

9-29-2015

Healthcare Studies: 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, "Healthcare Studies: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation" (2015). *Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation*. 92.

<http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt/92>

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.



The College at
BROCKPORT
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTHCARE STUDIES

**GUIDELINES
FOR
PERSONNEL EVALUATIONS**

Table of Contents

Section	Page Number
<u>College Guideline on Tenure and Promotion</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Uniqueness of the Healthcare Studies Program</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Teaching Effectiveness</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Scholarship</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Service</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>Academic and Experience Justifying Rank</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>Criteria and Procedures for Single-Year Evaluations</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>Teaching Effectiveness</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>Scholarship</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>Service</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>Procedures for Discretionary Salary Increase (DSI/DSA) Consideration</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>Multi-Year Evaluation Material for Contract Renewal (QAR)</u>	<u>22</u>
<u>Multi-Year Evaluation Material for Tenure-Track Faculty</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>Process: Overview of Application & Review for Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, Promotion</u>	<u>26</u>
<u>Guidelines for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor (with tenure, as appropriate)</u>	<u>29</u>
<u>Guidelines for Promotion to the Rank of Professor</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>Procedure for Adjunct Faculty Review</u>	<u>33</u>
<u>References</u>	<u>34</u>
<u>Appendix A</u>	<u>35</u>

College Guideline on Tenure and Promotion

The following paragraph is taken from the [Faculty Guide](#) in relation to the College Guideline on Tenure and Promotion:

Departmental APT documents are explicit in describing the guidelines for evaluating teaching and the expected teaching loads for the department, the kinds of scholarship considered appropriate to the discipline and the quantity and quality measures used in determining appropriate scholarship for rank, and the department's system of weighting the relative importance of teaching, scholarship and service (although as a general rule, teaching must always be weighed at least 50%, and scholarship must be weighed more heavily than service). Of course, departments can only make personnel recommendations. Ultimately, only the College President (in consultation with the school deans and academic VP) makes personnel decisions. These department APT documents are reviewed and approved by the deans and the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs. Accordingly, they represent the minimum guidelines agreed to by College Administration in making these decisions. *The guidelines in these departmental documents describe a set of minimal (necessary) performance expectations. They should not be construed, however, as explicating a set of criteria that are sufficient for a positive recommendation.* Minimal expectations will be taken into consideration as part of a thorough and comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's professional performance and contributions. Furthermore, the comprehensive evaluation should consider both retrospective and prospective points of view, including, for instance, the candidate's potential for achieving and/or performing at, the highest academic rank. For more information visit <http://www.brockport.edu/acadaff/facguide/>

Uniqueness of the Healthcare Studies Department

The mission of the Department of Healthcare Studies is to prepare individuals for roles in the healthcare field, with the ultimate goal that graduates will provide and support culturally-competent and evidence-based healthcare that improves the lives of patients, their families, and the community. Each program within the department has a curriculum that is designed to provide the knowledge, skills, abilities, and values required to succeed in the profession or area of healthcare that it serves. Each program emphasizes the development of competencies and professional skills that are outlined by the accrediting and/or governing bodies for each profession and that prepare graduates for early careerist positions and/or graduate education. Further, the programs prepare alumni to hold positions of increasing responsibility during their careers.

Healthcare Studies faculty believe in an integrated approach to healthcare studies education. The faculty operate with a common goal expressed by our philosophy and student learning outcomes. This close team relationship requires mutual trust and respect among faculty members. Each faculty member is responsible for creating and utilizing teaching approaches which reflect the departmental philosophy and the SLOs of the program. Teaching, scholarship, and service are interrelated faculty activities.

TEACHING

Healthcare Studies education has its primary focus on two teaching objectives:

- 1) to impart the theoretical and practical knowledge that underlies program area practice and role development; and
- 2) to provide students with opportunities to apply theory to the experiential learning opportunities (e.g. practicums, internships) in their program area.

Teaching activity includes classroom teaching, practicum/internship supervision, role modeling, seminar, supervising directed studies, advising, and student precepting. Teaching activities also include attending professional development and continuing education courses to improve one's own ability to teach and/or stay current in the profession.

Faculty who have or who are required to have certification and/or licensure by the agencies accrediting each program area need to maintain their certification and/or licensure.

Healthcare is ever changing and curricula must reflect best evidence based practices. Practicum and internship preceptors are expected to model these practices for students while the students are under their supervision.

Effective teaching also includes activities that promote effective learning environments. These activities include revision of current course materials and the addition of new teaching activities, lectures and exams and evaluation and revision of the curriculum to ensure it remains current. Effective teaching also includes: reading of professional journals and textbooks, attendance at conferences and workshops, and involvement in practice settings to maintain proficiency and currency of subject matter in the discipline.

Lastly, it is expected that faculty who hold teaching responsibilities design and deliver their classes with emphasis on preparing students to meet program and departmental learning objectives, and to enter early careerist positions and/or graduate education.

SCHOLARSHIP

In 1990, Boyer established a model for Scholarship called *Scholarship Reconsidered* which identified four broad domains for scholarly works including: discovery, integration, engagement, and teaching. Healthcare Studies faculty who maintain a 3/3 teaching load, are expected to have an active scholarship program which includes ongoing efforts at improving teaching, learning, or practice, as defined under primary and secondary products. Faculty who do not demonstrate an active program of scholarship *will* contribute more in teaching (4/4) or in service.

Scholarship of Discovery

Discovery is defined as original work that contributes to existing knowledge in one's discipline. It is demonstrated with a document or written/visual product that includes current, professional referencing and evidence of achievement/dissemination. Examples of scholarship that would be considered discovery include, but are not limited to:

- peer-reviewed publications of research, theory, or philosophical essays;
- peer-reviewed presentations of research, theory, or philosophical essays;
- grant awards in support of research or scholarship;
- mentorship of junior colleagues in research or scholarship which results in a peer-reviewed product;
- state, regional, national, or international recognition as a scholar in an identified area; and
- positive peer evaluations accomplished

Scholarship of Integration

Integration is defined as work that integrates or interprets findings across disciplines. It is demonstrated with a document or written/visual product that includes current, professional referencing and evidence of achievement/dissemination. Examples of scholarship that would be considered integration include, but are not limited to:

- peer-reviewed publications of research, policy analysis, case studies, integrative reviews of the literature, and others;
- copyrights, licenses, patents, or products for sale;
- published books;
- positive peer evaluations of contributions to integrative scholarship;
- reports of interdisciplinary programs or service projects;
- interdisciplinary grant awards;
- presentations; and
- policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments.

