

**APPLICATION FOR PROMOTION IN RANK**

**MidAmerica Nazarene University**

**Name Jill Gonzalez-Bravo Date 8/25/2022**

**Link to online portfolio:** [**http://jillgonzalezbravo.weebly.com/introduction-portfolio-for-rank-advancement-full-professor.html**](http://jillgonzalezbravo.weebly.com/introduction-portfolio-for-rank-advancement-full-professor.html)

**Current Rank (check one):**

☐ Assistant Professor X Associate Professor ☐ Professor

☐ Professor (Tenured)

**Rank Application for (check one):**

☐ Assistant Professor ☐ Associate Professor X Professor (Tenure)

☐ Post-tenure Review ☐ Tenure Only

**A. Earned Degrees**

 **Degree University Date Received**

 **Ed.D Kansas State University 2015**

 **MA Wichita State University 1999**

 **BS Kansas State University 1995**

**B. Full-time University Experience**

 **Institution Rank Years Completed**

 **MidAmerica Nazarene University Associate 2018**

 **MidAmerica Nazarene University Assistant 2015**

*Additional questions are in the pages that follow. Please complete the entire application.*

**Portfolio Instructions and Questions**

In your portfolio (template provided), you will address each of the promotion categories by including a summary, presentation of artifacts or evidence and reflection. The portfolio will reflect Ernest Boyer’s Model of Scholarship, both implicitly and explicitly. At the implicit level, the portfolio will summarize your professional practices of teaching and learning, scholarship, service, and integration. At the explicit level, the portfolio will feature scholarly work that you have done in one or more areas of Boyer’s model.

More specifically, for each part of the portfolio (Teaching and Learning, Scholarship, Service, and Integration), include:

1. A summary of the artifacts or evidence of mastery included;
2. For evidence related to conference presentations, publications, etc., please provide the COTP (Committee on the Professoriate) a summary of the criteria for acceptance.
3. The presentation of the artifact(s) (copies uploaded to support category);
4. A short, self-reflection narrative for each section detailing:
	1. As you review the artifacts, what you have learned about yourself and your role at the University?
	2. Include in the self-reflection any future goals that come to mind.
	3. With your annual goals in mind, reflect on your achievements for the past few years. Annual reviews and course evaluations should speak into this self-reflection and goals list.
5. There should be a minimum of five sections (or tabs) in your e-Portfolio: Introduction, Teaching, Scholarship, Service, and Integration. See the overview and suggestions for each section below. The template provided offers additional information.
6. Be sure to also refer to the promotion rubric as you develop your portfolio (Faculty Handbook Appendix C).
7. Introduction section or tab of the e-Portfolio:

 Explain why you are seeking the promotion and the general rationale that supports your application. Include an explanation and documentation regarding how your earned degrees support your position at MNU. Also include a summary of your experiences in higher education and how that experience has prepared you for the next rank in professional status.

 Artifacts to include:

* 1. Current CV.
	2. Copies of certificates of added professional experience (if applicable).
1. Teaching

 For this section of the portfolio, evaluation will be made on 3 subtopics: Teaching and Learning, Educational Philosophy, and Curricular Contributions. Please see rubric for evaluation levels. Possible artifacts to include in this section:

1. Statement of teaching philosophy which could include: addressing the role of the student, the role of the professor, the learning environment created, the nature of knowledge acquisition, faith integration in your discipline, etc. Note that this not inclusive, but ideas for consideration.
2. Documentation of teaching load for the last 3 years.
3. A representative sample of student evaluations should be provided in consultation with your chair, program director or dean.
4. Examples of syllabi, tests, exams, quizzes, technology usage, engaged learning, service learning etc. that would speak to excellence in Teaching and Learning.
5. Documentation of participation in faculty development or other professional development activities either on or off campus. Explain how those activities support your teaching at MNU.
6. Other artifacts addressing your ability of excellence in teaching and learning in the MNU classroom.
7. Please see rubric for evaluation levels and other ideas.
8. Scholarship: Discovery, Integration, Application and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

