

2001

# Business Administration and Economics: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation

The College at Brockport

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

## Repository Citation

The College at Brockport, "Business Administration and Economics: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation" (2001).  
*Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation*. 43.  
<http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt/43>

This Document is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @Brockport. It has been accepted for inclusion in Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @Brockport. For more information, please contact [kmyers@brockport.edu](mailto:kmyers@brockport.edu).

State University of New York - College at Brockport

**Department of Business Administration and Economics**

# Governance Documents

## Appendix A

### **Guidelines, Standards, and Procedures For Re-Appointment, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion**

Revision Date: 11/15/99



## Contents: Appendix A

<b>I.</b>	<b>Overview: Re-Appointment, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion Process:</b>	<b>Page</b>
1.	Role of the APT Committee.....	A-1
2.	Role of the Candidate.....	A-1
3.	Application Contents.....	A-1
4.	Criteria to be Considered.....	A-2
5.	Application Of Criteria Weights In The Review Process .....	A-2
6.	Distribution of APT Committee Reports .....	A-2
7.	Voting Process .....	A-3
<b>II.</b>	<b>Standards and Procedures for Evaluating Teaching</b>	
1.	Review of the Candidate's Teaching Portfolio .....	A-4
2.	Classroom Evaluation .....	A-4
3.	Student Opinions of the Candidate.....	A-5
4.	Professional Development and Interaction .....	A-5
5.	Basis For Judgement .....	A-5
<b>III.</b>	<b>Standards and Procedures for Evaluating Scholarship</b>	
1.	Standards for Scholarly Achievement.....	A-6
2.	Basis For Judgement .....	A-6
3.	Tenure-track Faculty Seeking Reappointment .....	A-8
4.	Faculty at the Rank of Lecturer .....	A-8
5.	Burden of Proof .....	A-8
6.	Non-traditional Forms of Scholarship .....	A-9
7.	Impact of Teaching Load on Expectations for Scholarship .....	A-9
8.	'Grandfather Clause' .....	A-9
9.	Required Supporting Documentation.....	A-9
10.	Definitions of Terms and Explanation of Concepts .....	A-10
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Standards and Procedures for Evaluating Service</b>	
1.	Scope of Department Service Activities .....	A-11
2.	Standards For Contributions To Department Service .....	A-11
3.	Adjustments to Expectations for Department Service.....	A-12
4.	Standards for College, Professional, and Community Service.....	A-13
5.	Reporting and Recording of Service Contributions .....	A-13
6.	Process: Evaluation of Service in Personnel Actions .....	A-14
<b>V.</b>	<b>Review and Revision Of Standards and Procedures.....</b>	<b>A-16</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Attachment 1: Classroom Observation Rating Sheet</b>	

This appendix to the Governance Documents describes the procedures, criteria, and standards, used by the Department of Business Administration and Economics, in the evaluation of faculty requests for re-appointment, continuing appointment, and promotion.

## I. **Overview of Application and Review Process:**

1. **Role of the APT Committee:** The APT Committee is charged with the review of all applications for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion within the Department. The review process will consider the performance of the Candidate with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service as specified in the sections below.

The outcome of the APT Committee review process will be a written report and recommendation to the Department faculty. Said report shall include 1) the Committee's recommendation, 2) the Committee vote on the personnel action being considered, and 3) a supporting narrative summarizing the Committee's conclusions as they pertain to the criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service. In cases where the APT Committee authors multiple reports for multiple candidates, the Committee should seek to produce reports that are consistent in format, style, and organization.

Each member of the APT Committee agreeing with the recommendation shall sign the report. A Committee member not agreeing with the recommendation is not required to sign the report. If a member chooses not to sign the report, it is deemed an abstention unless the Committee member chooses to attach a written statement to the contrary. Members of the Committee not agreeing with the recommendation may prepare a written, signed statement that will become a permanent attachment to the report. Dissenting opinions are to be attached prior to the distribution of the report to the faculty.

