

EXAMPLE DOSSIER

PENNSTATE



PROMOTION AND TENURE FORM

Purpose: This recommendation form is used for (1) awarding tenure to the ranks of professor, librarian, associate professor, associate librarian and assistant professor; and (2) for promotion to the ranks of professor, librarian, senior scientist, associate professor, associate librarian, and senior research associate.

Instructions: See the following link on GURU for details:
<http://guru.psu.edu/forms/4-21PromotionandTenureForms.html>

Date September 9, 2005

Name Doe, John A.		PSUID 999999999	Promotion <input type="checkbox"/>	Early Tenure <input type="checkbox"/>	8th Year Tenure <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Present Rank and Title Assistant Professor of Education		College Education	Department Education Policy Studies		
Campus University Park	Rank and Date of Initial Appointment to the University Assistant Professor of Education August 2000				
Graduate Faculty Status <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Member <input type="checkbox"/> Nonmember	Rank and Date of Appointment to Tenure-Eligible Position 0				
	Years of Credit Granted Toward Tenure at Appointment to Tenure-Eligible Position				
	Previous Promotions				
	Staying of the Provisional Tenure Period				
Proposed Rank and Title (For Promotion Only)			Rank _____ Date _____ Tenure Status as of Effective Date of Promotion		
(Check One)					
Unit	Recommended	Not Recommended	Signature	Date	
Campus (If Applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair - Campus Review Committee	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campus Chancellor	_____	
Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair - Department Review Committee	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Department Head	_____	
College	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair - College Review Committee	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dean or Campus Chancellor at Great Valley	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School	_____	
University	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair - University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Executive Vice President and Provost of the University	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	President of the University	_____	



PROMOTION AND TENURE FORM

Purpose: This recommendation form is used for (1) awarding tenure to the ranks of professor, librarian, associate professor, associate librarian and assistant professor; and (2) for promotion to the ranks of professor, librarian, senior scientist, associate professor, associate librarian, and senior research associate.

Instructions: See the following link on GURU for details: <http://guru.psu.edu/forms/4-21PromotionandTenureForms.html> Date September 9, 200

Name Doe, John A.		PSU-ID 999999999	Promotion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Early Tenure <input type="checkbox"/>	6th Year Tenure <input type="checkbox"/>
Present Rank and Title Assistant Professor of Education		College Education	Department Education Policy Studies		
Campus University Park	Rank and Date of Initial Appointment to the University Assistant Professor of Education August 2000				
Graduate Faculty Status <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Member <input type="checkbox"/> Nonmember	Rank and Date of Appointment to Tenure-Eligible Position 0				
	Years of Credit Granted Toward Tenure at Appointment to Tenure-Eligible Position				
	Previous Promotions				
	Staying of the Provisional Tenure Period				
Proposed Rank and Title (For Promotion Only) Associate Professor of Education			Rank _____ Tenure Status as of Effective Date of Promotion _____		
(Check One)					
Unit	Recommended	Not Recommended	Signature	Date	
Campus (if Applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair - Campus Review Committee	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campus Chancellor	_____	
Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair - Department Review Committee	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Department Head	_____	
College	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair - College Review Committee	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dean or Campus Chancellor at Great Valley	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School	_____	
University	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair - University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Executive Vice President and Provost of the University	_____	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	President of the University	_____	



BIOGRAPHICAL DATA FOR PROMOTION/TENURE REVIEW

I.

Last Name Doe	First Name and Initial John A.	Exact Title of Position Assistant Professor of Education
College Education	Department Education Policy Studies	Location of Residence University Park

II.

ACADEMIC TRAINING

Name and address of institution	Major Subjects	Minor Subjects	Degrees - Dates
Under-graduate			
Under-graduate			
Graduate School			
Other			
Professional Status - Law, CPA, Other Degrees or Licenses Held		Honorary Degree(s) - Institution	

III.

OCCUPATIONAL RECORD

Previous Employers With Addresses Including U.S. Military (Most Recent First)	Work Performed: If Teacher, List Subjects Taught	Rank or Title	Dates
			From To
List most recent (other than PSU) first			From To
			From To
			From To
			From To

IV.

PREVIOUS SABBATICALS AT THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Activity or Project	Results: Publications, Reports, etc.	Dates

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA GUIDELINES

The following guidelines for awarding promotion and tenure in the College of Education are offered with the understanding that reasoned judgments ultimately must be made about the merits of individual cases. The significant breadth of the field of education makes it difficult to provide detailed statements about what successful performance entails within individual branches of the field. Rather, and in accord with HR-23, general and broad guidelines are provided herein for promotion and tenure committees within the College that allow for the exercise of skilled, informed, and objective professional and academic judgments. The committees will apply progressively more exacting standards as the candidate moves from assistant to associate to professor. More specific guidelines than those presented here may be found in department publications and HR-23.

General Guidelines

The College recognizes the scholarship of teaching and learning; the scholarship of research and creative accomplishments; and service and the scholarship of service to the University, society, and the profession. Promotion and tenure shall be based on recognized performance and achievement in each of these areas. The following general guidelines will be followed by the College's promotion and tenure committees:

- It is the responsibility of the Department Head (drafted in consultation with the designated administrator from a non-University Park, Penn State location, when appropriate) to prepare a dossier which documents the quality of the candidate's contributions and impact of these contributions in each of three areas: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments; and Service and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession.
- Promotion and tenure are separate, but not necessarily independent, decisions. The promotion and tenure committees consider the same functional categories in their deliberations on both promotion and tenure. A decision to promote a candidate is based on recognized performance and achievement in each of the areas discussed below, with reference to the responsibilities assigned to the faculty member. Tenure decisions are based on the candidates' potential for future advancement in those areas as indicated by their performance during the provisional period. The tenure decision is a particularly critical one.
- The University-defined categories for promotion and tenure consideration are not mutually exclusive. Ultimately, the promotion and tenure committees will judge each individual's record as a whole, considering his/her overall performance pattern while at the same time being cognizant of each evaluation area. In cases where a faculty member has a joint appointment with another unit (within or outside of the College), committees need to be sensitive to the legitimate demands of the other unit on the faculty member's time.
- Although the College promotion and tenure committee will be aware of the criteria of the department in which the initial review takes place, the College committee's primary task will be to bring broader faculty judgment to departmental recommendations regarding individual candidates. In these matters, the committee will also monitor the general standards of quality, equity, and adequacy of the procedures and criteria employed consistent with the College's vision, mission, and goals. For favorable consideration, an individual's activity should contribute to the vision, mission, goals, and needs of the College and tend to increase the overall excellence of the College. Changes in the vision, mission, and goals of the College over time and corresponding accomplishments of the candidate will be considered by the committee.
- Both the academic and professional merits of candidates will concern the promotion and tenure committees. The reference group for comparison is the candidate's academic peers and colleagues both from within and from outside the University.
- The sources of evidence to be used in examining each individual's record are those identified in HR-23, in department criteria, and in other relevant materials. Candidates should present whatever evidence they believe to be important in assisting the committees to arrive at a fair and impartial judgment of their unique function and competence. The promotion and tenure committees will also consider the faculty member's assigned duties when evaluating each section of the dossier. Candidates are encouraged to include a single narrative statement of no more than three pages at the *front* of the dossier that indicates their sense of their accomplishments in the scholarship of teaching and learning; the scholarship of research and creative accomplishments; and service and the scholarship of service to the University, society and the profession. The purpose of the statement is to give candidates the opportunity to place their work and activities in the context of their overall goals and agendas.