Scholarship of Engagement

Engagement is defined as testing and applying findings in new and varied settings. It is demonstrated with a document or written/visual product that includes current, professional referencing and evidence of achievement/dissemination. Examples of scholarship that would be considered include, but are not limited to:

1. **Development of clinical knowledge.** Many healthcare practitioner-academics are immersed in evidence based practice and expert consensus driven primary and specialty clinical practice arenas to meet the healthcare needs of individuals, families, communities and populations.
2. **Application of technical skills.** Acquiring new clinical skills by the healthcare practitioner-academics promotes comprehensive healthcare and supports teaching and learning.

Scholarship of Engagement, continued

3. **Peer reviews of practice.** Peer reviews of practicing practitioners support responsibility and commitment to scholarship.
4. **Presentations related to practice.** Expertise that healthcare practitioner-academics have in their specialty area of practice are presented in poster and podium presentations, as well as healthcare staff development workshops.
5. **Case studies.** Published case studies providing practice-area situations which are shared with the profession through publication in peer-reviewed journals.
6. **Establishing Academic-Service Partnerships.** Healthcare professionals are positioned to reshape interdependent healthcare processes and academic systems with the establishment of academic-health organization partnerships.
7. **Reports compiling and analyzing client programs/ health outcomes.** Written analysis of healthcare practice and service outcomes may provide suggestions for change in practice which will reshape healthcare.
8. **Dissemination of research findings for public awareness.** This information may influence public policy matters, legislation, and health care reimbursement.
9. **Model Program Implementation.** The development and implementation of evidence-based programs in practice settings may be shared with others through published manuscripts.

Scholarship of Teaching

Teaching is defined as transforming and extending the knowledge of learners, and building the knowledge bridge between learners and teachers. It is demonstrated with a document or written/visual product that includes current, professional referencing and evidence of achievement/dissemination. Examples of scholarship that would be considered teaching include but are not limited to:

- peer-reviewed publications of research related to teaching methodology or learning outcomes, case studies related to teaching-learning, learning theory development, and development or testing of educational models or theories;
- accreditation or other comprehensive program reports;
- successful applications of technology to teaching and learning;
- positive peer assessments of innovations in teaching;
- state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master teacher;
- published textbooks or other learning aids;
- grant awards in support of teaching and learning;
- design of outcome studies or evaluation/assessment programs; and
- presentations related to teaching and learning.

For a product to be considered scholarship, regardless of type, at The College at Brockport, there must be demonstration that the products were adjudicated/peer-reviewed. Scholarship products are considered to be peer reviewed if they are reviewed by one or more peers in the field where the scholarship product is seeking publication/dissemination. This would include blinded review, un-blinded review, single reviewer, multiple reviewers, and editor review.

SCHOLARSHIP, continued

Tenured faculty who engage in scholarship, as described above, will be required to cover a teaching load of 3/3. Those faculty who do not demonstrate an active scholarship program or traditional research will contribute more in teaching (4/4 teaching load). Faculty who assume significant departmental administrative assignments including Chair and Coordinator will be considered exempt from a 4/4 teaching load.

Faculty who have active scholarship programs may have grant awards that augment their salary. In this case, teaching loads will be adjusted depending on the grant support for research and faculty salary.

SERVICE

Healthcare Studies includes professional programs that are service-oriented professions. Healthcare Studies faculty believe that service includes a number of activities that benefit the department, the college, the community, and the profession. Within the college and in the community, healthcare providers and consumers require Healthcare Studies faculty to meet healthcare needs. Service activities within the Department of Healthcare Studies support the overarching institutional mission, and the mission of each of the professions.

Areas of service involvement include, but are not limited to:

Advisement:

Faculty are very active in advisement. Faculty participate in all college organized advisement activities and advise all majors in their respective program of study. They also advise interested transfer students and campus visitors.

Department Governance

Departmental governance is influenced by state and federal regulatory agencies, accrediting bodies, and standards of professional education. These constituencies place exceptional demands on faculty time, committee structure, and curriculum implementation and evaluation.

Student/Departmental Support

Other service activities include promoting student employment through writing letters of recommendation, developing and maintaining the department's web page, participating in departmental, school, college and university governance, and engaging in discipline/ college specific community work.

Professional Associations

Membership and/or leadership in professional associations is an expectation for Healthcare Studies faculty. In addition, Healthcare Studies faculty represent their professions in community committees and advisory boards.

Professional development.

Healthcare Studies faculty may be called upon to deliver professional development and/or continuing education opportunities to others in the profession for the improvement of the profession as a whole.

College-Wide Service

Healthcare Studies faculty also serve on committees that support college governance, structure and/or strategic initiatives. Faculty are active in college-wide committees, grade appeal committees, and faculty senate.

Academic & Experience Justifying Rank

Faculty hired into the Department of Healthcare Studies will earn the title of Clinical Assistant Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor based on education and experience. Clinical Assistant Professor and Visiting Assistant Professor will be considered Qualified Academic Rank (QAR) faculty. QAR faculty are not required to participate in scholarship and are required to teach a 4/4 load, unless they are engaged in significant administrative service to the department as chairperson or coordinator. All faculty are expected to have a minimum of a master's degree in their program's profession, closely-related discipline, or related field for which the appointee is to carry major teaching/clinical responsibility.

Clinical Assistant Professor (Lecturer)

- An appointee to the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor (Lecturer) will have a master's degree in their program's profession or closely-related discipline
- Have practiced in their discipline for a minimum of two years.
- Will be expected to contribute significant service to the department.

Visiting Assistant Professor

- An appointee to the rank of Visiting Assistant Professor will have a doctoral degree in program's profession, closely-related discipline, or related field (i.e., PhD, EdD,).
- Have practiced in his/her discipline for a minimum of two years,
- Teaching experience is preferred.

Assistant Professor*

- An appointee to the rank of Assistant Professor will have a doctoral degree in his/her program's profession, closely-related discipline, or related field (i.e., PhD, EdD,)
- Two years of teaching in an accredited university or college is preferred,
- Demonstrate a beginning program of scholarship.

Associate Professor*

- An appointee to the rank of Associate Professor will have a doctoral degree in his/her program's profession, closely-related discipline, or related field (i.e., PhD, EdD,)
- A minimum of four years of teaching at the rank of Assistant Professor,
- Maintain a program of scholarship.

Professor*

- An appointee to the rank of Professor will have a doctoral degree in his/her program's profession, closely-related discipline, or related field (i.e., PhD, EdD,)
- A minimum of ten years of teaching, including a minimum of five years at the rank of Associate Professor,
- Maintain a program of scholarship.