2. **Role of the Candidate:** Requests by full-time faculty, to be considered for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion, are to be made in writing to the APT Committee in accordance with current administrative deadlines. It is the responsibility of each individual seeking re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion within the Department to prepare a complete and organized package of materials supporting his/her request. Further, it is the responsibility of each individual to know and understand 1) the terms of his/her current appointment and 2) application deadlines for contract renewal, continuing appointment, and promotion.
3. **Application Contents:** Materials supporting the Candidate's request for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion, shall be organized and indexed in accord with any administrative guidelines in effect at the time of the application. The Candidate should strive to ease the burden of those reviewing the Candidate's request through the use of a clear, concise, and consistent labeling scheme for all supporting documents. Where guidelines do not exist, the following ordering of materials shall be used:
  - Letter of application, including criteria weights to be applied;
  - Inventory of materials submitted;

- Annual reports for the period under review, including comment and signature pages;
- Teaching Portfolio;
- Supporting documents related primarily to scholarship;
- Supporting documents related primarily to service; and
- Other documents and appendices included by the Candidate.

Where possible, materials should be organized into three-ring or equivalent binders that are clearly labeled. A Candidate should not expect individuals reviewing his/her materials to sift through unorganized and loose materials contained in boxes.

4. **Criteria to be Considered:** The report and recommendation of the APT Committee will focus on the Candidate's record in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as it pertains to the personnel action under consideration. Any application, for re-appointment, continuing appointment or promotion, must include a statement by the Candidate regarding the relative weights to be applied to the criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service. Each Candidate will select a set of weights such that:
  - The weight on teaching is at least 0.5;
  - The weight on teaching > weight on scholarship > weight on service;
  - The weights applied to scholarship and service must be at least 0.15; and
  - The sum of the weights is equal to one.

**The Candidate's right to specify weights in the review process does not remove the obligation of the Candidate to meet minimal performance standards in teaching, scholarship, and service as described later in this document.**

5. **Application Of Criteria Weights In The Review Process:** Members of the APT Committee are charged with applying the weights, as supplied by the Candidate, as they consider the Candidate's request for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion. Each member of the APT Committee is responsible for ensuring that his/her vote takes into account the weights specified by the Candidate.
6. **Distribution of APT Committee Reports:** The APT Committee members are responsible for conducting the review process and preparing the Committee report in conformance with published administrative deadlines. Further, accommodation of a period of review, by the Candidate and the Department, must be made as described below.

The written report of the Committee will be shared with Candidate prior to forwarding the report to the Department. The only purpose of sharing the report with the Candidate, prior to its being forwarded, is to allow clarification by the Candidate. It is understood that the Candidate has the option of withdrawing his/her request at any time prior to when the recommendation is presented by the Committee to the Department for formal vote, provided that the Candidate withdraws his/her request in

writing. The identity of the Candidate who chooses to withdraw his/her request will be kept confidential.

Except in cases where the Candidate chooses to withdraw his/her request for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion, the Committee will submit its written report to the Department Chairperson and the Department for the purpose of a departmental vote on the recommendation. The signed Committee report must be distributed to the faculty at least 5 working days before any faculty vote on the Committee's recommendation.

For a reasonable period of time prior to the vote, the Candidate's application and supporting documentation, including an inventory of the contents provided by the Candidate, will be kept on file in the Department office for examination. Materials removed for examination will be recorded on the inventory. All materials will be returned to the Candidate by the appropriate College official or will be retained in the Department office pending disposal.

7. **Voting Process:** The members of the Department vote on the recommendation of the APT committee. During the faculty meeting at which a vote on the Committee recommendation is taken, the Candidate will have an opportunity to speak to the Department concerning the Committee's recommendation and to address the Department as the Candidate sees fit. The Department will also have the opportunity to ask questions of the Candidate; the Candidate will then be asked to leave the room.

The Department will then have the opportunity (1) to ask questions of the APT Committee and (2) for general discussion. The members of the Department will then vote by secret ballot. The result will be announced to the Department, and then to the Candidate, immediately after the balloting and be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. The Chairperson's recommendation will then be made known to the Department at this time. The Committee's recommendation, along with the Department vote on the recommendation, will be forwarded to the Dean.

## II. **Standards and Procedures for Evaluating Teaching**

As described below, the APT Committee will formulate its recommendation, as it pertains to teaching, based upon the following:

1. The Candidate's teaching portfolio;
2. Classroom evaluations;
3. Student opinions of the Candidate; and
4. Evidence provided concerning professional development and interaction, as it concerns teaching.