- Upon the request of College Department Heads, candidates will be asked to provide the names of not more than three individuals the candidate feels would be qualified to assess the relative merits of the candidate's work. Upon receiving the candidate's list, Department Heads will then consult with other experts in the field, including the Professor-in-Charge of the relevant graduate program for the purpose of adding to this list. The Department Heads will then assemble a final list of not fewer than six names that is submitted to the Dean along with a brief biographical sketch for each name. The Dean will independently choose at least four individuals from the list to contact. The Department Head will be notified of the Dean's selection.
- Candidates should include their narrative statement with the materials that are shared with the evaluators from outside the University. The purpose of this statement is to provide the external evaluators with a contextual framework with which to judge the candidate's line of research. The candidate's supporting materials should include a list of the publications forwarded to the evaluators.
- In cases where the candidate's appointment is co-funded by a University consortium (e.g., the Children, Youth, and Families Consortium (CYFC)), the department head should comment on the nature, extent, and success of the candidate's involvement with the consortium in the department head's letter of evaluation.
- The candidate is expected to review the portions of the dossier he/she has access to for accuracy before the dossier goes to the committees. In accordance with HR-60, *Access to Personnel Files*, candidates have the legal right and are encouraged to inspect all information in the dossier including the internal evaluations of committees and administrators and excluding the external letters of assessment, as provided for in HR-23, at the conclusion of the promotion and tenure process.

Criteria

This section outlines the criteria and expectations comprising the basis of judgments to be made in each of the three categories currently provided for in HR-23. At this time, HR-23 recognizes the following three categories: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments; and Service and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession. The criteria, kinds of judgments to be made, and the nature of supporting evidence to be considered in making these judgments in the promotion and tenure categories are extensions of, and consistent with, the guidelines provided in HR-23.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

A candidate's professional responsibilities in the scholarship of teaching and learning, including regular classroom instruction, independent study, thesis direction and assistance, and academic advisement and consultation with students, will be used by the committee to evaluate the candidate within the context of the candidate's job responsibilities. The basis for judgment and the typical evidence used by faculty members to support their proficiencies in this area are explicated below.

The committee will more heavily weigh evidence that consists of systematic and impartially monitored peer observations of teaching ability and effectiveness gathered as part of the normal arrangements of a department for the development and guidance of its faculty. These peer observations of teaching will be informed by the goals the College establishes for teaching as articulated in the following paragraph.

The committee will judge regular classroom instruction and courses and workshops taught in support of outreach-based instruction, including continuing and distance education, service learning courses, international programs, and cooperative extension programs in terms of: (a) suitability of the instructional program's objectives; (b) the degree to which classroom instructional activities contribute to student development and achievement or levels of performance commensurate with these objectives; (c) the maintenance of a teaching and learning environment where students are treated as welcomed contributors; and (d) the correspondence of evaluation procedures to these course objectives and instructional activities. Evidence may include current or proposed course outlines, syllabi, and study materials; evaluations by students; and evaluations by colleagues.

For formal and informal individual instruction (i.e., directing or assisting in independent study, thesis research, or individual projects), the instruction should be responsive to student needs and should enhance curricular and professional goals of the program and department. Evidence supporting a faculty member's proficiency in this area may include illustrative programs, research projects, and study topics developed for and with students.

Judgments regarding academic advisement and informal consultation will rest on the faculty member's responsiveness to student needs and effectiveness in achieving program goals with minimal confusion and conflict. The candidate may provide satisfactory evidence through impartial department procedures, using such things as faculty and administrators' observations and periodically solicited comments from currently enrolled and/or previously graduated students.

The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments

Research and creative accomplishments consist of original works disseminated to an audience of peers. Promotion and tenure committees will base their judgments on the quality and quantity of such efforts as determined by the extent to which the research and creative accomplishments are: (a) conceptual rather than merely technical, (b) the products of sustained and programmatic activity as contrasted with unrelated and unfocused activity, and (c) significant in their effects on thought and practice.

Evidence of research and creative accomplishments may take many forms including: articles published in refereed journals, especially those that are considered prestigious and well regarded in the faculty member's principal area of emphasis; books and monographs; chapters or parts of books; involvement in funded projects (completed, in progress, and proposed); new computer software programs; papers presented at technical and professional meetings; and, honors and awards for scholarship, creative production, and professional activity, in addition to the other categories enumerated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Candidates are not necessarily expected to present a record that includes entries for every possible type of evidence.

Implicit in these illustrations of evidence is the view that the product has been subjected to the judgment of professional peers who are sufficiently informed to evaluate quality. Research and creative accomplishments which have been favorably reviewed by professional or academic peers will be weighed more significantly than those that have not. Within the constraints described in this section and the candidate's assigned duties, publications jointly written with students are also valued. The extent to which a faculty member stimulates research and creative accomplishment in students and peers is important.

The candidate's active memberships in professional societies (when there was recognition through election to major offices or committees) constitute another source of evidence of accomplishment in this area of performance when such information is accompanied by descriptions of the contributions made to these organizations.

Service and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession

On the one hand, service and the scholarship of service to the University, society, and the profession encompasses activities that are internal to the University, College, department, or program that contribute to governance, management, and administration for the achievement of the institution's goals. Such activities, for example, include committee work at the University, campus, College, or departmental level; involvement with the College Faculty Council, University Faculty Senate, Graduate Council; and administrative support work such as professor-in-charge of a graduate program or coordinator of an administrative office.

On the other hand, service and the scholarship of service to the University, society, and the profession encompasses activities that involve the faculty member's professional expertise and the application of this expertise for the betterment of organizations and entities that are external to the University. Such activities, for example, include consulting to assist the Pennsylvania Department of Education, schools, businesses, and other institutions or agencies; providing formal and informal credit and non-credit education programs for youth and adults; organizing conferences and service on conference committees making speeches and other responses to requests from citizen groups; and membership and significant participation on task forces, meetings of public, non-profit, or private organizations, governmental agencies, and industry; and service on committees and other invited work for professional organizations and learned societies.

The quality of service will be determined by such indicators as type and scope of professionally related service; offices held within governmental and related organizations; and letters or other written documents that attest to the value and effectiveness of the candidate's contributions. Articles or other written materials that elucidate the intellectual grounds and plans underlying a faculty member's service activities can provide useful insights into the significance of the service being provided. (Endorsed by the College of Education Faculty Council, February 16, 2006.)

DEPARTMENT PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA

This statement is intended to supplement existing statements of University and College of Education policy relative to advancement to tenure and promotion.

I. Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure

The Committee will be composed of seven tenured faculty members: Two members elected by each Program (at least one of the two at full professor rank), and one Department At-Large member (associate or full professor) appointed by the Department Head. The Committee will serve to review faculty and recommend action on promotion and tenure with only faculty of higher rank than the candidate voting on promotion. Persons serving on the Committee will be elected by the respective Program faculty and appointed by the Department Head. Program representatives are to serve three-year terms with at least one member being retained each year.

II. Committee Function

The Department Committee should formulate and advance to the Department Head its recommendations utilizing basically the materials provided. The Committee on its own initiative may seek augmenting information relative to the faculty member and to its recommended action. All such compiled additional information should be made known to and approved by the candidate and the Department Head.