* Faculty who hold a terminal but non-doctoral degree in their field of study who currently hold and who were awarded continuing appointment at The College at Brockport prior to the creation and implementation of this document may pursue promotion to Associate or Full Professor within the department provided they meet all other criteria of that rank as outlined in the requirements for promotion.

Academic & Experience Justifying Rank, continued

The remainder of the Healthcare Studies Department APT Document is divided into two main sections. The first section is to assist faculty in one-year evaluations and the second section is to assist the faculty member with contract renewals, tenure, and promotion.

Single Year Evaluation Material

Criteria and Procedures for Single-Year Evaluations

The Department of Healthcare Studies has adopted a systematic evaluation of faculty using a 5-point rubric scale that was developed and recommended by representatives of the School of Health & Human Performance. This rubric template is tied to the notion of below, at rank, and above rank. The rubrics contain different criteria which have been established by each department appropriate for the particular discipline. This one-year evaluation will be used by the chair of the department and the APT Committee for faculty annual evaluations, for DSI/DSA procedures, and for other evaluations as required.

School of Health & Human Performance Sample Rubric Template Single Year Evaluation

- | | | |
|---|------------|---|
| 5 | Above Rank | A score of 5 indicates a level of performance that is significantly above that which is expected for a faculty member at a particular rank. |
| 4 | Above Rank | A score of 4 indicates a level of performance above that which is expected for a faculty member at a particular rank. |
| 3 | At Rank | A score of 3 indicates a level of performance that is expected for a faculty member at a particular rank. (Over <u>multiple years</u> , it is expected that faculty members at a particular rank would “average” a score of 3 for a specific faculty role.) |
| 2 | At Rank | A score of 2 indicates a minimally acceptable level of performance for a particular academic rank <u>in a single year</u> . Faculty who score a 2 for one of the faculty roles are eligible to be considered for a DSI/DSA for performance in other faculty roles. (Over <u>multiple years</u> , faculty who “average” a score of 2 generally would not be considered to be performing “at rank” for that specific faculty role.) |
| 1 | Below Rank | A score of 1 indicates a level of performance below that which is expected for a faculty member at a particular rank. Faculty who score 1 in a single year evaluation for one faculty role are not eligible to be considered for a DSI/DSA regardless of performance in other faculty roles. |

Criteria and Procedures for Single-Year Evaluations, continued

[Note 1: When assigning a rubric score, it is possible to give fractional points around a score to account for perceived nuances in the evaluation. Evaluators may add or subtract either .25 or .50 when assigning a score. Scores such as 3.25 (3 + .25) or 4.50 (4 + .50 or 5 - .50), for instance, are equally valid scores to whole number scores.]

[Note 2: When all faculty roles (teaching, scholarship, and service) are evaluated on scales that have been set to a common standard (the notion of “at rank”), scores for those roles can be weighted and combined to achieve a composite score to reflect an overall level of performance. Ordinarily, teaching is weighted .50, scholarship is weighted .30 to .40, and service is weighted .10 to .20. For example, for faculty roles weighted 50% for teaching, 35% for scholarship, and 15% for service, and with rubric scores of 3.00 for teaching, 3.25 for scholarship, and 4.75 for service, the composite score is 3.35 ($3.00 \times .50 + 3.25 \times .35 + 4.75 \times .15 = 3.35$) indicating an overall performance that is somewhat better than “at rank.” QAR faculty who teach four classes and are not required to conduct scholarship ordinarily will be weighted .65 for teaching and .35 for service.]

The following are two discipline-specific rubrics which will be used to evaluate faculty performance:

- 1. One set to evaluate non-tenured faculty (typically ranks of clinical assistant professor, visiting assistant professor and assistant professor). Please note, clinical and visiting assistant professors are not required to produce scholarship according to college guidelines.**
- 2. The second set will be used to evaluate tenured faculty (typically ranks of associate professor and professor).**

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

The Healthcare Studies department has identified six components for the evaluation of effectiveness: course design (including syllabi, content and program evaluation), student engagement (including work with students outside of normal class hours, and emphasizing active, collaborative and/or service learning), students reaction to instruction (reflecting instructional delivery skills), professional development (including both on-and off-campus activities designed to improve teaching), and course management (including all of the administrative tasks associated with teaching a class). [Note: Course management is assessed only by the department chair.] These components are weighted differently and combined to arrive at an overall evaluation of teaching; course design and student reaction to instruction carry the heaviest weights, followed by assessment and students engagement, while professional development and course management have the lowest weights.

Each component is evaluated separately using a worksheet based on the information which follows. The evaluator assigns a score for each component by circling a point value among the range of points assigned to a particular component (e.g., 0-5 for course content, 0-3 for assessment, etc.). Associated with each component are a series of bulleted activities that evaluators can use to help structure the evaluation. The bulleted activities are not meant to be used as a checklist; rather they should serve as prompts that provide reminders, to both faculty and evaluators alike, as to the kinds of evidence that can be used to demonstrate proficiency in each category. Evaluators should consider the depth and breadth of the evidence in each category and assign a score based on a “holistic” assessment of the component, rather than a more prescriptive, checklist-type, assessment. When evaluators believe that the evidence in any component is consistent with what we might reasonably expect from a faculty member, the evaluator should assign the middle score in the range or the whole number just above the middle score (e.g., a 3 for a 0-5 range) when there is an even number of scores in a range. When the evidence is either above or below that expectation, the evaluator assigns a different score according to his/her judgment.

Once all components have been scored, the point are totaled and converted to a rubric score according to the ranges provided for the personnel committee (based on 18 points maximum) and the department chair (based on 20 points maximum). In cases where all components are scored in the middle of the point range (or just above the middle of the point range), the total number of points will yield a rubric score of 3 (at rank).

