

2005

Physical Education and Sport: 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, "Physical Education and Sport: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation" (2005).
Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation. 26.
<http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt/26>

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.

Revised: Approved Spring 06 version

Department of Physical Education and Sport

Criteria for Personnel Evaluation

APTD Committee

The Department's personnel committee is an elected body comprised of five faculty members. A majority of the committee must have continuing appointment and senior rank. Junior faculty may serve on the committee and participate in DSI evaluations and help to formulate issues of policy. Only senior faculty may evaluate applications for continuing appointment and promotion to associate professor. For promotion to professor, the committee must include at least one full professor.

The APTD Committee is charged with the task of peer-reviewed personnel evaluation. The information contained in this document shall serve as a basis for making this assessment.

Matching Evaluation to Workload

Consistent with the philosophy of the *Roles and Rewards* document, the Department has agreed (at least in principle) to allow faculty to negotiate workload (within specified parameters) so that each faculty member has the opportunity "to do what they do best." Faculty who are teaching 9 credits per semester (or equivalent) will be assigned a 50% workload in teaching and can allocate the remaining 50% to scholarship and service consistent with the percentages contained within this document. The remaining 50% can be allocated at the time that faculty apply for DSI consideration. Those faculty members who teach more than 9 credits per semester (or equivalent) can increase their teaching percentages by 5% for each credit above 9 they teach (e.g., those with a 12 credit teaching load can claim as much as 65% for the evaluation of teaching and could allocate the remaining 35% to scholarship and service).

Faculty with qualified academic rank currently are those who are assigned responsibilities in other units on campus (athletics and/or campus recreation). For the evaluation of QAR faculty, percentages assigned to other units will be considered by those units. Of the percentage assigned to PES, 10% will be assigned to service with the remainder assigned to teaching.

Teaching is the Highest Priority

The percentages assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service are consistent with those that appear in *Roles and Rewards*, where teaching is at least 50% and where teaching > scholarship > service (and where service is at least 10%). The weighting system explained in this document assures that faculty with traditional assignments are evaluated according to these percentages. Exceptions to these percentages occur when faculty

receive release time from teaching. In this case the percentage of teaching release should be assigned to either scholarship or service depending on the reason for the release. When faculty receive release time for service it is possible that their weighting for service will be greater than that of scholarship and possibly even teaching when the release time is large.

Values and Rubrics

For each area of a faculty member's responsibilities (teaching, scholarship, service), the criteria for evaluation are described in this document. Initially the Department lists those characteristics that it values within each area of responsibility. These values are then followed by a series of rubrics (i.e., rating scales) which seek to operationalize the values. Rubric scores can range from 0 ("poor")-5 ("exceptional") (actually 5.33 as explained below) depending on how well the faculty member's papers address the descriptors associated with each level of the rubric. Descriptors within each rubric are arranged so that a 2 ("good") is considered at rank for junior faculty members and a 3 ("very good") is considered at rank for senior faculty members. Rubrics are not additive; the rating corresponds to the highest level achieved by any of the activities reported. Scores are determined separately for teaching, scholarship, and service. Evaluators have the latitude to assign "plus" and "minus" scores to a rubric score to distinguish among performances at a given level. A plus would result in an additional .33 points assigned to a rubric score and a minus would result in .33 fewer points assigned to a rubric score. Hence, for example, 5.33 is possible for an "exceptional plus" and 4.67 points is possible for an "exceptional minus."

Weighting the Rubric Scores

After evaluators have assigned a rubric score to each of the three areas of responsibility, a composite score is calculated by multiplying the rubric scores by the percentages allocated for evaluation and summing the products. (The intent is that by the year 2001-02 the workload and evaluation percentages will be the same for most, if not all, faculty. For the evaluation of 1999-2000, the evaluation percentages will be consistent with the approach described above.) It is expected that senior faculty members attain a composite rubric score of 3 or better in order to be considered at rank. For the purposes of DSI, junior faculty (lecturers, instructors, assistant professors) with a composite score greater than (or equal to) 2.67 will be recommended; senior faculty (associate professors and above) with a composite score greater than (or equal to) 3.67 will be recommended. To the extent that it may be necessary to distinguish among DSI-eligible faculty at some higher level of deliberation (e.g., School of Arts and Performance), the degree to which each eligible faculty member exceeds his/her minimum criterion (2.67 or 3.67) will be considered. The APTD Committee is charged with the responsibility of conveying to each faculty member who applies for DSI the rubric scores for each area of responsibility and the calculations of the composite score.