III. Progress Toward an Advancement to Tenure

In performing the second, fourth, and sixth year reviews of faculty for tenure, evidence should be presented of reasonable progress toward promotion to the next rank.

IV. Advancement to Associate Professor

Each candidate will be assessed on the following criteria for advancement to associate professor

A. The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning . Student evaluation as a teacher should be consistently high. Teaching effectiveness should be judged on the basis of periodic peer observation and evaluation of the candidate's instructional work. Evaluation will be made of the effectiveness of the faculty member as a graduate advisor and as a member of master's or doctoral committees.

B. The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments . A record of substantial intellectual achievement is essential for consideration in advancement to associate professor rank. Research competence should be demonstrated by involvement in a recognized line of research for at least a three-year period. There should be evidence of a consistent publication record and participation in professional activities. Scholarship is a category that reveals the candidate's continued growth in his/her discipline. Evidence can be drawn from curricular development, research, and professional activities such as the following: new courses and course development, participation in professional conference and meetings, presentations of papers and speaking engagements, officership in professional organizations, and other activities in which there is use of the candidate's expertise.

C. Service and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession . Service to the University as evidenced by significant work with state or national agencies, University, college or departmental committees or in continuing education.

V. Advancement to Professor

Candidates for professor should exhibit a strong record in teaching, research, and service. Candidates will provide evidence of genuine distinction in teaching and research. The following paragraphs are intended to describe the successful candidate.

A. The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning . Student evaluation as a teacher should be consistently high. Teaching effectiveness should be judged on the basis of periodic peer observation and evaluation of the candidate's instructional work. The development of new courses could be offered as evidence of creative teaching.

B. The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments . Research competence can be evidenced by a line of funded or unfunded research, but should be recognized by prominent researchers in the professor's own area in other institutions. The quality of scholarship should be supported by a consistent record of professional publications in the form of journal articles, books, monographs, reports for national or international agencies, and papers delivered at national professional meetings. Scholarship is a category that reveals the candidate's continued growth in his/her discipline. Evidence can be drawn from curricular development, research, and professional activities such as the following: new courses and course development,

1

participation in professional conferences and meetings, presentations of papers and speaking engagements, officership in professional organizations, and other activities in which there is use of the candidate's expertise. Significant leadership at the state or national levels must be demonstrated by recognition and knowledge about the work of the candidate by appropriately determined officials and professional leaders in other educational institutions.

C. Service and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession . Service to the University as evidenced by consistent involvement and leadership in work with school districts, state or national education agencies, University, college or departmental committees, or continuing education. Membership and activity in national professional organizations must be exhibited.

VI . In applying the above criteria for all tenure and promotion recommendations, the Committee will justify any judgments which are exceptions to the above criteria.

Narrative Statement

John Doe

As a member of the Science Education Option Area and the elementary Education Program faculty in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, I am committed to improving K-12 science education and supporting the development of the next generation of distinguished science teacher educators and scholars through an integrated program of teaching, research, and service. The overarching theme that organizes my scholarly activities is that of science teacher learning and development. More specifically, I am interested in how prospective and practicing teachers develop reform-oriented, subject-specific pedagogical knowledge and practices for supporting students' meaningful science learning and scientific inquiry. Within this theme, three major initiatives can be used to describe my work — (1) using applications of technology to enhance science learning and learning to teach, (2) supporting the development of teachers through school–university partnership activities, and (3) collaborating with scientists to improve the subject matter learning of teachers. Evidence of these initiatives is visible in my publications, conference papers/presentations, speaking and consulting engagements, grant work, and course development efforts at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

One of the strongest examples of how I integrate scholarly activities associated with teaching, research, and service centers on using applications of technology for two main purposes — enhancing science learning and supporting learning to teach. From the time I was a middle school science teacher, I have been interested in applications of technology that have the potential to enhance science learning by facilitating real-time data collection, providing access to complex databases and powerful analytic tools and/or simulating natural phenomena that are difficult to observe in laboratory settings. In 1999, a colleague and I were awarded a grant that supported our efforts to systematically integrate cutting edge technology tools, such as the ones described previously, into our science teacher education program. Not only did the project result in the re-conceptualization of most undergraduate science education course offerings, but it also provided rich opportunities to collaborate with faculty members and graduate students on associated teaching and research projects. For example, I was able to offer a two-semester course sequence in which I worked with a group of graduate students to examine the literature on technology in teacher education and design a new course for secondary science education majors, *SCIED 410: Using applications of Technology to Support Learning Science as Inquiry*. During the initial implementation of the course, I co-taught it with three graduate students who simultaneously were engaged in research projects associated with a National Science Foundation grant for which I served as the project director. To date, research efforts associated with this project have resulted in dissertations, manuscripts and presentations at national and international conferences.

While the approach to technology integration emphasizes the enhancement of science learning, I use technology to support learning to teach. For the past seven years, I have been investigating the use of electronic teaching portfolios to facilitate critical reflection and teacher learning.

Since Spring 1998, we have required the development of electronic teaching portfolios by prospective elementary teachers enrolled in *SCIED 458: Teaching Science in Elementary Schools*. As a result of collaborating with faculty and graduate students, as well as engaging in research on e-Portfolios in SCIED 458, I have come to view e-Portfolios as “scholarly spaces” in which prospective teachers make their personal pedagogical theories about supporting students' learning explicit, and reconsider those theories in light of new learning and experiences. Given the growing interest in e-learning, my work with e-Portfolios has resulted in a number of speaking engagements within the Penn State community and at the national level. In Spring 2002, I co-authored a report on the state of e-Portfolios at Penn State, which contributed to the development of www.portfolio.psu.edu (university resources for e-Portfolio development). In addition, I am serving on a number of College and University committees with a focus on the use of technology in teaching and learning. My work with e-Portfolios also has resulted in a number of publications and presentations at the national, state, and local levels.

Another initiative around which I organize and integrate my professional activities is that of simultaneous renewal through school–university partnerships. For the past five years I have been the lead science education faculty member in the Penn State University – State College Area School District (SCASD) Elementary Professional Development School (PDS) Program. The program was recently recognized by the Holmes Partnership (Best Practice Award, 2001) and the Association of Teacher Educators (Distinguished Program Award, 2002). Working in the Elementary PDS has provided rewarding opportunities to collaborate with an interdisciplinary team of faculty, graduate students and local teachers and administrators who are committed to excellence in teacher education. There are three main aspects to my PDS activities. First, I chair a committee with four elementary teachers, a principal, and the SCASD elementary science and mathematics coordinator. This group, the PDS Science Education Planning Team, is responsible for the continuous development of the section of SCIED 458 taken by interns in the Elementary PDS Program for which I serve as the instructor. Second, I provide leadership in technology integration for the program, ranging from supporting classroom learning opportunities with appropriate applications of technology to providing specialized technology work sessions for teachers and staff. Finally, I offer summer professional development opportunities for practicing teachers in the areas of science and technology, including one offering that was collaboratively planned and taught with faculty from the Department of Entomology.

The research activities in which I am involved in the PDS setting are probably those that are most closely connected to my interests in science teacher learning. The context provides valuable opportunities to investigate the ways in which prospective and practicing teachers develop specialized knowledge and practices for supporting students' science learning and scientific inquiry.

