

Department of Educational Administration and Secondary Education

The College of New Jersey

Disciplinary Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion


The attached disciplinary standards have been reviewed and approved by the Committee on Faculty Affairs, the Council of Deans, and the Provost.

To avoid creating a moving target for candidates for reappointment, the disciplinary standards in effect during a faculty member's first year of employment will be used for reappointment and tenure applications. Candidates for promotion will use the disciplinary standards in effect in the year in which they apply for promotion.



Department Chair

3/11/20
Date



Dean

3/30/20
Date



Provost

04/24/20
Date

The Department of Educational Administration and Secondary Education will next review its disciplinary standards in Academic Year 2025-2026.

Disciplinary Standards for Scholarship

Department of Educational Administration and Secondary Education

School of Education

The College of New Jersey

Modified April 14, 2020

I. Purpose & TCNJ Values Alignment

The Department of Educational Administration and Secondary Education takes pride in offering rigorous, high quality teacher and educational leadership programs. Consistent with the mission of the College and the School of Education, the mission of our programs is to create exemplary educational professionals prepared to enrich the lives of the people of New Jersey and the nation through teaching and educational leadership. This document describes the standards and guiding principles for the evaluation of candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion within the Department of Educational Administration and Secondary Education. It supplements and is consistent with the College Reappointment and Promotion Policy.

In accordance with the College's mission, faculty will not only excel in teaching and scholarship but will also intertwine these two aspects of their professional lives. The teacher-scholar actively engages with the emerging and established knowledge base on teaching and learning and uses it to inform his/her practice. Whatever the means of inquiry, a faculty member connects knowledge with others both inside and outside of their discipline. In this way, we are participating actively in the life of the campus community and seeking to find ways to improve other communities in which we live and work. Through this work, we affirm the ideals of liberal education and the importance of preparing the next generation of committed citizens.

II. Categories of Acceptable Scholarly/Professional Work

A. Clear articulation of the range of recognized tangible scholarly outcomes

EASE recognizes a range of products, including but not limited to, the following:

Publications

[Tier 1]

- Book manuscripts published or under contract that make a contribution to the field
- Journal articles
- Book chapters

[Tier 2]

- Articles and training manuals that explain specialized knowledge to classroom teachers and practitioners
- Program evaluation that involves the creation of new knowledge in the field
- Editor of a peer-reviewed journal or guest editor of a special volume
- Editor of a book series
- Writing/and or obtaining grants
- Evaluation reports for external agencies
- Products (e.g. white paper, new curriculum, policies) resulting from work with NJDOE and other agencies

Presentations

[Tier 1]

- Peer-reviewed regional, national, or international conference presentations
- Invited presentations

[Tier 2]

- Peer-reviewed professional development workshops

B. Modes of Scholarship

The American Education Research Association defines education research as “the scientific field of study that examines education and learning processes and the human attributes, interactions, organizations, and institutions that shape educational outcomes. Scholarship in the field seeks to describe, understand, and explain how learning takes place throughout a person’s life and how formal and informal contexts of education affect all forms of learning. Education research embraces the full spectrum of rigorous methods appropriate to the questions being asked and also drives the development of new tools and methods.” (<http://www.aera.net/About-AERA/What-is-Education-Research>) Among the modes of scholarship we value are the following, but this list is not comprehensive, as new methods arise and others evolve:

Action Research

Applied Research

Developing Research Protocols

Mixed Methods

Pedagogical Research

Program Evaluation

Quantitative Methods

Qualitative Methods (e.g., ethnography, interviews, case studies)

Research Synthesis and Review

Single-Subject Design
Theoretical Research

We recognize that these educational modes of scholarship fall within any of the following:

Scholarship of Discovery
Scholarship of Integration
Scholarship of Application
Scholarship of Pedagogy

C. Flexibility in support of diverse paths in scholarship/professional activity

As noted in the two preceding sections, EASE allows flexibility for a wide range of paths.

D. Discipline specific challenges for the field of education

The challenges for Education scholarship are centrally concerned with the process of conducting research with human subjects, often within applied settings. This work includes complex ethical considerations and must go through an IRB review process. Research within applied settings also involves the challenge of accessing participants. This is especially a challenge given that our subjects are diverse (including populations who are from culturally diverse groups, for whom English is not a first language, as well as individuals with disabilities) and involve individuals who belong to vulnerable groups. Research within schools requires district approval, which can be a lengthy process and can result in access to samples being restricted. For some research that involves very specific populations, scholars may need to travel nationally or internationally to collect data.

Educational research often does not follow a traditional experimental design in which there is a true control group. Ethical considerations often prohibit such a design in which a treatment condition might include educational instruction or intervention of one group at the possible expense of another. Instead, there is a rich history within educational research of other modes of inquiry, which we have previously detailed. Some of these modes of inquiry, such as qualitative methods, require a lengthy period of intensive data collection and analysis, which must be completed before writing can begin. Such modes of inquiry can result in rich work, but it is produced over a more extended timeline of data collection, analysis, and dissemination.