1. **A Thorough And Complete Review Of The Candidate's Teaching Portfolio:** The Candidate's teaching portfolio shall contain the following:
  - a) A written statement on the Candidate's philosophy of education and educational goals as they relate to the mission of the Department and the mission of the College.
  - b) A reflective statement indicating how the materials compiled by the Candidate demonstrate teaching excellence and continued growth as an instructor.
  - c) A written statement on the Candidate's educational goals relative to specific courses the Candidate currently teaches or has taught during the review period and how those goals relate to the mission of the Department and the College.
  - d) The following course materials:
    - (i) One copy of the Candidate's syllabus (from any semester during the review period) for each course taught during the review period.
    - (ii) One complete set of examinations (i.e., all semester exams and the final exam, if given) for one section of each course taught during the review period. The Candidate may, optionally, also include samples of student work, such as papers or term projects.
  - e) Computer printouts of the four global questions for all Instructional Assessment System (IAS) teaching evaluations given during the review period.
  - f) Evidence as to the Candidate's involvement with course development and/or instructional innovation.
  - g) Evidence of interaction with the professional community during the review period.
  - h) Any items the Candidate feels will help the Committee with its deliberations.

No materials relating to summer teaching are required for inclusion in the portfolio. They may be included, however, at the option of the Candidate.

For the purposes of compiling a teaching portfolio, the term "review period" is defined as follows:

- a) **As to re-appointment:** The time period since the Candidate was last reviewed by the Department for re-appointment or, if this is the Candidate's first re-appointment, the time period since the Candidate began full-time employment with the Department.
  - b) **As to continuing appointment:** All academic years the Candidate has been on a "tenure track" line. The Candidate may, however, include information from any academic year he or she was on a non-tenure track line at SUNY-Brockport.
  - c) **As to promotion:** a minimum of the previous five academic years (not including sabbaticals or leaves) or time at current rank, if less than five years.
2. **Classroom evaluation:** Each member of the APT Committee is to observe at least one of the Candidate's classes. Each of the Candidate's courses (excluding internships,

independent study, and directed study) must be observed at least once by at least one member of the Committee. If the Candidate teaches multiple sections of a course during the semester the evaluation is taking place, the Candidate may require that at least one member of the Committee observe additional sections of that course. All classroom observations will be arranged with and agreed to by the Candidate prior to each visit. The APT Committee will initiate arrangements for classroom visitation. The survey instrument for this purpose is attached, as Attachment 1. Each member of the Committee will use these guidelines as the basis for his or her evaluation. Committee members are free to supplement his/her evaluations with any other written comments they deem appropriate. Future APT Committees wishing to modify Attachment 1 may do so, subject to formal departmental approval.

In undertaking a classroom evaluation, Committee members are to look for evidence as to how the Candidate applies his or her teaching philosophy and attempts to meet the educational goals stated in his or her teaching portfolio, along with evidence of course development and instructional innovation.

The intent of using a standard classroom evaluation form is to 1) promote consistency in the evaluation process and to 2) help a Committee member recall his/her reaction and experience during the classroom evaluation, which may have preceded committee deliberations by a significant period of time. Classroom evaluation forms are intended to support the Committee's deliberation concerning a Candidate and, as such, may be reviewed by any member of the APT committee. However, at the end of the Committee's deliberation, the classroom evaluation form and any supporting notes remain the property of the individual APT committee member that conducted the classroom observation, i.e., evaluation forms are not attached to the Committee report.

3. **Student Opinions Of The Candidate:** The IAS form is the mandated survey instrument until such time that an alternative document is developed and approved by both the Department and the College. The Candidate may, at his or her option, provide the Committee with any additional survey instruments used (i.e., additional questions given along with the IAS or essay questions) and any correspondence received from students.

Committee members will review the IAS results submitted for the purpose of determining if the Candidate's scores meet the minimum acceptable range of 2.25 or lower, as established by the Department.

4. **Professional Development and Interaction:** The Candidate should provide the Committee with evidence that the Candidate is remaining current in his or her instructional field(s), including interaction with business practitioners, for the purpose of both academic and professional growth.
5. **Basis For Judgement:** For a Candidate's application to be considered "favorable" by an individual APT Committee member, three of the four following standards must be met in the area of teaching:
  - a) The Candidate's teaching portfolio - Evidence presented by the Candidate must show that the Candidate's educational goals, as stated in his/her portfolio, are consistent with the Department and College mission statements and have been met or are in the process of being met.