At this point in time, I have several manuscripts and conference presentations associated with this work. In addition, my involvement in the Elementary PDS Program has produced several funded projects that have supported instructional activities and facilitated changes in the elementary science curriculum. A University colleague and I received a New York State grant to support the development of a specialized database for teachers to share internet resources connected to district curriculum units and technology enhanced lessons. In addition, I was part of a collaborative team of university and school district faculty that received a Kellogg grant focused on developing instructional enhancements for elementary science curricula. Most recently, I co-authored a grant that was funded to support a schoolyard habitat and gardening project at a local elementary school.

The final initiative I use to describe my work is one that underlies learning to teach science – collaborating with scientists to improve the science subject matter knowledge of teachers. Research clearly indicates that although subject matter knowledge alone is insufficient for teaching for understanding, it is fundamentally necessary. Since arriving at Penn State, I have been working with scientists to develop science content courses and professional development experiences that are appropriate for prospective and practicing teachers. In 1998-99 I worked with a group of faculty and graduate students from Science Education and the Department of Entomology to co-develop, pilot, and implement an applied life science course for education majors. Investigating teacher learning in the context of this course has resulted in manuscripts, conference presentations, and a dissertation study. In addition, I have been working with Milton Cole from the Physics Department, and a group of elementary teachers and undergraduate honors students to construct an affordable wind tunnel to use in conjunction with the SCASD intermediate level science unit on air and aviation. The apparatus is supported by instructional activities that promote students' scientific inquiry, as well as a video we produced to demonstrate the principles of flight in action. Not only have these materials been used to enhance the school district's science curriculum, but they also have been integrated into SCIED 458 and summer courses for teachers as learning opportunities that model meaningful, reform-oriented science instruction. Two publications are currently associated with this project, including a guest editorial that Professor Cole and I co-authored for the *American Journal of Physics*.

My development as a scholar has required me to make some difficult decisions regarding which opportunities to pursue and which to forego. The framework for scholarship and teaching described here has helped me to do this in a thoughtful way, and has assisted me in achieving a balance among my work with technology integration, school-university partnerships, and collaborations with scientists.

THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

This section contains:

- List of courses taught in resident instruction at Penn State for each semester with enrollments in each course
- List of courses and workshops taught in support of outreach-based instruction, including continuing and distance education, service learning courses, international programs, cooperative extension programs, and clinical assignments at Penn State
- List of advising responsibilities
- Concise compilation of results of student evaluation from multiple sources, documented evaluation of candidate's programs, activities, and skills in relating to clientele
 - If student comments from such sources as student evaluations, formal interviews, or exit surveys are reviewed, the findings should be presented by a summary statement that conveys the students' sense of strengths and weaknesses.
- Faculty input concerning the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, including any statements from colleagues who have visited the candidate's classroom and evaluated his or her teaching, or who are in good position to evaluate outreach-based instruction or advising
 - Peer review shall consider a range of teaching activities including, but not limited to, the development of materials such as case studies and class assignments, course or teaching portfolios, advising, research collaboration, and graduate student mentoring. Internal letters about teaching effectiveness should be included in this section.
- Any statements from administrators which attest to the candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness
- Other evidence of resident and/or outreach-based teaching and advising effectiveness (e.g., performance of students in subsequent courses; tangible results and benefits derived by clientele; recipient of teaching awards)
- Supervision of graduate and undergraduate dissertations, theses, projects, monographs, performances, productions, and exhibitions required for degrees; types of degrees and years granted
- Supervision of other undergraduate research
- Teaching materials available as supplementary materials, including such items as case studies and teaching portfolios
- Membership on graduate degree candidates' committees

THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

COURSES TAUGHT

RESIDENT COURSES			SRTE SUMMARY		
Semester	Course	No. Enrolled	No. of Respondents	Course Quality	Instructor Quality
Fall 2002	CI 495B, Clinical Application of Instruction	2			
Sp 2002	SCIED 558, Research Problems in Science Teaching	9	6	6.67	6.83
Fall 2001	SCIED 458, Teaching Science in Elementary Schools	32	31	6.68	6.94
Sp 2001	CI 495F, Professional Development	7	7	6.50	6.50
Sp 2001	SCIED 410, Using Application of Tech	12	11	4.42	5.00
Sp 2000	SCIED 597A, Research Projects	8	8	6.67	6.83
Su 2000	SCIED 497F, Supporting Children's Scientific Inquiry	17	17	5.24	5.88
Fall 2000	CI 595B, Clinical Application of Instruction	26	25	6.21	6.38
Sp 1999	ENT 397C, Teaching with Insects	12	10	6.09	6.55
Fall 1999	SCIED 548, Teaching Science in Elementary Schools	26	25	6.21	6.38

OUTREACH COURSES			SRTE SUMMARY		
Semester	Course	No. Enrolled	No. of Respondents	Course Quality	Instructor Quality
Fall 1999	SCIED 458, Tchg Science in Elementary Schools	12	12	6.59	6.93
Su 1998	SCIED 458, Tchg Science in Elementary Schools	15	15	6.4	6.17

ADVISING RESPONSIBILITIES

Academic Year	No. of Advisees	Degree	Major
Fall 2001-Spring 2002	7	M.Ed.	Science Education
	30	Ph.D.	Science Education
	30	Undergrad	EKED
Fall 2000-Spring 2001	3	M.Ed.	Science Education
	5	Ph.D.	Science Education
	30	Undergrad	EKED
Fall 1999-Spring 2000	2	M.Ed.	Science Education
	3	Ph.D.	Science Education
	22	Undergrad	EKED

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF STUDENT COMMENTS (STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES)

SCI 458, Fall 1999. Students convey enthusiasm for the positive experience in the clinic, including the opportunity to understand literacy learning and teaching in different ways by working collaboratively with other teachers. They suggest that more time is needed and more direction about specifics of writing reports on students.

LLED 550, Spring 2000. Students identify strengths of the reading clinic experience as the opportunity to apply their learning in settings with real children. They thought it would have been helpful to work more closely with some diagnostic tools that are typically required by reading specialists.

SCI 458, Fall 2001. Students appreciated having the notes online and found the assignments very helpful. They suggested more in-class group work and hands-on activities.

FACULTY INPUT CONCERNING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

2nd Year Reviews Letters: Judith Star and Henry Blake

4th Year Reviews Letters: Patrick Early and Jamie Best

6th Year Review Letters: Elise Nelson and Steven Nolan

STATEMENTS FROM ADMINISTRATORS

See summary results of departmental survey conducted by Department Head.

OTHER EVIDENCE OF RESIDENT/OUTREACH TEACHING AND ADVISING EFFECTIVENESS

Obtain and supervise 10 Internships for Science Degree Program, 2000-2004

Lisa Carney, Advisee, Top Award Winner, Penn State Undergraduate Web Fair, 2003

College of Education Outstanding Teaching Award, Penn State, 2002

Guest Lecture, SCIED 532 Applications in Science, Fall 2002

Guest Lecture, "Science is Fun," Second Grade Fairmont Elementary School, October 3, 2002

Participant, workshop on "Best Advising Practices", Penn State, October 2002

Participated in "Recruiting Fair," HUB Penn State, October 2002

Organized Interview Day for recruiting new degree candidates, Spring 2001.