Matching Teaching Assignments to Variable Workload/Evaluation Percentages

Teaching assignments are made by the department chair in consultation with the faculty member. A standard teaching load in the department is 9 credits (or equivalent) for faculty demonstrating an “active program of scholarship” and/or with major or multiple service responsibilities. Faculty who do not demonstrate an “active program of scholarship” should contribute more in the areas of teaching and/or service. Faculty may carry fewer credits when they receive release to perform additional duties in either scholarship (e.g., a grant) or service (e.g., administrative release). Tenured faculty may carry more than 9 credits in response to programmatic need or as the result of negotiation with the chair. In any case, faculty usually will have some degree of latitude in establishing workload and evaluation percentages in scholarship and service. These percentages are used to weight the rubric scores when calculating a composite score. Faculty can declare their percentages at the time they submit their papers for DSI consideration.

Credits	Teaching	Scholarship	Service
0	0	30-90	10-70
1	10	30-80	10-60
2	15	30-75	10-55
3	20	30-70	10-50
4	25	30-65	10-45
5	30	30-60	10-40
6	35	30-55	10-35
7	40	30-50	10-30
8	45	30-45	10-25
9	50	30-40	10-20
10	55	25-35	10-20
11	60	25-30	10-15
12	65	20-25	10-15

Evaluating Faculty Portfolios

Members of the Department's APTD Committee and the chairperson have the responsibility of evaluating faculty performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. That evaluation should take place in accord with the criteria established within this document. Evaluators assign a score for each area of responsibility consistent with the scoring rubrics described below. In addition to assigning whole number scores (ranging from 0-5) evaluators also may assign "plus" and "minus" scores (adding or subtracting .33 from the whole numbers) when they believe that the faculty members performance falls somewhere between rubric levels.

Teaching

The Department of Physical Education and Sport values the following characteristics of good teaching:

- student satisfaction
- rigor and high expectations
- "student-centered" teaching
- knowledge of subject matter and use of effective methodologies and materials
- evidence of student learning/success

Evaluation

Faculty submit portfolios that *must* include student evaluations (per College's *Roles and Rewards* document) and *should* include evidence of each of the other values:

- student satisfaction as evidenced by the four "global" questions of IAS
- knowledge of subject matter and use of effective methodologies and materials (including innovative approaches, use/development of current materials, and)
- rigorous standards (including grading patterns), assignments, content, objectives
- "student-centered" teaching (including level of involvement with tutoring, review sessions, independent and directed studies, thesis work, and the like)
- evidence of student learning/success (including pass rates on external measures or standardized tests, comparisons of pre-post testing, student self-appraisal of learning, and the like)
- peer review of teaching (CELT or others)

Note: Faculty should submit *all* student reaction to instruction (SRI) scores for the review period, but only the best 2/3's will be used for the purpose of assigning a rubric score.

Peer review of the faculty portfolio will be made according to the following rubric:

- 5 Exceptional
 - Excellent student evaluations (IAS means generally < .85 or modes generally = 0.00) and strong evidence of at least three of the remaining four portfolio criteria

- 4 Excellent
 - Very good student evaluations (IAS means generally < 1.25 or modes generally = 1.00) and strong evidence of at least three of the four remaining portfolio criteria
 - Excellent student evaluations (IAS means generally < .85 or modes generally = .00) and strong evidence of at least two of the remaining four portfolio criteria

- 3 Very Good
 - Good student evaluations (IAS means generally < 2.25 or modes generally = 2.00) and strong evidence of at least three of the four remaining portfolio criteria
 - Very good student evaluations (IAS means generally < 1.25 or modes generally = 1.00) and strong evidence of at least two of the remaining four portfolio criteria
 - Excellent student evaluations (IAS generally < .85 or modes generally = .00) and strong evidence of at least one of the remaining four portfolio criteria

- 2 Good
 - Fair to good student evaluations (IAS means generally < 2.75 or modes generally = 2.00 and 3.00) and strong evidence of at least three of the remaining four portfolio criteria
 - Good student evaluations (IAS means generally < 2.25 or modes generally = 2.00) and strong evidence of at least two of the remaining four portfolio criteria
 - Very good student evaluations (IAS means generally < 1.25 or modes generally = 1.00) and strong evidence of at least one of the remaining four portfolio criteria
 - Excellent student evaluations (IAS means generally < .85 or modes generally = .00), but no/little evidence of any of the remaining portfolio criteria

1 Fair

- Fair student evaluations (IAS means generally < 3.25 or modes generally = 3.00) and strong evidence of at least three of the remaining four portfolio criteria
- Fair to good student evaluations (IAS means generally < 2.75 or modes generally = 2.00 and 3.00) and strong evidence of at least two the remaining four portfolio criteria
- Good student evaluations (IAS means generally < 2.25 or modes generally = 2.00) and strong evidence of at least one of the remaining four portfolio criteria
- Very good student evaluations (IAS means generally < 1.25 or modes generally = 1.00), but no/little evidence of any of the remaining portfolio criteria

