and a trajectory that suggests a comparable level of performance will continue following promotion.

Research:

Broadly, an essential criterion for promotion to associate professor with tenure in CEPSE is demonstrated stature as a researcher with a growing reputation nationally and internationally in the candidate’s field and leader in their career cohort. This stature may be demonstrated by a sustained and successful research agenda, including annual publications in high-quality peer-reviewed national and international journals, sustained efforts at competitive internal and external funding, and strong letters of review (4-6) from leading senior researchers who are independent of the candidate.

The record of publication must constitute a systematic program of research of the highest quality and of sufficient quantity to demonstrate a leading and highly productive research program with a strong and growing national/international impact. There is no numerical formula for evaluating a publication record, though candidates at this level are expected to continue a successful trajectory of peer-reviewed publications, including publishing multiple articles each year. The number of publications may vary, and successful records should be evaluated related to both the quantity of publications as well as the quality of the outlets (e.g., 1 publication in a top-ranked journal in the candidate’s field may be enough to indicate impact for a year).

The order of authorship and impact rating of the journal will vary depending on the specific field. However, all candidates should have some publications in highly respected journals (as judged by impact factors, known “top” journals in the candidate’s field, or other metrics such as acceptance and/or rejection rates) and show scientific leadership as a first author or corresponding author or last author on several of their publications, which may vary among disciplines. Candidates should also show independence from former PhD and/or Post-Doc advisors/mentors.

In addition to peer-reviewed papers, a growing list of peer-reviewed presentations or invited presentations at national and international conferences can be used as evidence of impact on the field. Demonstration of impact on the field can also be provided through increasing h-index score, number of citations, or other indicators.

Candidates should have a funding record consistent with a sustained and systematic line of research in their specific field. At this stage, the candidate may demonstrate sustained attempts to obtain funding, through applying for grants, responding to reviews, and resubmitting unsuccessful application. To demonstrate the variation that might be observed, evidence of distinction can include internal or external funding as a Principal Investigator, as well as receiving high scores or making it to the review panel on competitive federal grant proposals despite not being funded. Candidates should situate their efforts to obtain funding within their field of study, the nature of their work, and the extent to which their research requires funding to be conducted.

Collaborative research is also highly valued. Candidates should clearly identify their role in collaborative projects and describe their unique contribution (such as technical expertise or intellectual leadership). If collaborative-funded research is a substantial component of the justification for promotion, the candidate's role in obtaining the funding and undertaking the research should be described.

Teaching/Advising:

Success in teaching includes consideration of course instruction as well as advising and mentoring in CEPSE. In addition to evidence described for reappointment, candidates for promotion and tenure may also demonstrate evidence of how their courses meet their field's professional standards, efforts to improve courses, efforts to innovate, knowledge generation and knowledge transmission with respect to teaching. (e.g., applying for training grants).

Candidates should also show a strong record of advising master's and/or doctoral students. Evidence of strong advising may include a record of publishing peer-reviewed papers with students as co-authors and possibly first authors, growing or diversifying the field through successful graduate recruitment or training grant involvement, undergraduate and/or graduate student engagement in faculty research, graduate students demonstrating research success, graduate students engaging with community and/or professional organizations in their field. Serving or chairing graduate student committees (thesis, dissertation, guidance) also shows evidence of successful advising

Service:

Candidates are expected to demonstrate professional academic service that shows recognition of their expertise in a national arena. Evidence could include: serving as a guest Editor of a

special issue or as an associate editor; running for an elected position or having served in an elected or appointed position in a professional organization; serving as an invited or elected member of a licensing, advisory, or professional board; or engaging on a grant review panel.

Candidates should be engaged in program/department/college-level committee work – demonstrating capacity to participate in the internal academic functions of the department, College, or University. Although assistant professors are not heavily involved in internal service, there should be an increasing level of service at the department or college level over the pre-tenure period.