SUPERVISION OF DISSERTATIONS/THESES, AND MEMBERSHIP ON GRADUATE COMMITTEES

Student	Degree	Major	CANDIDATE'S ROLE			Date Graduated
			Cmte Chair	Thesis Advisor	Cmte Member	
Abruzzo, Sheila	Ph.D.	C & S			x	
Ascroft, Paul	Ph.D.	SCIED	x			
Avraamidou, Lucy	Ph.D.	SCIED	x			
Boardman, Leigh	Ph.D.	SCIED	x			May 2001
Courson, Susan	Ph.D.	SCIED	x	x		Aug 2001
Cullin, Mike	Ph.D.	SCIED			x	
Friedrichsen, Pat	Ph.D.	SCIED			x	May 2001
Haefner, Laura.	Ph.D.	SCIED	x	x		Aug 2001
Hui, Pi-Sui	Ph.D.	INSYS	x			
Kreamer, Sherry	Ph.D.	SCIED			x	
Kuech, Bob	Ph.D.	SCIED			x	Dec 1999
Macaroglu, E.	Ph.D.	SCIED	Co	Co		Dec 1999
Mackin, Joan	Ph.D.	SCIED			x	Aug 1998
Munford, Danusa	Ph.D.	SCIED	x	Co		May 2002
Ritter, Jenny	Ph.D.	SCIED			x	Aug 1999
Sillman, Kate	Ph.D.	SCIED			x	Dec 1998

SUPERVISION OF OTHER UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH

PDS Undergraduate Interns. Teacher research projects supported within the context of the Elementary Professional Development School (PDS) Program.

Faculty advisor to Students for Better Campus Life (SBCL).

TEACHING MATERIALS AVAILABLE AS SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Course portfolio (<http://www.scasd.k12.pa.us/developers/>)

Technology tutorial for the development of electronic teaching portfolios

Summary Results of Department Survey Conducted by Department Head to Evaluate Advising Effectiveness

The Department Head conducted an independent evaluative study of the effectiveness of the candidate's undergraduate and graduate advising. Current undergraduate and graduate advisees who have seen the candidate within the past year were contacted and asked to complete an evaluative questionnaire, which is designated for this use. (*A copy of the questionnaire is included in the supporting materials.*)

The advisee was asked to rate the faculty member's performance as an advisor using a scale of 1 to 5 (1=Inadequate Performance; 5=Outstanding Performance). The first part of the questionnaire included 10 items; the second part allowed the advisee to add comments.

Thirty-three (33) of the candidate's undergraduate advisees and six (6) graduate advisees were sent questionnaires in mid November 2001 with a return deadline of two weeks. Fourteen (14) of the undergraduate advisees and two (2) of the graduate advisees responded.

Data compiled from the undergraduate responses shows the candidate is considered to be a "good" advisor. The mean responses on the first eight questionnaire items ranged from 3.00 to 4.80, corresponding to the "Good Performance" scale descriptor. The mean response on item 10, which assessed his overall performance, was 3.83, consistent with the "Good Performance" rating. Eleven of the 14 undergraduate responses included comments presented below in random order:

- °I found myself in an academic predicament and my advisor was very slow to respond.
- °Overall, I enjoy him and have no complaints!
- °Makes me feel very comfortable in our meetings; answers my questions.
- °Good for mapping-out future schedules and programs.
- °He is an outstanding teacher and advisor! Top notch.
He was helpful and informative.

Data compiled from graduate advisees responses also shows the candidate is considered to be a "good" graduate advisor. The mean responses on the first nine questionnaire items ranged from 3.33 to 4.60, corresponding to the "Good Performance" scale descriptor. The mean response on item 10, which assessed his overall performance, was 4.33, consistent with the "Good Performance" rating. One written comment was included:

- °I am very fortunate to have the candidate as my advisor. He has made my transition to PSU as smooth and stress free as can reasonably be expected. He shows genuine concern and great care in not only the academic well-being of a student, but the other areas which can ultimately affect academic progress. Even though he has a number of responsibilities he places his advisees very high on his list of priorities. This gives me a positive outlook on the program and personalizes the advising process.

PEER EVALUATION

Name of the Instructor _____

Course _____

Date Observed _____

Name and Title of the Evaluator _____

Full Signature of Evaluator _____ Date _____

Comments



THE SCHOLARSHIP OF RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This section contains the following, listed in standard bibliographic form with the most recent date first: (Do not include material contained in other sections of the dossier.)

- **Research and/or scholarly publications**

Citations should include beginning and ending page numbers or total number of pages, where appropriate; for multiple-authored works, the contribution of the candidate should be clearly indicated (e.g., principal author, supervised person who authored the work, etc.). Electronic journals should be listed in appropriate categories with documentation as outlined in the Administrative Guidelines, III.C.7.b.

Publications should be listed as follows:

1. Articles published in refereed journals (include only articles in refereed journals in this section)
2. Books
3. Parts of books
4. Book reviews
5. Articles published in nonrefereed journals
6. Articles in in-house publications
7. Research reports to sponsor
8. Manuscripts accepted for publication (substantiated by letter of acceptance) - Indicate if peer reviewed and number of pages of manuscript
9. Manuscripts submitted for publication, with an indication of where submitted and when - Indicate if peer reviewed and number of pages of manuscript
10. Manuscripts in progress (second- and fourth-year reviews only)
11. Cooperative extension bulletins and circulars

- **Creative accomplishments**

Exhibition, installation, production, or publication of original works of architecture, dance, design, electronic media, film, journalism, landscape architecture, literature, music, theatre, and visual art

Performance of original dance, literary, musical, visual arts, or theatrical works or works from traditional and contemporary repertoires of the performing arts

- **Papers presented at technical and professional meetings (meeting and paper titles); indication about whether the candidate was the presenter**
- **Record of participation in, and description of, seminars and workshops (short description of activity, with titles, dates, sponsor, etc.); indication of role in seminar or workshop, e.g., student, invited participant, etc.**
- **Description of outreach or other activities in which there was significant use of candidate's expertise (consulting, journal editor, reviewer for refereed journals or presses, peer reviewer of grants, speaking engagements, services to government agencies, professional and industrial associations, educational institutions, etc.)**

THE SCHOLARSHIP OF RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

RESEARCH AND/OR SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS

Articles published--refereed journals

Cole, M. & Doe, J. (2002). Enhancing science instruction in the elementary schools. *American Journal of Physics*, 70 (10), 984-5. **(Equal contributions by authors)**

Doe, J., Krajcik, J., & Blumenfeld, P. (2002). Elementary student teachers' science content representations. *The Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 39 (6), 443-463. **(Principal author)**

Avraamidou, L. & Doe, J. (2001). Web-based philosophies: Making Prospective Teachers' Personal Theorizing Visible. *Science Education International*, 12 (4), 2-5. **(First author supervised by candidate)**

Dana, N.F., Silva, D.Y., Gimbert, B., Nolan, J., Doe, J., Tzur, R., Mule, L., & Sanders (2001). Developing new understandings of PDS work: Better problems, better questions. *Action in Teacher Education*, 22 (4), 15-25. **(Contributing author)**

Sillman, K., Doe, J., & Dana, T. (2000). Prospective teachers explore elementary use of classroom technologies through a unique university program. *Science and Children*, 38, 42-45. **(Other authors supervised by candidate)**

Books

Doe, J., Broido, E. M., Davis, T. L., & Evans, N. J. (Eds.) (in press). *Increasing Students' Development of Social Justice Attitudes and Actions*. (New Directions in Student Services). Expected publication, Summer 2003. **(Contributing Author)**

Parts of books

Gimbert, B. & Doe, J. (2001). Integrating technology into prospective elementary teachers' classroom practice in the context of a professional development school. A manuscript prepared for Technology: Applications to Teacher Preparation Monograph, The Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Teacher Educators. **(Equal contributions by authors)**

Dana, N.F., Silva, D.Y., Gimbert, B., Doe, J., Tzur, R., Sanders, L., & Mule, L. (2000). We have better problems: New problems as indicators of growth in a professional development school. A manuscript prepared for School/University Partnership Monograph, The Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Teacher Educators. **(Contributing author)**

Book reviews

Doe, J. (2002). Review of *Assessing Student Learning and Development: A Handbook for Practitioners* [book review]. *Journal of College Student Development*. 45, 702-704.