- b) Classroom evaluations - A majority of the responses recorded by an individual APT Committee member on his or her survey instrument (Attachment 1) must be either positive (i.e., "yes") or "not applicable".
- c) Student opinions of the Candidate - At least seventy percent of the individual global questions included in the review period must have a mean rating of 2.25 or lower. The Candidate has the opportunity to provide the Committee with supplemental student surveys, including IAS responses to the "non-global" questions.
- d) Professional development and interaction, as it concerns teaching - The Candidate must present some evidence of continuous professional development supporting the assertion that the Candidate is remaining current in his or her instructional field(s).

### III. Standards and Procedures for Evaluating Scholarship

As described and explained below, the APT Committee will formulate its recommendation, as it pertains to scholarship using the following guidelines:

1. **Standards for Scholarly Achievement:** It is not possible to anticipate every possible path that a candidate might follow when undertaking the pursuit of scholarship. The Department recognizes several possible profiles that faculty might assume in meeting expectations for scholarly activity. These include:
  - Example 1:** The Scholar who writes in multiple media;
  - Example 2:** The Scholar who writes articles in moderation;
  - Example 3:** The Scholar who creates the rare breakthrough and publishes it;
  - Example 4:** A portfolio comparable in scholarly worth to examples 1, 2 or 3 above.
2. **Basis For Judgement:** All of the above scholarly profiles are recognized and valued equally. Examples conveying minimum expectations for each of these profiles are set forth in the tables below. Faculty who demonstrate that his/her work meets or exceeds the levels of productivity shown in the examples below will have met the Department's expectation for scholarship. Since individuals may not exactly fit into any of the first three categories, the APT Committee must be flexible in its interpretation of where the Candidate fits and **not** require a Candidate to fit exactly in any of these slots.

The table below provides **examples** of how faculty can meet the minimum "Scholarly Activity" requirements for **Continuing Appointment and/or Promotion to Associate Professor**.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Example 1</b> (Diversified portfolio of scholarship)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Example 2</b> (Constant stream of traditional publications)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Example 3</b> (Very high quality scholarship)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 publications in peer-reviewed journals plus any 5 of the following               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Refereed conference proceeding</li> <li>◆ Published book review or article summary</li> <li>◆ Textbook chapter</li> <li>◆ Chapter(s) of scholarly book(s)</li> <li>◆ Published textbook ancillary</li> <li>◆ Published instructional materials</li> <li>◆ Additional journal article</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 publications in peer-reviewed journals plus any 3 of the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Refereed conference proceeding</li> <li>◆ Published book review or article summary</li> <li>◆ Chapter(s) of scholarly book(s)</li> <li>◆ Additional journal article</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 publications in peer-reviewed journals plus a scholarly<sup>1</sup> book</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 articles in "top-tier" journals</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 seminal publication</li> </ul>

---

<sup>1</sup> As attested to by external sources.

The table below provides **examples** of how faculty can meet the minimum "Scholarly Activity" requirements for **Promotion to Full Professor**.

Example 1	Example 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 seminal publications</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 of the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ publications in “top-tier” journals,</li> <li>◆ scholarly texts,</li> <li>◆ significant instructional texts</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A combination of the above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 publications in peer-reviewed journals plus a scholarly<sup>2</sup> book</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 publications in peer-reviewed journals plus any 6 of the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Refereed conference proceeding</li> <li>◆ Published book review or article summary</li> <li>◆ Chapter(s) of scholarly book(s)</li> <li>◆ Textbook chapter</li> <li>◆ Published textbook ancillary</li> <li>◆ Published case, teaching materials, etc.</li> <li>◆ Additional journal article</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Note:** The numbers shown in the above table for promotion to full-professor are cumulative, i.e., they include the numbers already achieved at the Associate Professor level.