For this section, evaluation will be made in several different scholarly subtopics that apply to individual participants such as original research (the Scholarship of Discovery), integration (the Scholarship of Integration, discipline-specific service (the Scholarship of Application), or teaching and learning (The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, or, SOTL). The appropriate artifacts will be determined by the applicant and the discipline field, but possible artifacts include:

1. Documentation of original research that advances the academic discipline individually or in a group of researchers;
2. Documentation of integrative work that interprets, draws together or brings new insight to original research;
3. Documentation of rigorous application of academic discipline to real world problems and scenarios. This could include service learning experiences as well.
4. Documentation of the scholarship of teaching as pedagogy/andragogy is changed based on research and scholarship in the field of teaching and learning (scholarship of teaching and learning).
5. Documentation of achievement in the performing arts if applicable.
6. Documentation of other scholarship development activities such as grant proposals, reports written for accreditation, accreditation training, etc.
7. Please see rubric for evaluation levels and other examples.

As mentioned in the Faculty Handbook, a minimum of one area of scholarship must be evaluated. More areas may be evaluated if closely related to the scholarly demands of the discipline or of particular interest to the faculty member. Departments may provide specific guidelines for the criteria in this rubric. In the space provided below, indicate the area(s) of scholarship on which you wish the Committee on the Professoriate (COTP) to focus during the review of your portfolio.

It is important for each applicant to carefully consider how many areas of scholarship are selected. Reviewing the rubrics in Appendix C in the Faculty Handbook will be helpful in discerning which areas to select. Ratings of a “4,” for example, often require rigorous levels of peer-review, a difficult outcome to achieve in all areas of scholarship. Higher levels of achievement within a given area of scholarship may in aggregate positively impact the final portfolio score. If a higher level of achievement can be maintained in multiple scholarship areas, the same result will be had. The decision to offer multiple areas of scholarship or focus in this portfolio application process can be informed through a discussion with your chair and dean.

Area of Scholarship:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scholarship of Discovery | Scholarship of Integration | Scholarship of Application | Scholarship of Teaching and Learning |
|  |  | X |  |

 The COTP would like to understand the reasoning behind your selection. Use the

 space here to provide context for your scholarship area(s) of focus.

Evidence presented in the Scholarship of Application is a representation of the culmination of research and publications I started at the beginning of my doctoral work in 2012 and the continued dedication to integrative advocacy work conducted within the local community, across the state, and nationally in my work with accreditation, policy, and service to professional organizations.

1. Service: Community Engagement and Service

For this section, evaluation will be made in several subtopics. Service to the university and the discipline is important to the development and welfare of the academy and our students. Artifacts for this section could include:

1. Documentation of serving/leading on university committees and or taskforces.
2. Documentation of your participation in Faculty Assembly meetings, chapel sessions and other similar university activities;
3. Documentation of advising and mentoring of students in and out of your discipline area.
4. Documentation of actively involved/leading in discipline specific organizations outside of the university in the broader discipline context.
5. Documentation of actively involved/leading in community focused organizations.
6. Please see rubric for evaluation levels.
7. Integration: Faith Integration and Interdisciplinary Work

For this section, evaluation will be made in several subtopics. The scholarship of integration, or in other words, the connections between faith and discipline areas are very important to our mission and vision of who we are as educators and as a university. Subtopics for this segment of your e-portfolio/evaluation include faith contextualization, faith application/reflection, philosophy of Christian education, curricular contributions with faith integration and engagement in interdisciplinary learning experiences Artifacts for this section could include:

1. Documentation of course examples of learning experiences, lectures, activities, etc. that showcase the relevance of faith integration with discipline-specific knowledge.
2. Documentation of curriculum that emphasizes faith integration into the academic discipline.
3. Documentation of a clear and comprehensive philosophy of Christian education.
4. Documentation of learning environments demonstrating interdisciplinary engagement and an awareness of campus groups and activities.

**Letters of Support**

 Letters of support are optional. Letters can be used to support various sections of your portfolio as evidence. These letters may be provided in your portfolio or sent directly to the VPAA. Deans and chairs will provide their recommendations through the rank advancement rubric process.