Special appreciation is given for the challenge of working with traditionally underachieving or underserved populations, adopting a challenging design (e.g., longitudinal design), or establishing cross-disciplinary and community-collaborative partnerships.

These unique conditions for research in educational administration and secondary education should be considered when evaluating the overall scholarship of faculty.

E. Clarity and flexibility of criteria to evaluate the quality of the venue in which scholarship is disseminated; flexibility to allow for the establishment of new venues and genres (e.g. emerging online venues)

Online and multimedia venues that undergo a rigorous review or editorial process are recognized as scholarly work in the field of education. Such scholarship, when conducted in conjunction with other recognized scholarly outcomes previously detailed, furthers growth in the field by exploring new boundaries of scholarly dissemination.

F. Recognition of Interdisciplinary Work

Interdisciplinary work is quite common in education, as the questions raised in the field often require a range of disciplinary lenses. As such, EASE recognizes and encourages interdisciplinarity when appropriate.

III. Criteria to Evaluate Different Types of Scholarly/Professional Work

Due to the varied nature of the scholarship reflected within the Department of Educational Administration and Secondary Education, and the unique nature of building and implementing a research agenda within these fields, the following considerations are necessary when assessing the merit of a scholarly body of work.

- Collaborative scholarly activities are honored and judged as complementary; therefore, multiple authorship and involvement are viewed favorably.
- Connections among a candidate's scholarly activities are often not easily visible to those outside of the discipline. Scholars should articulate these connections.
- Research that is narrow or small scale in its scope is considered acceptable since many scholars in the department are in fields that have constraints with regard to access to subjects or specific environments.

We recognize a range of tangible indicators of disciplinary scholarship quality which can be used to evaluate a faculty member's work. Faculty should articulate the intended impacts of their work and the rationale for their choice of a particular outlet. The following indicators of disciplinary scholarship quality serve as a guideline for evaluating a faculty member's completed scholarship. While the information below is expected to help generate a conversation and provide guidance, it is not comprehensive and neither is each work under each category expected to meet all of the criteria within the category. Given the evolving nature of the field, there may be other criteria that are not necessarily mentioned below, which candidates might articulate in their essay.

For journal articles:

- a. Peer review

- b. Acceptance/rejection rates for the journal
- c. Professional sponsorship or other affiliation status of the journal
- d. Status of the journal editors within the subfield
- e. The nature and kind of audience that the journal reaches. In this regard, while it may be feasible to look at overall circulation in some instances, in other cases it is not only the number of people that the journal targets that could be used as a criteria but also who the audience is comprised of (e.g., teachers and school leaders).
- f. Citations of one's scholarly work by others is not required but could be used as another means to enhance the scholar's dossier and provide evidence on the impact of the scholar's work. Citations of one's work should be accompanied by the scholar's explanation of how the citations provide evidence of the contribution of the work to the current scholarly literature. This could also apply to the section on books and conference presentations that follow.

For books (authored or edited):

- a. The quality of the publisher and recognition as an academic publisher
- b. Contribution to a book series
- c. Applicability of the book to real life such as textbooks that address aspects of teaching or teacher preparation
- d. Books that provide an original contribution to the field or inform a certain area of discourse
- e. Published reviews of the work

The invited publications and presentations (these would include invited contributions to special issues of a journal, invited chapters in books, and invited addresses to meetings of professional organizations):

- a. The stature of the editor of the special issue or book
- b. The stature of other contributors to the publication or meetings of professional organizations
- c. The quality of the publisher
- d. The quality of the journal and the extent to which it is recognized for its contribution in the field
- e. The scope of the journal
- f. The scope of the professional organization or journal extending the invitation, i.e., international, national, regional, or state

The conference presentations (e.g., symposia, papers, posters):

- a. A peer review process used for the conference
- b. The acceptance/rejection rates
- c. The scope of the professional organization sponsoring the conference, i.e. international, national, regional, or state
- d. The potential for impact in terms of professional attendance (e.g., presenting to 500 classroom teachers)

For grants:

- a. Academic standing of the agency and recognition in the field (e.g., federal funding, national foundations or organizations)
- b. Peer review by experts
- c. Acceptance/Rejections rates
- d. Receipt and amount of funding (grants not funded may be considered scholarly output albeit at a lower level than funded applications).

For editorial roles:

- a. Activities in the capacity of Editor-in-Chief, Associate Editor, or Assistant Editor
- b. Quality of the journal
- c. Guest Editor for a special issue of a journal
- d. Membership on an Editorial Board
- e. Invitations to serve as a review or an ad hoc reviewer on journal submissions, book chapters, grant applications, or conference presentations
- f. Membership on a grant review panel

IV. Scope, Quality, Importance, and Coherence of Scholarly/Professional Program

A. Clear articulation of how the department evaluates the scope, quality, and importance of a scholarly/professional project

See Section III above.