3. **Tenure-track faculty seeking reappointment** need to demonstrate continuous and substantive progress towards meeting the standards suggested in the tables above.
4. **Faculty at the rank of lecturer** are expected to meet the scholarship obligations negotiated at the time the individual was hired or, alternatively, the obligations that have since been mutually agreed to by the Department Chair and the faculty member. Faculty at the rank of lecturer are expected to remain current in his/her instructional field. To the degree that scholarship helps keep individuals abreast of the literature, it is assumed that instruction benefits. However, professional development and experience may substitute as a mechanism for maintaining qualifications.
5. **The burden of proof rests with the Candidate.** Since APT Committee members cannot be expected to be experts in the Candidate's area of expertise, the Candidate shall be responsible for supporting **all claims** concerning the importance, relevance, or quality of any publications. As noted below, copies of all publications are to be submitted to the APT Committee, not merely citations of those publications. Any claims made by the Candidate concerning the importance of his/her research must be supported. As examples, the Candidate might provide the number of and sources of citations of an

<sup>2</sup> As attested to by external sources.

article if she/he claims that the article is "seminal". If a Candidate claims that her/his article is in a "top journal", she/he must support the claim that the journal in question is indeed a top journal; that might be done by using some combination of (1) a ranking of journals from a published source, or (2) a ranking of journals from other colleges or universities or (3) multiple testimonials from prestigious institutions attesting that the journal would be considered a leading journal in that sub-field or (4) an assessment of journals from professional groups or (5) other relevant sources such as Cabell's measure of selectivity.

Reiterating the central points from 1, 2, and 5 above, the APT Committee is not able to provide the expertise to evaluate quality in all areas and thus it is the Candidate's responsibility to argue that she/he meets the scholarship requirements suggested by the tables above and to substantiate that claim. The APT Committee is expected to weigh evidence, not to collect it.

6. **Non-traditional forms of scholarship:** In satisfying the standards and requirements for scholarship described herein, a Candidate must make the case for including less traditional or emerging forms of scholarly and creative contributions in his/her scholarship portfolio.
7. **Impact of Teaching Load on Expectations for Scholarship:** Because standards may change over time, it is expected that these guidelines will be modified by the Department at some future time. The criteria above were established under the assumption that the "normal" teaching load is nine hours per semester. Should the "normal" teaching load be redefined, the suggested "Scholarly Achievement" requirements for promotion and tenure should also be redefined.
8. **'Grandfather Clause':** These scholarship guidelines apply to faculty hired subsequent to the adoption date of this document. If the guidelines are changed, faculty hired subsequent to the change will be subject to the new guidelines, while faculty who were formerly subject to older guidelines may choose either the criteria described in this document or the guidelines/criteria in place at the time when the person was appointed to his/her current position.
9. **Required Supporting Documentation:** In addition to a Curriculum Vita, all Candidates for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure are expected to provide the APT Committee with documentation of scholarship which includes, but is not limited to:
  - A reflective statement discussing how the Candidate's scholarship meets the expectations implied by the tables in section III.2 and how the Candidate's scholarship is relevant to his/her teaching and/or service responsibilities;
  - Reprints or photocopies of all published work;
  - Complete copies of works in progress listed in the Vita;
  - Documentation supporting claims of quality or importance of scholarship.

## 10. Definitions of Terms & Explanation of Concepts

- (1) The term "peer review" includes editorial review of articles in outlets of relevant academic/professional publications.
- (2) The term "publication" is defined to be either a work in print or a work accompanied by an editor's letter indicating an unconditional acceptance for publication. Furthermore, "publication" shall be restricted to topics relevant to business and economics. Publications may be books or articles in peer-reviewed journals or peer-reviewed edited books. The Candidate may make a case for inclusion of emerging and newer forms of publications, e.g., electronic publications.
- (3) A Candidate who suggest that his/her work is "seminal" must provide supporting evidence for such a claim. For example: the frequency of citation of the seminal work from a recognized and objective source.
- (4) A Candidates who suggest that his/her work is "top-tier" must provide supporting evidence of such a claim.
- (5) The applicant is free to supplement his/her scholarship portfolio with other evidence of quality and contributions, such as testimonials and/or letters from peers or outsiders. A further example of the kind of evidence which the Committee would find helpful and appropriate might include evidence of the number of adoptions, **across institutions**, of a text, monograph, study guide, etc. that is claimed to be a "significant instructional tool".
- (6) The examples in the tables are meant as guidelines. The Candidate is expected to provide substantiating evidence on questions of quality and "importance" of scholarly work. The Committee has a clear responsibility to detect and deny frivolous or exaggerated claims of "scholarly" achievement.
- (7) All applicants should demonstrate evidence of continued performance in the area of scholarly activity, e.g., working papers, papers in progress, conference presentations, grants received, articles under review, etc.
- (8) Some of the "minimal acceptable publications" required for promotion or tenure must have been published in the five years preceding application. For example, for the Candidate applying for promotion to associate professor who claims 4 publications in peer-reviewed journals and 3 published book reviews, some of the publications or book reviews must have been published in the five years preceding the personnel action.