TEACHING - Single-Year Evaluation for Non-Tenured and Tenured Healthcare Studies Faculty

Course Design: 5 4 3 2 1

Evidence for rating includes the following:

- Syllabi are properly developed and include required components
- Course content is current (revised as appropriate) and matched to the level of the class
- Internship/practicum syllabi and course packets are updated annually and contain needed material for the practice site
- Practical (internship/practicum) experiences are appropriate for the level of learning and the area of content
- Completes mandatory competencies and training that allows the faculty member to supervise students in the practice setting
- Assignments and activities are rigorous and contribute to student learning (reading, writing, critical thinking, active and/or collaborative activities are emphasized as appropriate)
- Use of technology is built into course design as appropriate
- Course content includes diverse perspectives and/or cultural competence as appropriate
- Methods and materials are appropriate to class size, level, and content
- New course preparation, new course development (approved by curriculum committee), and/or course conversion to online (or hybrid) format
- Other equivalent course design activities

Assessment: 3 2 1

Evidence for rating includes the following:

- Appropriate tools are used to assess student learning
- Feedback to students is timely and meaningful
- Grading patterns are appropriately rigorous
- Class progress on student learning outcomes is assessed and appropriate steps are taken for continuous improvement (“closing the loop”)
- Indices of student learning/success
- Positive comments from peers in clinical settings
- Other equivalent assessment activities

Student Engagement: 3 2 1

Evidence for rating includes the following:

- Chairs or serves on undergraduate and/or graduate project (thesis, synthesis, major paper, etc.) committee (beyond teaching load)
- Sponsors independent or directed studies, Honors Thesis, and/or McNair Research Projects
- Involves students in research or service projects outside of class
- Mentors students to publish a paper, present at professional conference, attain employment, or gain admission to graduate school
- Conducts review sessions and/or tutors outside of class
- Promotes student engagement in the practice setting
- Engagement with students outside the classroom
- Effective advisement
- Encourages other equivalent student engagement activities

TEACHING - Single-Year Evaluation for Non-Tenured and Tenured Healthcare Studies Faculty, continued

Student Reaction to Instruction: 5 4 3 2 1 0

Evidence for rating is based on IAS scores:

- IAS scores generally <.75 (5 points)
- IAS scores generally <1.00 (4 points)
- IAS scores generally <2.00 (3 points)
- IAS scores generally <2.25 (2 points)
- IAS scores generally <2.50 (1 point)
- IAS scores generally >2.50 (0 points)

Professional Development: 1 0

Evidence for rating includes the following:

- Attended at least one CELT presentation on teaching and learning
- Attended a state, national, or international conference in faculty member's field
- Other equivalent professional development activity

*Course Management: 2 1 0

Evidence for rating includes the following:

- All course related deadlines are met, including textbook orders, midterm grades, and final grades
- Regular office hours are maintained and faculty member is reasonably available and responsive to students via e-mail or telephone
- Class meets for the entire scheduled time
- Required clinical hours are met for clinical courses

*This component of teaching effectiveness is completed by department chair only.

Notes: When assessing course design, assessment, and student engagement, evaluators should assign the "middle score" when they believe the candidate has done an appropriate job for that component given the candidate's rank. Scores above or below the "middle score" should be assigned when the performance is deemed to be above or below expectation. Scores for student reaction to instruction are tied directly to IAS scores. Professional development essentially is scored as a "yes" or "no" answer to the question, "did the candidate pursue professional development related to teaching" during the year in question. Chairs have some latitude in assigning points for course management based on their knowledge of circumstances pertaining to this component.

APT Committee Evaluation (18 points maximum):

5	Above Rank	16-17 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
4	Above Rank	13-15 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
3	At Rank	10-12 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
2	At Rank	7-9 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
1	Below Rank	fewer than 7 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet

Chair Evaluation (20 points maximum):

5	Above Rank	18-19 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
4	Above Rank	15-17 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
3	At Rank	12-14 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
2	At Rank	9-11 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
1	Below Rank	< 9 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet

SCHOLARSHIP - Single-Year Evaluation for Non-tenured Healthcare Studies Faculty

- | | | |
|---|------------|---|
| 5 | Above Rank | 2 or more refereed papers/publications, and/or book chapters, or
Medium* grant acquisition, or
2 or more national/international presentations, or
Re-credentialing in area of professional practice, or
Reports that compile and analyze patient programs and health outcomes, or
Model program implementation, or
Invited manuscript, book, or editorial review, or
Member of editorial board for professional journal, or
Local/university awards in recognition of scholarship, or
Policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments, or
Equivalent level of productivity |
| 4 | Above Rank | 1 refereed paper/publication, or
1 book chapter, or
Small* grant acquisition, or
Large* grant submission (scored well, unfunded), or
1 national/international presentation, or
State, regional, or local presentations, or
Invited keynote address, or
Maintaining certification in area of professional practice, or
Reports that compile and analyze patient programs and health outcomes, or
Invited manuscript, book, or editorial review, or
Exam question development for certification or state exams, or
Equivalent level of productivity |
| 3 | At Rank | Presentation at professional meeting, or
Publication in conference proceedings, or
State, regional, or local presentations, or
Scholarly product under review or revision, or
Documented progress on scholarly product, or
Evidence of on-going program of scholarship, or
Maintaining certification in professional area of practice, or
Equivalent level of productivity |
| 2 | At Rank | Documented progress on scholarly product, or
Evidence of on-going program of scholarship, or
Invited manuscript, book, or editorial review, or
Equivalent level of productivity |
| 1 | Below Rank | Little or no evidence of on-going program of scholarship |

SCHOLARSHIP - Single-Year Evaluation for Tenured Healthcare Studies Faculty

- | | | |
|---|------------|---|
| 5 | Above Rank | 3 or more refereed papers/publications, and/or book chapters, or
Authored or co-authored text, or
Edited or co-edited text, or
Large* grant acquisition, or
3 or more national/international presentations, or
Development of Significant learning aids (e.g. book Computer software), or
Primary author of accreditation report, or
Copyrights, licenses, patents, or products for sale, or
Equivalent level of productivity |
| 4 | Above Rank | 2 refereed papers/publications, and/or book chapters, or
Medium* grant acquisition, or
2 or more national/international presentations, or
Re-credentialing in area of professional practice, or
Reports that compile and analyze patient programs and health outcomes, or
Model program implementation, or
Invited manuscript, book, or editorial review, or
Member of editorial board for professional journal, or
Local/university awards in recognition of scholarship, or
Policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments, or
Equivalent level of productivity |
| 3 | At Rank | 1 refereed paper/publication, or
1 book chapter, or
Small* grant acquisition, or
Large* grant submission (scored well, unfunded), or
State, regional, or local podium/poster presentations, or
Invited keynote address, or
Maintaining certification in area of professional practice, or
Reports that compile and analyze patient programs and health outcomes, or
Invited manuscript, book, or editorial review, or
Exam question development for certification or state exams, or
Equivalent level of productivity |
| 2 | At Rank | Presentation at professional meeting, or
Publication in conference proceedings, or
State, regional, or local podium/poster presentations, or
Scholarly product under review or revision, or
Documented progress on scholarly product, or
Evidence of on-going program of scholarship, or
Maintaining certification in area of specialty area of practice, or
Invited manuscript, book, or editorial review, or
Equivalent level of productivity |
| 1 | Below Rank | Little or no evidence of on-going program of scholarship |

Scholarship Definitions

Peer-reviewed

Scholarship products, regardless of type, are considered to be peer reviewed if they are reviewed by one or more peers in the field to where the scholarship product is seeking publication. This would include blinded review, un-blinded review, single reviewer, multiple reviewers, and editor review.