Promotion to Full Professor

“In as much as the University invests in an individual at the time of tenure, the measure of promotion to “full” is the investment the individual has made in the University. As such, a recommendation for promotion from associate professor to professor in the tenure system should be based on several years of sustained, outstanding achievements in scholarship and education across the mission, consistent with performance levels expected at peer universities. Moreover, it is an expectation that individuals should provide leadership within the department, mentorship to junior faculty and graduate students (where appropriate), teaching of undergraduates (where appropriate), service on committees, and contribute to a flourishing intellectual life for those in the broader discipline, unit, college, and Institution. A reasonably long period in rank6 before promotion is usually necessary to provide a basis in actual performance to permit endorsement of the individual as an expert of national and international stature and to predict continuous, long-term, high-quality professional achievement and University service. As a tenured faculty member, a professor must not only demonstrate disciplinary excellence, but also demonstrate commitment and effectiveness in larger institutional missions such as improving culture, inclusiveness, and equity both in the academy but also more broadly in society. Innovation brought to teaching and interdisciplinary team building that enables broader groups of people from the widest possible disciplinary or college perspective are also part of a move from individual work to being a university professor. Such a responsibility is even greater for those who earn promotion to full professor.” (p. 5-6, Office of the Provost, Fall 2024 RPT Memorandum)

The expectations for promotion to Professor in CEPSE are to demonstrate outstanding performance in research, teaching/advising, and leadership/service and to be demonstrably prepared to take on the intellectual and organizational leadership expected at this rank.

Research:

In research, candidates should be established as an expert in one’s discipline. Candidates should demonstrate a consistent publication record in highly respected national and international journals. The level of authorship and impact rating of the journal will vary depending on the specific field. However, candidates are expected to publish in the top journals in their field and other relevant specialty areas. Candidates are also expected to show scientific leadership as a first author or corresponding author or last author on several of their publications, which may vary among disciplines. If candidates have shifted to primarily the last author position, this should be discussed in relation to the norms of the field. Reviewers should use the recommendations of department personnel committee, department chair, and external reviewers to evaluate the quality of the journals in which faculty are publishing.

In addition to publishing research, the candidate should continue to demonstrate dissemination of research through peer-reviewed presentations at national and international conferences or invited presentations at major national or international conferences. Demonstration of impact

on the field can also be provided through increasing h-index score, number of citations, or other indicators.

Candidates for Full Professor should have a funding record consistent with a sustained and systematic line of research in their specific field, depending on the availability and necessity of funding to conduct their research. There should be evidence that the candidate can continue to support sustained research following the promotion. Examples of such evidence may include external funding from federal organizations or foundations, or contracts. Another possible indicator of success at this level may be inclusion in significant multi-site externally funded research projects. In such cases, candidates should clearly identify their role and scientific contributions (such as technical expertise or intellectual leadership) on collaborative projects.

Teaching/Advising:

In addition to evidence described for promotion and tenure, candidates for promotion to full professor may also demonstrate effective teaching through evidence of how their courses meet their field's professional standards, efforts to develop new courses or to improve courses, efforts to innovate, efforts to develop new degree or certification programs, knowledge generation and knowledge transmission with respect to teaching. (e.g., applying for training grants).

Candidates should also show a strong record of advising master's and/or doctoral students. Evidence of strong advising may include an increasing record of publishing peer-reviewed papers with students increasingly included as first authors, growing or diversifying the field through successful graduate recruitment or obtaining training grants, undergraduate and/or graduate student engagement in faculty research, graduate students demonstrating research success, graduate students engaging with community and/or professional organizations in their field. Serving or chairing graduate student committees (thesis, dissertation, guidance) also shows evidence of successful advising. Awards or other forms of recognition for teaching also show accomplishment.

In addition, candidates must show successful mentorship of graduate students, as demonstrated by student success. Evidence may include co-authoring peer-reviewed papers with students as first author, or positive graduation rate within 5 years for PhD students and 2-3 years for MA students.

There should also be evidence of continuing successful student engagement in less formal ways. These may include but are not limited to graduate advising, supervision of graduate research, and participation in graduate guidance, thesis, and dissertation committees.

Service:

Candidates seeking promotion to Professor should demonstrate a strong commitment of service to the field, both within and outside the University. Demonstration of successful service could include serving as an Associate Editor or Editor on a journal, serving on multiple editorial boards, serving on multiple federal grant review panels, serving as an invited guest editor for a special issue journal, or a combination of each of these that shows progress in stature in terms of impact in field. These types of service appointments should be sustained over a period of time within the review period and not single instances of service.

Candidates should also show increased leadership at the program/department/university level by service in leadership positions on committees that contribute to the academic function of the department, college, or university. Some candidates may show higher allocations of service leadership within a program or department level but should also demonstrate service leadership within the college or university.