## IV. Standards and Procedures for Evaluating Service

Service has an important role in the academic community. Contributions to the service needs of the Department, the College, the community, and one's profession are an ongoing expectation within the total professional obligation. Sections 1 through 6 below describe the expectations, reporting requirements, and evaluation of service contributions for the Department of Business Administration and Economics.

1. **Scope of Department Service Activities.** Department service activities, and the anticipated effort required to execute each activity, are detailed annually in the Department planning document. These obligations include not only the activities of the major Department Committees, but also those activities required to maintain competitive programs, including program development, program coordination, program assessment, program accreditation, advisement, student recruitment, employer relations, and retention.
2. **Standards For Contributions To Department Service:** All faculty are required to maintain a minimum of four hours per week of office hours and are expected to attend faculty and area meetings. All faculty are expected to shoulder a proportionate share of the Department's advisement and registration activities and to dispatch the same in a professional and competent manner. Minimum standards for competency in advisement include regular availability during scheduled hours, non-cursory review of student course schedules prior to providing approval, returning student phone calls, etc. Additionally, the following expectations must be met:
  - (1) **Minimum Acceptable Contribution to Department Service:** In addition to the service obligations described in the preceding paragraph, all faculty at the **rank of assistant professor and above** are expected to shoulder a proportionate share of the service obligations detailed annually in the Department planning document. The ***minimum acceptable contribution*** in the area of Department service is 60 hours per year, contributed to service activities detailed in the annual planning document, with the anticipated standard hours provided in the planning document used as the basis for calculating hours contributed. This contribution of 60 hours is in addition to the 1) advisement, 2) registration, 3) office hours<sup>3</sup>, and 4) faculty meeting obligations described above. In this context, the term ***minimum*** is meant only to convey the lower limit of a standard and is not meant to convey that a faculty member's contribution is immaterial or trifling. Rather, faculty meeting this minimum standard are judged to have made material and important contributions to the service needs of the Department. As such, the Department service contributions of the faculty member will be categorized as having "met expectations".
  - (2) **Additional Requirements for Promotion.** Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor are expected to be able to demonstrate service contributions that reflect significant growth in responsibility and leadership over time. Candidates for Full Professor must demonstrate high quality and substantial contributions to the committees on which they serve. Candidates for promotion to Full Professor should

---

<sup>3</sup> For full-time faculty, a minimum office hour obligation of four hours per week (approximately 120 hours per year) is mandated by College policy.

also be able to demonstrate on-going constructive and leadership roles in non-committee service contributions and a willingness and ability to undertake administrative duties of increased scope or complexity.

- (3) Faculty **at the rank of lecturer** are expected to meet the service obligations negotiated at the time the individual was hired or, alternatively, the obligations that have since been mutually agreed to by the Department Chair and the faculty member.
  - (4) With respect to service, the minimum service obligation of **tenure track faculty in their first year** at SUNY Brockport is defined as participation in orientation training provided by the Department and the College, scheduled office hours, and attendance at Department and area meetings. Normal contributions to advisement and registration activities will begin in said faculty member's second year at SUNY Brockport. The standards in 2.1 become effective in said faculty member's second year at SUNY Brockport.
3. **Adjustments To Expectations For Department Service:** The expectations for Department service are based on a 9 hour per semester teaching load and continued activity in the area of scholarship commensurate with AACSB standards. However, there may be circumstances where expectations for an individual faculty member's annual contribution, to supporting the service activities identified in the planning document, need to be adjusted to a level below that defined in section 2. These circumstances include increases in the number of sections taught and substantial participation in activities and initiatives sanctioned by the Department but not explicitly accounted for in the planning document. All faculty are expected to meet minimal expectations as defined in 2 unless a documented agreement is reached with the Department Chair as per 3.1 or 3.2 below.

Examples of sanctioned activities include substantial curriculum development (e.g., design of new degrees, curricula, and courses), unanticipated administrative assignments (e.g., acting Associate Dean), major faculty development initiatives required by the Department, and approved leave for sabbatical or faculty exchange.