Articles published--non-refereed journals

Avraamidou, L. & Doe, J. (2002, July). Bridging contexts: Preparation to teach and early field experiences. In N. Bizzo, C.S. Kawasaki, F. Ferracioli & V.L. da Rosa (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2002 Symposium of the International Organization for Science and Technology Education*. Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, 359-367. **(First author supervised by candidate)**

Dana, T. & Doe, J. (2001, March). Learning to teach with technology. *Proceedings of the 2002 Meeting of the Society for Information Technologies in Teacher Education (SITE)*, Orlando, FL. **(Equal contributions by authors)**

Doe, J. & Dana, T. (2001, March). Argument and evidence in web-based teaching portfolios. *Proceedings of the 2002 Meeting of the Society for Information Technologies in Teacher Education (SITE)*, Orlando, FL. **(Principal Author)**

Research reports to sponsor

Doe, J. & Cole, M. (January, 2002). An online database for K-5 science teaching. A final report to the New York State Section of the American Physical Society. **(Principal Author)**

Doe, J. (September, 2001). Learning to fly: Enhancing the teaching of science in elementary schools through school-university partnership. A final report to the Kellogg Foundation, Leadership for Institutional Change (LINC) Initiative.

Doe, J. (August, 2000). *Using technology to support science teacher learning (Part I)*. An annual report to the principal investigator (Elliot Soloway, The University of Michigan) for the Penn State sub-contract on the National Science Foundation grant, Project ASSESS: Analyzing Software Scaffolding for Educational Settings in Science.

Manuscripts accepted (substantiated by letter of acceptance)

Gimbert, B., Doe, J. & Abruzzo, S. (accepted). Teacher inquiry as professional development for integrating technology and classroom practice in the context of a school-university partnership. *Teacher Education & Practice*, 16(2). **(Equal contributions by authors)**

Manuscripts submitted

Avraamidou, L. & Doe, J. (submitted March 2002). Exploring the influence of web-based portfolio development on learning to teach elementary science. *Technology & Teacher Education*, 23 pages. **(Peer Reviewed, First author supervised by candidate)**

Friedrichsen, P., Munford, D. & Doe, J. (submitted September 2002). Using inquiring empowering technologies to support prospective teachers' scientific inquiry and science learning. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 34 pages. **(Peer Reviewed, Equal contributions by authors)**

Manuscripts in progress

Avraamidou, L. & Doe, J. Using a web-based task to make prospective elementary teachers' personal theorizing about science teaching explicit. **(First author supervised by candidate)**

Avraamidou, L. & Doe, J.. Making the case for the use of web-based portfolios in support of learning to teach. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*. **(First author supervised by candidate)**

CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Doe, J. (2000, June). *Making the most of your time in college*. Video production for Penn State freshman orientation, University Park, PA.

PAPERS PRESENTATIONS

Lunetta, V., Krajcik, J., Reiser, B., Doe, J. & Hug, B. (2003, February). How do we help people, especially at middle-school level, understand *enduring scientific ideas*? A symposium accepted for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), Denver, CO. **(Co-presenter)**

Richmond, G., Anderson, A., Cartier, J. & Doe, J. (2003, January). Designing scaffolded university and field-based assignments to promote analytical and reflective teaching practice. An interactive panel discussion accepted for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Education of Teachers of Science (AETS), Saint Louis, MO. **(Presenter)**

Haefner, L., Doe, J., Friedrichsen, P. & Avraamidou, L. (2003, January). Learning about science inquiry and science teaching and learning: A technology-enhanced applied life science inquiry and science course for prospective science teachers. A paper accepted for presentations at the Hawaii International Conference on Education, Honolulu, HI. **(Lead presenter)**

Doe, J., & Simpson, D. (2001, November). A teacher developed tool for integrating technology into curriculum units. A presentation at the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (PASCD), Hershey, PA. **(Co-presenter)**

Nolan, J., Dana, N., Doe, J., & Romig, G. (2001, November). Making teacher inquiry by classroom teachers and preservice students a reality in school–university partnerships. A workshop at the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Teacher Educators (PAC-TE), Grantville, PA. **(Contributing author but did not present)**

Doe, J., Carney, L., Galati, M.J., Romig, G. (2001, April). Students' insights into web-based portfolio development in teacher education. A presentation at the 9th Annual Teaching & Learning with Technology Symposium, Penn State, University Park, PA. **(Lead Presenter)**

Sillman, K., Boardman, L., Bolinger, J., Avraamidou, L., and Doe (1999, October). Integrating technology into an elementary science methods course. A presentation at the annual meeting of the Northeast Regional Association for the Education of Teachers of Science (AETS-NE), Syracuse, NY. **(Co-presenter)**

Zemba, C. M., Krajcik, J. S., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Palincsar, A. S. (1994). Apprenticeship teaching: Assisting pre-service elementary teachers in developing a cognitive framework for science content representation and instruction. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Anaheim, CA. **(Presenter)**

PARTICIPATION IN SEMINARS AND WORKSHOPS

Colloquy, Teaching & Learning Consortium, Penn State, May 2002. **(Invited Participant)**

Seminar on Electronic Portfolios and Portfolio Assessment, E-Education Institute, Earth and Mineral Sciences, Penn State, Fall 2000 and Fall 2001 (two hours per meeting, two meetings per month). **(Lead Presenter)**

Workshop, *Using PASCO Probeware to Conduct Scientific Investigations*, Link-to-Learn Professional Development given by Clay Cross, Penn State, August 1999. **(Presenter)**

DESCRIPTION OF OUTREACH OR OTHER ACTIVITIES

Editorial

Editorial Board, *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 2001 – present.

Editorial Board, *North American International Journal of Science Education*, 1998 – present.

Reviewer - Journal or Press

Reviewer, *Teacher Directed Research*, Chapter One & Chapter Five, Prentice-Hall Inc. March 1998.

Guest Reviewer, *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 1998 – 2001.

Reviewer, *Journal of Family Psychology*, 1998-2000

Reviewer - Grants

Proposal Reviewer, National Institute of Mental Health, 2004.

Consulting

Consultant, *Primary Science Curriculum Enrichment*, Radio Park Elementary, State College Area School District, Spring 2000.

Consultant, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Gates Millennium Scholars Program, 2000.