Presentation

Presentations include invited presentations, oral/podium presentations, roundtable presentations, invited panel presentations, and poster presentations.

***Grant size**

Grant Size	Monetary Amount
Small	\$ 0 to \$9,999
Medium	\$10,000 to \$49,999
Large	\$50,000 or greater

All scholarship grants must be competitive in nature.

SERVICE - Single-Year Evaluation for Non-tenured Healthcare Studies Faculty

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| 5 Above Rank | Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from at least two different categories with a) evidence of leadership in at least one, b) evidence of effectiveness in all, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental tasks and quality advisement, or, Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from three different categories with evidence of effectiveness in all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental tasks and quality advisement |
| 4 Above Rank | Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from at least two different categories with evidence of effectiveness on all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental tasks and quality advisement, or Actively engaged in at least two on-going service activities from two different categories with a) evidence of leadership on at least one, b) evidence of effectiveness on all, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental tasks and quality advisement |
| 3 At Rank | Actively engaged in at least two on-going service activities in any category with evidence of effectiveness on all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental tasks or quality advisement, or
Actively engaged in at least one on-going service activity in any category with a) evidence of leadership, b) evidence of effectiveness, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental tasks or quality advisement |
| 2 At Rank | Actively engaged in one on-going service
Participates in departmental tasks and provides quality advisement |
| 1 Below Rank | Not engaged in any service activities outside department
Does not participate in departmental tasks or advisement |

SERVICE - Single-Year Evaluation for Tenured Healthcare Studies Faculty

- 5 Above Rank Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities (or equivalent)* from at least three different categories (departmental, college, university, professional, community) with a) evidence of leadership on at least one, b) evidence of effectiveness (products, outcomes, etc.) on all, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement
- 4 Above Rank Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from at least two different categories with a) evidence of leadership on at least one, b) evidence of effectiveness on all, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement, or Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from three different categories with evidence of effectiveness on all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement
- 3 At Rank Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from at least two different categories with evidence of effectiveness on all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement, or Actively engaged in at least two on-going service activities from two different categories with a) evidence of leadership on at least one, b) evidence of effectiveness on all, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement
- 2 At Rank Actively engaged in at least two on-going service activities in any category with evidence of effectiveness on all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores or quality advisement, or Actively engaged in at least one on-going service activity in any category with a) evidence of leadership, b) evidence of effectiveness, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores or quality advisement
- 1 Below Rank Actively engaged in fewer than two on-going service activities without evidence of leadership, or Little or no evidence of effectiveness in any service activity, or Failure to participate in departmental chores or failure to provide quality advisement

Service Definitions

On-going service activities

This implies that the service contribution takes place over an extended period of time. As a guideline, service as a member of a committee may be counted as an on-going service activity if the committee meets at least once per month across the academic year and requires some preparation or contribution between meetings. Similarly, service roles as a program coordinator, site accreditation visitor, journal reviewer, or the like may be counted as on-going service activities only if the requirements of that role demand multiple contributions over time. Service activities that do not require multiple contributions over time (e.g., a journal reviewer who evaluates a single manuscript, a faculty member who leads a brown bag presentation at CELT, etc.) may be combined during the evaluation process to create equivalents to on-going service activities.

Procedures for Discretionary Salary Increase/Award (DSI/DSA) Consideration

- 1) The APT Committee is charged with the review of all Discretionary Salary Increase/Award (DSI/DSA) applications, when available by UUP contract.
- 2) The faculty member wishing to be considered for DSI/DSA will submit his/her entire annual report for the year that the faculty member wishes to be evaluated. A cover letter asking for DSI/DSA consideration and delineating the reasons the candidate believes he/she is qualified should accompany the materials. The faculty member is also asked to complete the standard score sheets for DSI/DSA consideration.
- 3) To qualify for consideration for a DSI/DSA during a one-year period, a faculty member is expected to present evidence of minimum performance, according to the faculty's rank, in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and present evidence of exceptional performance in at least one area of either teaching, scholarship, or service as defined previously in this document.
- 4) The needed materials should be submitted to the chair of the APT committee by the established deadline.
- 5) APT members independently evaluate each file according to the published criteria and record the evaluations on the standard score sheets.
- 6) APT members review and discuss each file and rank all files according from the most qualified to the least qualified according to a composite score.
- 7) All files are forwarded to the department chair's office along with a copy of the APT summary score sheet for each file.
- 8) Chair conducts an independent evaluation of the file and ranks the files from the most qualifying to the least qualifying according to a composite score.
- 9) The Annual Reports and summary sheets of candidates whose meet or surpass the published standards for DSI/DSA are forwarded to the Dean's office for consideration at the Dean's level.

Multi-year Evaluation Material for Contract Renewal (QAR)

Portfolio Content for the School of Health and Human Performance Personnel Review File for Contract Renewal

Introduction: Candidates up for contract renewal must submit materials to the APT committee of their home department to initiate the review process. The candidate is responsible for gathering all required evaluative materials. Evaluation materials are due in the fall semester of year two of the currently contracted three year agreement.

A. Components of the Review File (subject to change by direction of the Provost):

- The department's portfolio on the candidate is placed in a labeled **manila folder** (no binders) prepared and **handled by the department** (on behalf of the candidate).
- The folder does not belong to the candidate, nor is it returned to the candidate.
- The portfolio includes:
 - An updated vita prepared by the candidate.
 - Copies of the three most recent annual reviews with chair's comments (or only review in the case of first contract renewal).
 - **A Plan of Service**
 - Current plan of service and evaluation of how it has been met
 - Plan of service effective for the next three year contracted term
 - A change of appointment personnel form
 - Copies of the APT review letter (after notification), the Department vote – numerical tally (not seen by the candidate), Chair review letter (after notification), Dean review letter (after notification) and any response statements from the candidate.

Teaching Requirements for Contract Renewal (65%)

The faculty member is expected to:

1. Teach a 4/4 course load or contribute more to service by assuming an advisement load greater than usual baseline for the department, assume additional departmental administrative responsibilities, or actively participate on more committees than is the usual departmental expectation or serve on more than one campus-wide or community-wide committee.
2. Have positive evidence of student learning outcomes.
3. IAS scores where at least seventy percent of the individual global questions included in the review period have a mean rating of 2.00 or lower. Candidates with IAS scores of greater than 2.00 will need to present evidence of remediation or an active plan of remediation.
4. Have evidence of continued professional development supporting the assertion that the candidate is remaining current in his or her instructional field(s).