Except as noted in (1) and (2) below, the following activities generally **do not** qualify for adjustment in Department service expectations: routine faculty development, consulting or business activities of the faculty, on-going revision of existing courses, and College and professional service activities not explicitly required by the Department or assigned by the Department Chair. Faculty involved in these types of activities, who are having difficulty meeting their Department service obligations, may wish to reduce their levels of College and professional service, keeping in mind that College guidelines for various personnel actions require some activity in these areas. The assignment of three course preparations in a single semester is generally not sufficient to justify an adjustment in Department service expectations. However, when combined with other non-standard obligations (e.g., developing a new course or program) consideration may be given.

- (1) **Adjustment For Increased Teaching Load:** In the event that a faculty is assigned a teaching load in excess of three courses per semester, a commensurate reduction in service and/or scholarship contribution shall be granted as mutually agreed to between the faculty member, the Department Chair, and the Dean of Professions. All such agreements will be documented by the Department Chair in 1) a written memo to the

faculty member, and 2) in the Chair's comments in the faculty member's annual report, which should explicitly indicate the magnitude and nature of the agreed upon adjustment.

- (2) **Other Adjustments:** Any faculty may make the case for a reduction in expectation for Department service on the basis of time demanded by competing obligations or temporary personal circumstances. In general, requests for reduction in expected Department service level should be related to the need to pursue other initiatives that benefit the Department or College, with priority given to initiatives that appear in Department and College planning documents. In consultation with the Chair, a commensurate reduction in the minimum service load defined in section 2 may be authorized. All such agreements will be documented by the Department Chair in 1) a written memo to the faculty member, and 2) in the Chair's comments in the faculty member's annual report, which should explicitly indicate the magnitude and nature of the agreed upon adjustment.
4. **Standards for College, Professional, and Community Service:** While all faculty are encouraged to participate in service to the College and Profession, determination of the annual scope and intensity of such service is largely left to individual faculty, given their specific interests and aspirations. However, faculty should consider the following:
    - (1) Faculty are required to meet the requirements and standards for College and professional service as set forth in performance at rank documents sanctioned by the Academic Vice-President's office;
    - (2) Faculty seeking **continuing appointment and/or promotion to associate professor** should be able to demonstrate significant and on-going service contributions to the College, as well as to their profession or the community. With regard to Community and Professional service activities, activities must be relevant to the Candidate's teaching, scholarship, or specific initiatives of the Department (e.g., recruiting, program marketing, etc.). Candidates seeking **promotion to full professor** must be able to demonstrate substantial leadership in the College and/or their profession.
  5. **Reporting and Recording of Service Contributions:** The annual report will serve as the primary record of how each faculty member met the service component of his/her professional obligation. In specifying the annual report as the primary record of contributions to service, the intent is to reduce the burden, on both a Candidate and the APT Committee, associated with the compilation and review of a Candidate's record of service for purposes of personnel actions.

In completing their annual reports, faculty shall indicate how they met the standards detailed in section 2 for minimum acceptable contributions to Department service. Faculty should provide a *brief* indication of their specific activities and accomplishments in each service capacity, i.e., simply listing appointments to positions and memberships on Committees is generally not adequate documentation of service contribution for purposes of annual evaluation or future personnel actions. Specifically, faculty should indicate their individual responsibility, participation, and any product developed. However, in the case of the following activities, attendance alone is considered indicative of contribution, and

faculty need not elaborate on activities: final registrations, transfer student registration events, and Saturday information sessions and similar recruiting events.

Candidates should also detail contributions to Community and Professional service, including an assessment of how the activities are relevant to the faculty's teaching, scholarship, specific Department initiatives (e.g., recruiting, program marketing, etc.), or to the central mission of the College.

## 6. Process: Evaluation of Service in Personnel Actions

(1) **Documentation.** With respect to evaluating service contributions, the primary documentation to be considered by the APT Committee in personnel actions is the annual report. However, the application for reappointment, continuing appointment, or promotion should also include:

- A (required) reflective statement discussing how the Candidate's service activities meet the expectations implied by this document and how the degree to which the Candidate's service activities inform his/her teaching or scholarship.
- (Optionally) supporting detail for activities listed on the annual report<sup>4</sup>. The purpose of submitting additional documentation beyond the annual report should be to provide the APT Committee with evidence of the scope, level of responsibility, and quality of service contributions, particularly in the case of promotion.