Consultant, *Teaching with Technology*. The Convergent Analysis Website Project sponsored by the Milken Foundation, Spring 1998.

Speaking Engagements

Web-Based Portfolios: Supporting the Learning to Teach Process. Lecture conducted at the Grand Rounds of the Child and Adolescent Service, Department of Psychiatry, Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute, San Francisco, CA, October 2001.

Summer Reading Clinic, Renova, PA, Spring 2001.

Adolescent literacy. Workshop designed for Huntingdon Area School District. (workshop designer and presenter)

Services

Board Member, National Center for family Literacy.

Chair, Board of Regents, Comanche Nation College, Lawton, OK.

FUNDED PROJECTS, GRANTS, COMMISSIONS, AND CONTRACTS

Completed

Date: August 2003 to June 2005

Title: *Assessment of a Service-Learning Intervention: A Pilot Study*

Funding Source: Penn State University Children Youth and Family Consortium

Amount: \$17,860

Role/Contribution: Investigator

Dates: May 2001 to February 2004

Title: *Foundations of Excellence in the First College Year*

Funding Source: Lumina Foundation for Education and The Atlantic Philanthropies

Amount: \$370,000

Role/Contribution: Co-Principal Investigator

Proposed

Dates: 2005-2007

Title: *Parsing the First-Year of College*

Funding Source: Spencer Foundation

Amount: \$420,000

Role/Contribution: Co-Principal Investigator

In progress

Dates: September 2003-present

Title: *Study of College Experiences, Racial Identity, and the Development of Social Justice Attitudes*

Funding Source: Penn State University College of Education Research Initiation Grant

Amount: \$8,290

Role/Contribution: Principal Investigator

MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES

American Educational Research Association (AERA), 1992 – present

Association for the Education of Teachers of Science (AETS), 1994 – present

Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development (ASCD), 1996 – present

National Association for Research in Science Teaching (NARST), 1992 – present

National Science Teachers Association (NSTA), 1988 – present

DESCRIPTION OF NEW COURSES/PROGRAMS DEVELOPED

SCIED 410: Using Applications of Technology to Support Learning Science as Inquiry (FA 2000 and SP 2001). This course was developed through efforts associated with the Link-to-Learn grant, *Teaching Science Using Technology*, and Project ASSESS. The course was designed as the first in a series of courses for secondary science majors (SCIED 410, 411, 412). The primary goal is for prospective science teachers to experience learning science as inquiry in a technology-rich environment.

DESCRIPTION OF NEW METHODS OF TEACHING ESTABLISHED COURSES/PROGRAMS

SCIED 458 PDS: Teaching Science in Elementary Professional Development Schools. With support from the Lucent Technologies grant, this course has been re-conceptualized by a team of university faculty, classroom teachers, and school administrators and curriculum support personnel to meet the unique needs of the prospective elementary teachers participating in the year-long internship (PSU – SCASD Partnership). SCIED 458 PDS places a heavy emphasis on learning science for meaningful understanding and the role of children's ideas in this process. Mentor teachers assist in teaching the course and are central in helping develop connections to classroom practice. In addition, course projects have been designed to bridge the theory-practice divide, capitalizing on opportunities available through the professional development school context. As part of this course, interns develop an extensive web-based portfolio to support their learning and demonstrate understandings, abilities and dispositions associated with supporting children's science learning.

LIST OF HONORS/AWARDS FOR SCHOLARSHIP OR PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY

Visiting Scholar, University of Sydney, Australia, 2006.
National Academy of Education, Spencer Foundation Postdoctoral Fellowship, 2004-2006.
Commonwealth of Australia Graduate Scholarship, University of Sydney, Australia, 2004.
Fulbright Award, 2002-2003.
Provost's Award for Collaboration, Science Education Group, The Pennsylvania State University, 2000
Recipient, Lawrence A. Conrey Award for Excellence in Science Teaching, The University of Michigan, 1990

LIST OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION

Completed

Dates: May 2002 to February 2003
Title: *Course Redesign and Improvement*
Funding Source: Penn State
Amount: \$5,000
Role/Contribution: Principal Investigator

Letter of Acceptance

for

Gimbert, B., Doe, J. & Abruzzo, S. (accepted). Teacher inquiry as professional development for integrating technology and classroom practice in the context of a school-university partnership. *Teacher Education & Practice*, 16(2).



SERVICE AND THE SCHOLARSHIP OF SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY, SOCIETY, AND THE PROFESSION

This section contains:

- **Service to the University**
 1. Record of committee work at campus, college, department and University levels
 2. Participation in campus and/or University-wide governance bodies and related activities
 3. Record of administrative support work (college representative, faculty mentoring, etc.)
 4. Record of contributions to the University's programs to enhance equal opportunity and cultural diversity
 5. Assistance to student organizations
 6. Other

- **Service to society as a representative of the University (limit the list to those activities that use the candidate's professional expertise)**
 1. Participation in community affairs
 2. Service to governmental agencies at the international, Federal, state, and local levels
 3. Service to business and industry
 4. Service to public and private organizations
 5. Service to citizen/client groups
 6. Testifying as an expert witness
 7. Other (e.g., participation in task forces, authorities, meetings, etc. of public, nonprofit, or private organizations)

- **Service to the disciplines and to the profession**
 1. Organizing conferences, service on conference committees
 2. Active participation in professional and learned societies (e.g., offices held, committee work, and other responsibilities)

SERVICE AND THE SCHOLARSHIP OF SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY, SOCIETY, AND THE PROFESSION

SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY

Committee work at campus, college, department, and University levels

Chair, Faculty Search Committee, Department of Curriculum & Instruction, 2005
Member, Department Curricular Affairs Committee, Chair, 2005-06
Chair, College of Education Curriculum Committee, 2003-04
Member, University Research Participant Committee, 2003-2004

Participation in campus/University-wide governance bodies

Department Representative to University Faculty Council, 2004-05
Member, University Research Committee of the Faculty Council, 2001-2002

Administrative Support Work

College Representative, SSRI Steering Committee, 2002-03
Professor-in-Charge, Educational Theory and Policy, 2000-2003
Coordinator, Teacher Education, 2000-2001
Interim Co-director, Center for Rural Education, 2000

Contributions to the University's programs to enhance equal opportunity and cultural diversity

Participant, University Climate Summit, September 2005.

Guest Speaker, *Overview of Penn State Science Education Program*, Presentation to Science Teachers in the 1998 Minority Research Apprenticeship Program, College of Health and Human Development, The Pennsylvania State University, June 1998.

Assistance to Student Organizations

Faculty Advisor, Science Education Student Association, 2002-2003
Faculty Advisor, Students for Better Campus Life, 2000-2001

SERVICE TO SOCIETY AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Participation in community affairs

Science demonstration at Fairmont School Fair, December 22, 2001

Service to governmental agencies (international, Federal, state, and local)

Briefing to Congressional staffers on the reauthorization of the Science Act, Washington, DC, August 2001.
Advisory Panel, National Research Council Board on Science Education, 2000-2001.
Invited Speaker, Pennsylvania State Board of Education Math Science Study, October 2000.