B. Indication of the value of student involvement in, or the contribution to, scholarly/professional work

EASE places value on scholarship that engages TCNJ students and supports students' development as scholars and professionals. Examples of such scholarship include, but are not limited to: Independent Study/Research, MUSE, co-authorship on scholarly outcomes, mentoring students through the research and/or dissemination process, participation in the Celebration of Student Achievement, and undergraduate research apprenticeships.

C. Clear articulation of productivity expected

For each level of evaluation (Pre-Tenure, Tenure/Associate Professor, Full professor) the assessment of scholarship includes activities since the previous personnel action. A new faculty member might discuss scholarship and publication that occurred prior to employment at TCNJ as a means of establishing their scholarship core, but in terms of accomplishments, only those achievements that occurred after their arrival at TCNJ would be considered. Scholarship may also include initial publication of one's dissertation research and the completion of scholarly work begun elsewhere but for which a majority of the work has been completed at TCNJ.

While the department recognizes the importance of providing some guiding criteria, we also believe that not all of these criteria can be translated into hard numbers. As stated in the 2019 TCNJ Promotion and Reappointment document, quality is more important than mere quantity and the "applicant's entire body of scholarly/creative/professional work provides evidence for the pattern of ongoing scholarship in support of promotion" (p. 5). The section below provides some productivity guidelines for each rank. While the section is expected to provide guidance, it should not be interpreted to be exhaustive. As previously stated, individual differences in scholarship might result in different trajectories or different examples. Candidates should explain the implications of their scholarship and the impact in their essay.

Guidepost for the road to tenure: Ideally, by the end of the third year, an untenured candidate would produce 3 tangible scholarly products. Two of these should be peer-reviewed publications; at least one accepted for publication and the second at a stage of review beyond initial submission (e.g. revised and resubmitted). These expectations are intended to provide guidelines to support progress in scholarship.

Application for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor: By the time scholars apply for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor it is expected that they demonstrate clarity in their scholarship plan. The goals articulated by the candidate should provide evidence of a well-planned and sustainable program of scholarship and we expect scholars to have produced *a minimum of six tangible scholarly outcomes* that represent contributions to the field since arrival at TCNJ, including a *minimum of three publications* (at least two of which must come from Tier 1; Refer to section II.A) *and a minimum of three peer-reviewed presentations* at regional, national, or international conferences. We also expect that in the years leading up to tenure, scholars will have begun to integrate their scholarship, teaching, and service and have begun independent or collaborative work on new scholarly projects.

Application for Full Professor: By the time scholars apply for promotion to Full Professor, it is expected that they have a clear scholarship plan and progress towards that plan. Maturation of scholarship is an important quality to consider. The scholar's research might explore diverse areas within the field, venture deeper into the disciplinary core, or take a risk to traverse disciplinary boundaries. Whatever the course of the scholarship, the scholar should be able to articulate their contribution to the current discourse and its connection to teaching and service. Scholars at this level should have produced a minimum of *seven tangible scholarly outcomes* that represent contributions to the field since promotion to associate professor, *including a minimum of three publications (at least two of which must come from Tier 1; Refer to section II.A) and a minimum of three peer reviewed presentations* at national or international conferences.

While exceptions to the guidepost numbers for both Associate and Full Professor will be considered, the applicant would need to provide substantial documentation of scholarly activities, reasons for less productivity, and evidence of a scholarly program that is both sustainable and will yield future publications. For example, a peer-reviewed book may be considered the equivalent of approximately two articles (determined by the PRC based on the quality of the work, the length compared to standard articles, the complexity of the subject matter, and the nature and scope of the research involved). The process for this involves the candidate informing the PRC when a book is published and writing a letter requesting it to be counted as two publications with an explanation based on criteria above. The PRC would then make a determination and provide the candidate with a decision in writing which would become part of their materials for submission. At the time of formal review, the PRC will articulate this clearly in the review letter.

D. Clarity for evaluating the quality and coherence of a sustained and ongoing program of scholarly/professional work that matures over time

A successful scholarship program will be exemplified by:

1. Several projects in different stages of development or a systematic plan for one's projects
2. Primary responsibility for scholarship
3. Work initiated at TCNJ
4. History of appropriate dissemination of scholarly product(s)

V. Authorship

A. Clear articulation of the ways in which the department evaluates different authorship patterns (e.g. single author v. multiple author) in scholarly/professional/creative projects

First or sole-authored works are evaluated most positively. The weight granted to multiple-authored works depends on the amount and nature of author contributions, and thus should be specified.

B. Clear articulation of how the department evaluates scholarly work that results from smaller vs. larger scale projects.

(See Section III, p. x)

Document Review

The Department of Educational Administration and Secondary Education Disciplinary Standards for Scholarship shall be reviewed at a minimum of every five years by the Chair in conjunction with the Departmental PRC. Reviews will occur more frequently when changes/issues arise such as changes to the TCNJ reappointment or promotions process.