### (2) **Basis for Judgement.**

- i) In cases of contract renewal, the standards set forth in section 2 and 2.1 provide the primary basis for evaluation by the APT Committee. The APT Committee report must conclude that the Candidate has/has not consistently met Department service expectations as per section 2.1. The report should include reference as to whether the Candidate has shouldered a proportionate share of the Department's advisement activities and dispatched the same in a professional and competent manner. At the second contract renewal (and beyond) for tenure track lines, the APT Committee should also explicitly indicate whether there is evidence of growth in the scope and level of responsibility associated with service activities of the Candidate commensurate with promotion to Associate Professor as per section 6.2.iii below.
- ii) **Continuing appointment:** See section 6.2.iii - *Promotion to Associate Professor* below.
- iii) In the case of **Promotion to Associate Professor**, the standards set forth in section 2, 2.1, and 2.2 provide the primary basis for evaluation, by the APT Committee, of the Candidate's Department service contribution. The APT Committee report must conclude that the Candidate has/has not consistently met

---

<sup>4</sup> For example, a supportive letter from a Committee Chair citing specific contributions to the work of the Committee, letters submitted by colleagues, letters of recognition from community agencies or professional organizations that cite contributions and initiatives undertaken by the Candidate, etc.

Department service expectations as per section 2.1 and whether the Candidate has dispatched the same in a professional and competent manner.

Additionally, the APT Committee report must indicate how the Candidate's service record does (or does not) demonstrate significant growth in responsibility and leadership in the Department or the College as per section 2.2 and 4. The APT Committee report should address how the Candidate's service record does (does not) meet the requirements for service to the College, Community, and Profession as specified in section 4. With regard to Community and Professional service activities, the APT Committee report should describe how the Candidate's contribution to the service needs of the Community and Profession are relevant to the Candidate's teaching, scholarship, or specific initiatives of the Department (e.g., recruiting, program marketing, etc.).

- iv) In the case of **promotion to Full Professor**, the standards set forth in section 2, 2.1, and 2.2 provide the primary basis for evaluation, by the APT Committee, of a Candidate's Department service contributions. The APT Committee report must conclude that the Candidate has/has not consistently met Department service expectations as per section 2.1 and whether the Candidate has dispatched the same in a professional and competent manner.

Additionally, the APT Committee report must indicate how the Candidate's service record does (or does not) consistently demonstrate high quality and substantial contributions to the Committees on which they serve. The APT Committee should indicate how the Candidate's record does (or does not) demonstrate on-going constructive and leadership roles in non-Committee service contributions and a willingness and ability to undertake administrative duties of increased scope or complexity.

Finally, the APT Committee report should address how the Candidate's service record does (does not) meet the requirements for service to the College, Community, and Profession as specified in section 4. Specifically, the APT Committee report should describe how the material submitted by the Candidate does (or does not) document that the Candidate is a leader in the College and/or their profession. Further, the APT Committee report should describe how the Candidate's contribution to the service needs of the Community and Profession are relevant to the Candidate's teaching, scholarship, or specific initiatives of the Department (e.g., recruiting, program marketing, etc.).

- v) In cases where a Candidate is applying prior service at another institution to meet the residency requirements for promotion or continuing appointment, the service record of the Candidate at SUNY Brockport may be difficult to assess. In assessing the service contribution of the Candidate, the APT Committee may also consider the recent service record of the Candidate at another institution as being indicative of his/her potential service contributions at this institution.

## **V. Review and Revision Of Standards and Procedures**

Any member of the full-time faculty may make a motion to amend the guidelines, standards, and procedures contained herein. Faculty interested in introducing such a motion should seek to have the motion placed on the agenda of a regularly scheduled faculty meeting, where the motion will be introduced, discussed, and adopted only by majority vote.

Additionally, the guidelines, standards, and procedures contained herein will undergo a regular review as part of the Department's strategic planning process, with a goal of maintaining guidelines, standards, and procedures that are consistent with Department and College strategic goals. Those members of the Department charged with recommending revisions to the Department's strategic plans shall introduce motions for change consistent with evolving strategic planning documents.

# **Attachment 1**

## **Classroom Visitation Survey Instrument**