Service Requirements for Contract Renewal (35%)

The faculty member is expected to actively participate in department level meetings and be on at least one additional department committee per academic year. He or she is expected to foster the department's relationships with the community agencies where students are placed for practical experience. Faculty at this level are also expected to participate in the college service of open houses, advisement, and registration.

Multi-year Evaluation Material for Tenure Track Faculty

Dossier and Portfolio Content for the School of Health and Human Performance Personnel Review File for Contract Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure (Continuing Appointment)

Introduction: Candidates for renewal of contract, for promotion, and for tenure prepare and submit materials to their home department to initiate the review process. The candidate is responsible for selecting and organizing materials that demonstrate their productivity in the three areas under review: Teaching, Scholarship and Service.

A. Components of the Review File:

1. The Dossier:

- The department's dossier on the candidate is placed in a labeled **manila folder** (no binders) prepared and **handled by the department** (on behalf of the candidate).
- The folder accompanies the candidate's supplementary materials but does not belong to the candidate, nor is it returned to the candidate.
- The dossier includes:
 - An updated vita prepared by the candidate.
 - Format in reversed chronological order (most recent credits first).
 - Include sections on Education, Professional Certifications/Licensures, Position/Employment History, Scholarly Activity, and Service.
 - Provide one copy to the APT Committee; one copy to the Department secretary for the dossier.
 - Copies of personal statements (teaching, scholarship, service) prepared by the candidate.
 - **Consists of a reflective and objective description/assessment of accomplishments in each area under review (teaching, scholarship, and service to students, to the College, and to the profession).**
 - May be prefaced with a letter to the Department APT Committee requesting review and action (renewal of contract, promotion/tenure or promotion to professor).
 - Format as three separate sections (teaching, scholarship, service).
 - One copy is provided to the APT Committee; one copy is provided to the Department secretary for the dossier.
 - A change of appointment personnel form prepared by the department. Promotion and tenure require a separate form for each action.
 - Copies of the external peer evaluation solicited by the department and reviewed by the APT committee (only done at time of request for promotion to full professor).
 - Copies of the APT review letter (after notification), the Department vote – numerical tally (not seen by the candidate), Chair review letter (after notification), Dean review letter (after notification) and any response statements from the candidate.

B. Components of Supplemental Materials Supplemental materials provide evidence of productivity, offer a context for the reviewers, and include evaluative comments on the candidate's work. Materials should be organized into three-ring or equivalent binders that are clearly labeled. A candidate should not expect individuals reviewing their materials to sift through unorganized and loose materials contained in boxes. A table of contents should also be included to organize the material submitted. The faculty member should also submit a letter to the APT committee expressing their wish to be evaluated,

1. Supplemental Materials for Teaching Effectiveness

- a. Faculty Annual Reports, including comment and signature pages;
- b. Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Focus which contains:
 - i. 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.
 - ii. A reflective statement indicating how the materials compiled by the candidate demonstrate teaching excellence and continued growth as an instructor.
 - iii. One copy of the candidate's syllabus and/or course packet (from any semester during the review period) for each course taught during the review period.
 - iv. Samples of course materials from each unique course taught during the review period. In the case of multiple sections of the same course, samples from one section would be sufficient.
 - v. Evidence as to the candidate's involvement with course development and/or instructional innovation.
 - vi. Any teaching and practice awards during the review period.
- c. Student Outcomes and Accomplishments
 - i. Table of grade distribution for all courses taught during the review period, including class size information.
 - ii. Sample of student products: care plans, term papers, research projects, etc.
 - iii. Scholar's Day presentations.
- d. Student Evaluations
 - i. Summary statement of all standardized assessments of teaching (IAS or other) given during the review period.
 - ii. Computer printouts of all standardized assessments of teaching (IAS or other) given during the review period.
 - iii. Course packet evaluations of courses taught.
 - iv. Student written comments from clinical evaluations and IAS evaluations.
 - v. Feedback from current students and alumni.
- e. Peer Evaluations
 - i. At least one peer-reviews from the classroom
 - a. At the time of promotion, At least three peer-reviewed from the classroom, at least one of which must be made by a member of the APT Committee at the time the peer-review was conducted.
 - ii. Statement as to the candidate's contribution to the curriculum and course development/revision.
 - iii. Peer evaluation of course materials used to teach each course during any one semester under the review period.
 - iv. Statement and peer evaluation of new innovations of teaching in the classroom
 - v. Service as a mentor to novice teachers in the department.

Supplemental Materials for Teaching Effectiveness, continued

- f. Teaching - Related Activity Beyond the Classroom
 - i. Independent/directed studies completed with students during the review period.
 - ii. Student involvement in research projects, publications, presentations resulting from individual student/faculty collaboration.
 - iii. Statement as to the number of advisees
 - iv. Invitations to be a guest lecturer during the review period.
 - v. Mentoring of students for C-step or McNair during the review period.

- g. Improvement of Teaching
 - i. List of all workshops and conferences attended that are pertinent to the program's profession for the review period.
 - ii. Candidate statement of efforts necessary to maintain mastery of subject matter and teaching methodologies.
 - iii. Candidate written statement related to improvement in teaching.
 - iv. Clinical practice activities during the period of review that assist in the acquisition of new knowledge to be used in teaching with students.

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

2. Supporting Documents Related to Scholarship

- a. Copies of all manuscripts
- b. Copies of books
- c. Copies of all presentations
- d. Copies of letters attesting to completion of scholarship
- e. Lists of citations of the faculty's work
- f. Copies of certification and/or licensure if applicable

3. Supporting Documents Related to Service

- a. Letters attesting to completion of service
- b. Documentation of the committees the faculty member has served on divided into department, college, community and profession

PROCESS: OVERVIEW OF APPLICATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT, CONTINUING APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION

1. **Role of the APT Committee:** The APT committee is charged with the review of all applications for personnel procedures within the Department. The review process will consider the performance of the candidate with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service as specified in the following sections. The APT committee will also solicit an external peer evaluation of the candidate for candidates that request promotion to full professor that will be reviewed and considered by the APT committee. In the event of promotion to the rank of professor, when there are no professors in the department, this process includes:
 - a. Notification of the Dean's office by August 1 of the year of the application review.
 - b. The Dean's office will appoint a professor within the School of Health and Human Performance to join the Department APT Committee
 - c. The chair of the Healthcare Studies APT committee will assist this newly configured APT committee in the review of the faculty person.
 - d. It is highly suggested that prior to the APT Committee review, the applicant request a professor within the School of Health and Human Performance to review the application packet for suggestions.
 - e. The above APT Committee will request of the applicant names of colleagues outside the campus that can attest to the quality of scholarship of the applicant, if outside review is to be completed.