Doe, John

C-2

Service to business and industry

Board of Directors, Science Academy, 2002-2003
 Invited Speaker, Science Institute of Education, 2002
 Consultant to the Social Policy Research Association, 2001
 Consultant, State College School District on cost analysis, 2001

Service to public and private organizations

In-service Training on School Law, Mount Nittany Middle School, November 2002
 Presenter, Panel Discussant, State College Perspectives on the United Nations 4th World Conference, 2001

Service to citizen/client groups

Pennsylvania's Charter School Appeals Board, 2001-2002
 Talk on Schooling and Teacher Roles in US, Germany, and Japan to the German American Friendship Society, 2001
 Member, Committee of the Centre for Rural Women, Centre County, 2000-2001

Other

Outside Evaluator, Dissertation at Australian Catholic University, 2001
 Expert opinion, Delphia Study creating an instrument to measure student voice within a school district, March 2001

SERVICE TO THE DISCIPLINES AND TO THE PROFESSION

Organizing Conferences; Service on Conference Committees

Chair, Planning Committee of annual international conference, *The 10th Annual Values and Leadership Conference*. Barbados, October 2005.
 Paper Reviewer for the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Nashville, TN, November, 2005.
 Co-Coordinator, Program Committee for the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Boston, MA, August 2005.
 Proposal Reviewer, AERA annual meeting, Division F, 2001-04.
 Member, Program Committee, American Psychological Association Annual Conference, 2000-2001.

Active participation in professional and learned societies

Member, Board of Directors, University Council for Educational Administration Center on Ethics, 2003-2004.
 Member, Outstanding Paper Award Committee, National Association for Research), 2003-2004.
 Member, Membership Committee, American Psychological Association, 2003-2004.



EXTERNAL LETTERS OF ASSESSMENT
(FOR PROMOTION AND FINAL TENURE REVIEWS)

This section contains:

- Description of how the letters of assessment were solicited, including a sample letter or request. Note: When letters are solicited, the request should be for letters of assessment rather than "recommendations" or "endorsements," and evaluators should be encouraged to concentrate on those aspects of the candidate's record which are most important to the external visibility and professional standing of the candidate.
- Identification of those who have written assessments, including a brief statement of the referee's achievements and standing in his/her discipline.
- Description of the procedure for selecting external evaluators.
- List of materials sent to external evaluators (e.g., copies of publications, vita, narrative statement, etc.)
- A log showing the date on which each external letter was requested by the department/dean, and the date the letter was received. All requests should be entered regardless of whether a response was obtained.

(07-01-04)

EXTERNAL LETTERS OF ASSESSMENT

Procedure for Selecting External Evaluators

In the College of Education, Department Heads ask promotion and tenure candidates for the names of not more than three (3) individuals the candidate feels would be in a good position to assess the relative merits of the candidate's work. The Department Heads also consult with other experts in the field, including the Professor-in-Charge of the relevant graduate program for the purpose of adding to this list. The Department Heads then assemble a final list of not fewer than six names that is submitted to the Dean along with a brief biographical sketch for each name. The Dean independently chooses at least four individuals from the list to contact and informs the relevant Department Head of the selection.

Solicitation of External Letters and List of Material Sent to Evaluators

A letter from the Dean detailing areas to be addressed is sent to each external evaluator. (See the following sample letter of request.) Materials sent to external evaluators included: A copy of the faculty member's curriculum vitae, a narrative statement from the candidate, and a representative sample of scholarly work that includes at least three refereed articles.

Identification of External Evaluators

John Doe, Associate Dean of Education, University of Iowa. Dr. Doe is Professor of Education and Dean at the University. He is editor of the Education Journal and has conducted comparative studies of schooling and education.

Jane Doe, Assistant Dean, University of Texas. She has written extensively on the role of schools in rural communities.

Tommy Doe, Dean of the School of Education at the University of Melbourne. He is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Spencer Foundation and has extensive research in the study of education in Australia.

Tina Doe, Professor of Education at the University of Kansas. Her specialties include cultural studies. She is former director and has extensive experience in cultural and foundational studies.

Sample/copy of letter sent to evaluators

Log Sheet
(John Doe - Jane Doe - Tommy Doe - Tina Doe)



Actual letters in the order that they appear on the log
John Doe - Jane Doe - Tommy Doe - Tina Doe



STATEMENTS OF EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE BY REVIEW COMMITTEES AND ADMINISTRATORS

This section contains:

Evaluative statements assessing the candidate's strengths and weaknesses with respect to University and local criteria shall be provided at campus, department, college, and University levels. Each of these evaluative statements is inserted in the candidate's dossier at each step in the review process in the following order:

1. For tenure cases, all previous tenure review evaluations, presented in chronological order, beginning with the earliest probationary reviews.
2. Campus review committee (if appropriate).
- *3. Campus chancellor (if appropriate).
- **4. Department review committee (if appropriate).
5. Department head, or other appropriate unit head; e.g., division head or school director (if appropriate).
6. College review committee (if appropriate).
7. College dean or campus chancellor.
8. University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (if appropriate).

The author(s) of the comments and recommendations at each of the above levels of review shall indicate the relative emphasis given to each of the University and local criteria/expectations in the evaluation of each candidate for tenure and promotion. When a candidate has not received a unanimous committee vote, the evaluation should include a discussion of the reasons for the divergent opinions.

All committee reports should list the entire membership, be signed and dated by at least the Chair.

The numerical vote of each committee should be reported.

*The review by the Chancellor of the Great Valley School of Graduate Professional Studies will be conducted at the end of the Great Valley review process for candidates whose locus of tenure resides at Great Valley; the Chancellor's letter will immediately precede that of the Senior Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School.

**An individual's performance in an intercollege research program should be evaluated in writing by the program director, or by appropriate faculty member(s).

(07-01-06)

STATEMENTS OF EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE BY REVIEW COMMITTEES AND ADMINISTRATORS

****Sample Format** Use letterhead for page one**

Date:

To: David H. Monk, Dean, College of Education

From: _____ Chair, Department Promotion & Tenure Review Committee (signed by Chair)

Subj: Recommendation for the _____ Year Tenure and/or Promotion Review for (Assistant or Associate) Professor _____

Committee Members: List name and full rank and title of committee members; note any abstentions.

The Department of _____ Promotion and Tenure Committee met on _____, to review Dr. ____'s dossier for _____.

The committee voted (RECORD EXACT VOTE even when unanimous Ex. 7=yes; 0=no):

- **unanimously that (name) be continued on the tenure track (or tenured, or promoted, etc.), or not be continued**
- **not unanimous vote: (number) for and (number) against continuing on the tenure track (or tenured, or promoted, etc.)**

Summarized below is the committee's evaluation of the candidate's performance in each of the three major categories of review described in HR-23.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

- **Discuss record. The committee viewed candidate's performance as _____ [unsatisfactory, satisfactory, very good, or excellent]**

The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments

- **Discuss record. The committee judged performance in this category to be _____**

Service and the Scholarship of Service

- **Discuss record. The candidate's record of service was seen as _____**

Consultation (if appropriate): Consultation occurred on (date) to discuss reasons for the different recommendations between (review level) and (review level).

Overall summary of record. Recommendation to the Dean.

- **Be cautious to avoid disclosure, either directly or by inference, of the identity of any external evaluator**
-

(no pagination)

CANDIDATE SIGNATURE PAGE

I have reviewed the contents of my dossier, with the exception of confidential materials, as defined in the HR-23 Guidelines.

Candidate Signature

Date