Discipline Specific Criteria for RPT

EPET: In line with the guidelines outlined above, it is expected that faculty in EPET will publish in high-quality, high-impact journals and pursue external funding. There are several additional unique considerations for faculty from the EPET program who are seeking promotion. Within the fields of computer science education and engineering education, peer-reviewed conference proceedings are viewed as similar to peer-reviewed journal publications in other fields due to the extensive peer-review process associated with these conference proceedings and the normative practice of citing conference proceedings more frequently than journal articles. While it cannot be a substitute for publishing in high-impact outlets, EPET also values publications related to the evolving mission in the fields of educational psychology and educational technology, including community-engaged scholarship (particularly co-authorship with community partners) that is published in broadly-distributed outlets that may not yield traditional academic impact ratings. Additionally, given the relatively small cohorts of doctoral students and the focus of the EPET program on doctoral teaching, EPET faculty may primarily teach relatively low-enrollment doctoral courses. Also note that most EPET faculty do not have the opportunity to teach undergraduate courses, and some do not teach master's level courses. The EPET faculty also particularly values innovation in teaching related to the application or development of instructional technology to support teaching and student learning.

SPED: Reviewers should note the limited audience of research in special education and take caution when interpreting impact factors. In special education and related fields (such as behavior analysis), a strong impact factor may be in the 2-3.0 (two year) range. See commentary from department personnel committee, department chair, and external reviewers when evaluating faculty publishing in such journals. Many faculty in special education publish single-case experimental design (SCEDs) research studies. These studies often have very low sample sizes (e.g., as few as 2 or 3 participants), but that should not be an indicator of impact, quality, or rigor of the research. High quality SCEDs demonstrate causal relations between independent and dependent variables (Epstein & Dallery, 2022) and are used by governing

bodies, including the What Works Clearinghouse and the Council for Exceptional Children, to establish evidence-based practices in special education and applied behavior analysis (Kratochwill et al., 2021).

Counseling and Counselor Education (formerly Rehabilitation): In addition to the general departmental guidelines for reappointment, promotion and tenure, the Rehabilitation program has certain expectations that are unique to the field, which are discussed below. The Rehabilitation program encompasses both practical/clinical-focused research, as well as applied pedagogical research (e.g., supervision, teaching). Disability is a specialty area, and our training philosophy and disability application encompassing holistic perspective of case conceptualization and can be synergically integrated into other disciplines. Thus, faculty's programmatic research can vary widely. Examples include the application of disability knowledge for the benefit of society on basic research (e.g., understanding stigma, intersectionality with other sociocultural variables); practical/clinical research (e.g., design and improve strategies to improve rehabilitation outcomes such as vocational, mental health, community integration); and educational-oriented research (e.g., investigation and refinement of strategies in pedagogy, clinical supervision, leadership and professional issues). Accordingly, the nature and expectations of faculty's scholarship and dissemination outlets can vary widely. Nevertheless, a high standard of research is expected to demonstrate via continuous, sustained, and significant contributions to the advancement of knowledge, theories, and practice in faculty's research area. Publications in traditional rehabilitation journals reach a specific (often smaller) group of audience (e.g., impact factor of around or below 1.0) as well as specialty journals (may have similar or varying impact factors) are all acceptable. Dissemination can be through a wide range of outlets, including peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, national disability websites, training materials, and technical reports, while conference attendance of professional and practitioner-oriented, leadership and training conferences. Faculty can demonstrate independence and leadership in research via senior-authored publication as well as engagement in interdisciplinary research efforts via multi-authored and/or cross-disciplinary publication. Grantsmanship can also be at a local, foundation and federal level, and for both research and training. Especially for early career faculty, some federal fellowship is highly regarded. Research collaboration is highly valued. The programs are nationally accredited, thus, the training of graduate students is also bound by accreditation standards, often involved restrictive instructor-to-student ratio, small classroom size in training students in clinical supervision, teaching and engaging in the community in leadership positions. Community outreach and engagement is highly valued as an applied discipline. While departmental guidelines for services are largely similar, rehabilitation faculty also has the opportunity to serve on accreditation organizations.

MQM: Might reference the journal list previously submitted to FAC as an appendix. Could also mention expectations re: publication and funding if those are somewhat different from what is already listed.

School Psychology: Quality of publication outlets is an important consideration in School Psychology. Candidates should have publications in outlets considered respectable to highly respectable within School Psychology and/or the candidate's subfield. Although impact factor might be used as a guide, many highly respected journals in School Psychology and related fields have impact factors that range from 1.0 to 2.0.