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, 3) a supporting narrative summarizing the Committee's conclusions as they pertain to the criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service and 4) the external peer evaluation solicited by the Committee for candidates applying for promotion to full professor. 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.

The APT Committee will notify faculty of appropriate appointment dates. This does not absolve the faculty member of keeping abreast of this information.

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 their request. Further, it is the responsibility of each individual to know and understand 1) the terms of their current appointment and 2) application deadlines for re-appointment, continuing appointment, and promotion.

PROCESS: OVERVIEW OF APPLICATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT, CONTINUING APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, continued

3. 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. The weight for each area for the candidate is determined by the candidate's contract with the department as negotiated between the candidate and the department/school. Each candidate's set of weights will reflect the following:
- The weight on teaching should be 50% with the possible exception of candidates who have outside grant support for scholarship or service.
 - The weight on scholarship should be greater than the weight for service.
 - The sum of the weights is equal to one.
 - Those faculty without scholarship expectations will have a weight of 65% teaching and 35% service.

Regardless of the candidate's individual weight determination, the candidate is expected to meet minimal performance standards in teaching, scholarship, and service as described later in this document.

4. Application of Criteria Weights in the Review Process: Members of the APT Committee are charged with applying the weights, as supplied by the candidate's contract, 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 their vote takes into account the candidate's contracted weights.
5. Distribution of APT Committee Reports: The APT Committee members are responsible for conducting the review process and preparing their 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 the candidate prior to forwarding the report to the Department. The only purpose of sharing the report with the candidate is to allow clarification by the candidate. It is understood that the candidate has the option of withdrawing their 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 a 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 APT Committee will submit its written report to the Department Chairperson and the Department for the purpose of a departmental vote on the recommendation. The Committee report will be given to the faculty via email.

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.

PROCESS: OVERVIEW OF APPLICATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT, CONTINUING APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, continued

6. Voting Process: The members of the Department vote on the recommendation of the APT Committee. The candidate will be asked to leave the room during this vote. Each faculty member appointed to the department who has at least 50% of his/her workload devoted to the department will have one vote in accordance with the departmental governance documents.

Healthcare Studies faculty will have the opportunity to ask questions of the APT Committee and to discuss the recommendations put forward. 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 this meeting. The Committee's recommendation, along with the Department vote on the recommendation and the Chairperson's recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean.

Guidelines for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor (with tenure, as appropriate) in the School of Health & Human Performance

General

- At minimum, faculty must serve 4 years at the rank of assistant professor before applying for the rank of associate professor (unless bringing prior service credit)
- Guidelines pertain to performance since appointment to assistant professor
- Guidelines are not fixed criteria; every portfolio will have unique aspects and evaluators will need to interpret the guidelines, judge equivalencies, and consider special circumstances, where appropriate

Teaching

- Portfolio must include a statement of teaching philosophy and evidence of (including reflective statements on) the following elements:
 - Instructional delivery
 - Course design
 - Assessment
 - Student engagement
 - Professional development
 - Course management
 - Documentation supporting mastery of subject matter
 - Student outcomes and accomplishments, including table of courses taught, number of students, grade distributions and interpretations
- Suggested examples of aspects of the teaching elements for which faculty could offer evidence and/or reflection are provided in Appendix A
- When all teaching elements are assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate is a very good teacher

Scholarship

- Portfolio must include evidence of publication of no fewer than 4 adjudicated papers (or equivalent)
 - All papers must appear in peer-reviewed national journals.
 - Regardless of equivalencies suggested below, the candidate must have at least 2 adjudicated papers published in peer-reviewed national journals in the discipline
 - Suggested equivalencies to adjudicated papers for this purpose:
 - One book chapter (“first edition”) can count as an equivalent
 - One external grant application that includes indirect costs and has a significant narrative with bibliography can be considered equivalent
 - Peer reviewed authored or edited books can be considered equivalent to multiple papers (not to exceed 2)
- Portfolio must include evidence of no fewer than 3 presentations (or equivalent) at appropriate state-level or higher professional conferences
 - At least 1 of the 3 presentations must be at the national (or international) level
 - Suggested equivalencies to state-level or higher presentations
 - Two local presentations can be equivalent to 1 state-level presentation or higher (a maximum of 1 time)

Scholarship, *continued*

- Documentation of other scholarship activities support the applicant's scholarship, such as published conference proceedings, edited books, book reviews, primary authorship of accreditation reports, clinical evaluation practice programs, journal manuscript review, computer assisted instruction materials, book computer software, member of editorial board of national journal, invited scholarly, reports of interdisciplinary programs or service projects, policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments, presentations and keynote addresses, local or university awards in recognition of scholars, journal reviews for peer review journals, reviews of textbook chapters, implemented clinical models,
- When scholarship is assessed, the conclusion must be that quality is good, that productivity likely will be sustained, and that the candidate has the potential to reach the scholarship guidelines associated with the rank of professor

Service

- Portfolio must include:
 - Evidence of involvement in at least 2 on-going departmental committees/initiatives at least over the most recent 2-year period
 - Evidence of at least 1 leadership role with good outcomes on service-related assignments in the department
 - Evidence of at least 2 on-going committees/initiatives outside the department (and 1 of those activities must be at the college level)
 - Evidence of departmental representation at various events (e.g., SOARs, open houses, open registration, community colleges, high schools, commencement, honors and awards ceremonies, etc.)
- When service is assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate has demonstrated a willingness and ability to participate in departmental governance and the potential to provide effective leadership to the department and beyond

Guidelines for Promotion to the Rank of Professor in the School of Health & Human Performance

- At minimum, candidates must serve 5 years at the rank of associate professor before applying for the rank of professor
- Guidelines pertain to performance since promotion to associate professor
- Guidelines are not fixed criteria; every portfolio will have unique aspects and evaluators will need to interpret the guidelines, judge equivalencies, and consider special circumstances, where appropriate

Teaching

- Portfolio must include a statement of teaching philosophy and evidence of (including reflective statements on) the following elements:
 - Instructional delivery
 - Course design
 - Assessment
 - Student engagement
 - Professional development
 - Course management
 - Documentation supporting mastery of subject matter
 - Student outcomes and accomplishments, including table of courses taught, number of students, grade distributions and interpretations
- Suggested examples of aspects of the teaching elements for which faculty could offer evidence and/or reflection are provided in Appendix A
- When all teaching elements are assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate is a very good teacher and has contributed positively to the instructional program both inside and outside the classroom

Scholarship

- Portfolio must include evidence of publication of no fewer than 6 adjudicated papers (or equivalent), at least 2 of which must have publication dates within 5 years of the application
 - All papers must appear in peer-reviewed national journals
 - Suggested equivalencies, not to exceed a total of 3 for this purpose, may include the following:
 - Book chapters (“first edition”) can count as up to 1 equivalent
 - Peer reviewed Conference proceedings can count up to 1 equivalent maximum (only if the full paper, not just an abstract, and was reviewed by a multi-person committee)
 - External grant applications that exceeds \$50,000, include indirect costs, and have significant narratives with bibliographies can count up to 1 equivalent maximum
 - Peer reviewed authored/edited books can count between 1-3 equivalents maximum (points within the range can be assigned in consideration of edition of the book, significance and/or impact of the book, or other relevant factors)

Scholarship, continued

- Documentation of other scholarship activities support the applicant's scholarship, such as published conference proceedings, edited books, book reviews, primary authorship of accreditation reports, clinical evaluation practice programs, journal manuscript review, computer assisted instruction materials, book computer software, member of editorial board of national journal, invited scholarly, reports of interdisciplinary programs or service projects, policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments, presentations and keynote addresses, local or university awards in recognition of scholars, journal reviews for peer review journals, reviews of textbook chapters, implemented clinical models, etc...
- Portfolio must include evidence of no fewer than 3 national presentations (or equivalent) at appropriate professional conferences, at least 2 of which must have presentation dates within 5 years of the application
 - Suggested equivalencies, not to exceed 1 for this purpose, may include the following:
 - Four presentations at local conferences may be considered equivalent to 1
 - Two presentations at state conferences may be considered equivalent to 1
- Documentation of other scholarship activities support the professor's scholarship, such as published conference proceedings, edited books, book reviews, primary authorship of accreditation reports, clinical evaluation practice programs, journal manuscript review, policy analysis, grant submissions and awards less than \$50,000,
- When scholarship is assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate has produced a "body of work," that productivity has been sustained, that quality is very good, and that the candidate has a national reputation in their field.

Service

- Portfolio must include:
 - Evidence of on-going involvement in at least 2 committees/initiatives either inside or outside the department each year at least over the most recent 5-year period
 - Evidence of continued departmental representation at various events (e.g., open houses, open registration, community colleges, high schools, commencement, honors and awards ceremonies, etc.)
 - Evidence that at least 1 service activity since promotion to associate professor was with a national professional or accrediting organization
 - Evidence of multiple leadership roles since promotion to associate professor with good outcomes (successfully meeting the "charge" or goals of the service activity) on service-related assignments both inside and outside the department
 - At least 1 leadership role must include chairing a departmental committee (or equivalent)
 - At least 1 leadership role in a college-wide committee or activity (or equivalent)
 - At least 1 leadership role must be in community or professional service
- When service is assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate is a leader in the department and beyond, and contributes in significant and on-going ways to the governance of the department, college, community, and profession

Procedure for Adjunct Faculty Review

The APT Committee of the Department of Healthcare Studies will collect IAS scores annually and conduct a full review of adjunct faculty every 1-3 years. Reviews will consist of the following information:

- **Annual review**

The annual review is required of all adjunct faculty utilizing IAS forms which are then submitted to the chairperson. The administration and reporting of teaching evaluations for all sections of all courses taught for our department is required. Teaching evaluations are a very important component of our assessment efforts.

Adjunct faculty should discuss the type of evaluation form and the process of administering the evaluation forms with the program coordinator prior to administration. A copy of the four global items should be submitted to the chairperson to be shared with the APT committee for personnel actions. The chairperson will review the IAS scores and determine the date for a full review pending these results and notify both the APT committee and the adjunct faculty member involved.

- **Full review**

The full review of adjunct faculty members includes IAS scores and a faculty-peer evaluation. Additional input may be requested as needed from program coordinators as well as student interviews, peer feedback and for adjunct faculty serving as preceptors, on-site staff input.

Program coordinators or designee will be responsible for completing and/or requesting a faculty-peer evaluation from professional staff at the agency where students are placed. The evaluation form will be returned to the APT Committee by the program coordinator or directly from the staff member who completed the evaluation via a self-addressed stamped envelope or email.

The APT committee will keep all documentation on file to be used exclusively for personnel actions and re-appointment. Documentation will be shared with the department chairperson and the APT committee.

References

Boyer, E. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (1999). Guidelines for faculty appointment, renewal, tenure (continuing appointment), promotion, and performance at rank. Brockport, NY: SUNY College at Brockport.

Final revisions and approval: **Departmental Revision and Approval April 17, 2015**
Departmental Revision and Approval May 1, 2015

Appendix A

Area	Example of Documentation
Instructional delivery	IAS scores must be provided for all, or almost all, course sections taught at least over the most recent 5-year period and scores, at minimum, generally should be below 2.0 (candidates with IAS scores greater than 2.0 will need to present evidence of remediation or an active plan of remediation); evidence of teaching excellence may be confirmed by departmental colleagues who are directly familiar with the candidate's work or augmented by peer review of teaching, as well as letters of support from students; documentation of improvement of teaching
Course design	Syllabi are properly developed and include required components; course content is current (revised as appropriate) and matched to the level of the class; assignments and activities are rigorous and contribute to student learning (reading, writing, critical thinking, active and/or collaborative activities are emphasized as appropriate); use of technology is built into course design in some way; course content includes diverse perspectives and/or cultural competence as appropriate; methods and materials are appropriate to class size, level, and content; new course preparation, new course development (approved by curriculum committee), and/or course conversion to online (or hybrid) format or evidence of a major contribution to the department or college-wide instructional program; etc.
Assessment	Appropriate tools are used to assess student learning; feedback to students is timely and meaningful; grading patterns are appropriately rigorous; indices of student learning/success with direct ties to faculty member; class progress on student learning outcomes is assessed and appropriate steps are taken for continuous improvement ("closing the loop"; indices of student learning or success, etc.)
Student engagement	Chairs or serves on graduate project (thesis, synthesis, major paper, etc.) committee (beyond assigned teaching load); sponsors independent or directed studies; mentors CSTEP, Honors or McNair students; involves students in research or service projects outside of class; mentors students to publish a paper, present at professional conference, attain employment, or gain admission to graduate school; provides excellent academic advisement; etc.
Professional development	CELT, webinars, professional teaching conferences, serves as a faculty or CELT mentor, etc.
Course management	All course-related deadlines are met, regular office hours maintained, reasonable availability to students outside of class, class meets for entire scheduled time, etc.