0 Poor

- No student evaluations submitted
- Very poor to fair student evaluations (IAS means generally > 3.25 or modes generally greater than 3.00)
- Fair student evaluations (IAS means generally < 3.25 or modes generally = 3.00), but strong evidence for less than three of the remaining four portfolio criteria
- Fair to good student evaluations (IAS means generally < 2.75 or modes generally = 2.00 and 3.00), but strong evidence for less than two of the four remaining portfolio criteria
- Good student evaluations (IAS means generally < 2.25 or modes generally = 2.00), but no/little evidence of any of the remaining portfolio criteria

Scholarship

The Department of Physical Education and Sport values the following characteristics of good scholarship:

- All forms of scholarship (basic, applied, integration, application, action, etc.) are recognized, but written works (including electronic formats) take precedence over presentations and adjudicated works take precedence over non-adjudicated works
- Quality (where adjudication takes the form of internal and external review processes)
- Volume (e.g., multiple quality scholarly products receive more credit than a single quality product)
- Significance (as evidenced by its professional impact, contribution to the body of knowledge, etc.)
- Scholarly activities that result in the acquisition of funds from external agencies which can be used to support research, training, or direct services under the direction of a faculty member

**An active program of scholarship is defined as:

An average rubric score of 2 or better under scholarship with a minimum of one refereed publication every three years. Each faculty member should include a research plan in their annual report documenting:

- ongoing scholarship
- manuscripts in progress, press, submission, etc.
- IRB approvals for research

Evaluation

Faculty members submit a research portfolio which lists and discusses their scholarly activities for a particular year. Peer review of the portfolio will be made according to the following rubric:

- 5 Exceptional
 - Authored or co-authored an adjudicated book or equivalent
(Note on co-authorship: when there are two authors or when the faculty member in question is one of the first two authors, the assumption will be that the faculty member was a “primary” author. When the faculty member is the third or subsequent author in a multi-authored manuscript, the faculty member must provide verification of contribution from the first author and ordinarily would be considered a

“secondary” author. Rubric scores for secondary authors shall be reduced by .33.)

- Edited or co-edited an adjudicated book or equivalent
- Authored or co-authored three or more adjudicated scholarly papers in professional journals
- Received a very large grant (> \$50,000 per annum)

4 Excellent

- Authored or co-authored two or more adjudicated papers in professional journals or equivalent
- Authored or co-authored two or more book chapters or equivalent
- Edited a special topics issue in a journal or periodical or equivalent
- Gave keynote address at a major conference or symposium or equivalent
- Received a large grant (>\$30,000 <\$50,000)

3 Very Good

- Authored or co-authored one adjudicated paper in a professional journal or equivalent
- Authored or co-authored one book chapter or equivalent
- Received a moderate grant (>\$10,000 < \$30,000)
- Gave invited major presentation or presentations at national or international conference or symposium or equivalent

2 Good

- Authored or co-authored adjudicated paper or papers are “in press”
- Authored or co-authored non-adjudicated paper or papers are published
- Authored or co-authored adjudicated abstract
- Gave presentation at state, national, or international conference, symposium, or workshop (includes panel discussions, poster sessions, clinics, etc.) or equivalent
- Received a small grant (< \$10,000) from an external agency
- Submitted an application for a large grant (> \$50,000)
- Evidence that a major scholarly project (textbook, research grant, or equivalent) is in progress

1 Fair

- Gave a local presentation or presentations
- Evidence that a scholarly paper or papers (articles, chapters, grant applications or equivalent) are in progress

0 Poor

- No scholarly activity is discernible
- No evidence of scholarly activity is provided

Service

The Department of Physical Education and Sport values the following characteristics of good service:

- Involvement with departmental “chores” (representing the department at SOAR sessions, transfer days, Open Houses, community colleges, high school “college nights,” graduate information nights and the like is a necessary component of every faculty members service portfolio)
- Quality student advisement (where student satisfaction is a necessary condition)
- Active participation over simple attendance
- Leadership over active participation
- Involvement at multiple levels (departmental, college, university, professional, and community) (Community service, however, must be linked to the faculty member’s professional expertise.)
- Valuable products/outcomes are generated (e.g., successful searches completed, development of policy statements or reports, or goals attained)
- Volume (e.g., multiple quality service contributions receive more credit than single quality contributions)
- Community outreach is a legitimate service contribution

Evaluation

Each faculty member will submit a service portfolio listing and discussing relevant activities for a particular year. Peer review of the portfolio will be made according to the following rubric:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 5 | <p>Exceptional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from three different levels (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 | <p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from two different levels 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 |

- Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from three different levels with evidence of effectiveness on all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement
- 3 Very Good
- Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from two different levels with evidence of effectiveness on all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement
 - Actively engaged in at least two on-going service activities from two different levels 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 Good
- Actively engaged in at least two on-going service activities at any level with evidence of effectiveness on all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores or quality advisement
 - Actively engaged in at least one on-going service activity at any level with a) evidence of leadership, b) evidence of effectiveness, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores or quality advisement
- 1 Fair
- Actively engaged in at least one on-going service activity at any level and supported by evidence of involvement with department chores or quality advisement
- 0 Poor
- No on-going service activities at any level
 - Failure to participate in departmental chores or failure to provide quality advisement

Weighting the Results of the Portfolio Evaluation

Each faculty member is evaluated through peer review on teaching, scholarship, and service. A score from 0-5.33 is assigned to each category based on the criteria associated with the rubrics. Rubric scores are then multiplied by the appropriate workload (or evaluation) percentage and added. Composite scores are then applied to criteria for “at rank” and “above rank.” Junior faculty (lecturers, instructors, and assistant professors) would need a composite score of 2 to be at rank, and a composite score of 2.67 or higher to be above rank for the purpose of DSI. Senior faculty (associate professors and higher) would need a composite score of 3 to be at rank and a composite score of 3.67 or higher to be above rank for the purpose of DSI.

Examples:

Assistant Professor A negotiated a 50-40-10 workload and taught 9 contact hours. APTD evaluated his performance as follows:

Teaching = 2.7
Scholarship = 3.1
Service = 1.0

Composite score = $2.5(.5) + 3.1(.4) + 1.0(.1)$
= 2.59

The conclusion was that Assistant Professor A was functioning at rank.

Associate Professor B negotiated a 65-25-10 workload and taught 12 contact hours. APTD evaluated her performance as follows:

Teaching = 4.6
Scholarship = 3.0
Service = 4.1

Composite score = $4.6(.65) + 3.0(.25) + 4.1(.1)$
= 4.15

The conclusion was that Associate Professor B was functioning above rank.

QAR Instructor C has a 60-(30)-10 workload and taught 11 contact hours. APTD evaluated his performance as follows:

Teaching = 3.9
Service = 2.2

Composite score = $[3.9 (.60) + 2.2 (.1)] / .7$
= 3.66

The conclusion was that QAR Instructor C was functioning above rank.

Suggestions for Portfolio Development

One of the principal advantages of using a rubric-based evaluation system is that both the evaluators and those being evaluated know the various criteria ahead of time. Faculty who are preparing portfolios for DSI consideration should consult the rubrics carefully and choose to include materials that speak to those criteria (or to the values upon which the rubrics are based). (In fact faculty may wish to organize their portfolio using the values described in this document as headings.) Listed below are some ideas for the kinds of materials that faculty might consider including in the three sections of their portfolios. The list is not meant to be inclusive nor should faculty feel compelled to address each of the following examples.

Teaching

- Reflective statement
- All SRI summary sheets (IAS)
- Other forms of student satisfaction/reaction
- Grade distributions
- Course syllabi
- Samples of tests or other evaluative tools
- Samples of student work
- Samples of course materials
- Descriptions of methodologies employed
- Description of involvement with independent student projects (including theses)
- Description of tutoring or review efforts or equivalent
- Evidence of student learning
- Description of new course development
- Peer review of teaching

Scholarship

- Reflective statement
- Copies of all published scholarly papers (including galleys for those “in press”)
- Copies of all papers “in review” or “in development” (include a statement on what has been accomplished during the current review period)
- Copies of any relevant communications with editors, publishers, organizers etc. pertaining to publications or presentations
- Copies of conference programs for presentations

Service

- Reflective statement
- Descriptions of activities under the five identified areas of service [departmental, college, university (SUNY-wide), professional, or community (provided it is related to professional expertise)]
- Descriptions of extent of involvement including leadership roles
- Letters of support from relevant individuals
- Descriptions of products/outcomes
- Evidence of quality student academic advisement (instrument to be developed)

Promotions

The rubric-based scoring system has been established primarily for the evaluation of a single year (e.g., DSI or possibly a one-year renewal), but has some applicability in determining a faculty member's eligibility for promotion (especially to associate professor). While the Department may wish to explore extending the utility of the rubric system to promotions in the future, the following will serve as guidelines until that time.

To Associate Professor (with tenure)

Teaching

- Successful candidates must be very good teachers
- As a guideline, tenure candidates should seek to demonstrate that their teaching performance has met the criteria for an average rubric score of at least 3 in teaching across the probationary period
- As a guideline, candidates for promotion who already have tenure should demonstrate that their teaching performance has met the criteria for an average rubric score of at least 3 in teaching since promotion or appointment to assistant professor (performance over the most recent five year period can be more heavily weighted)

Scholarship

- Successful candidates should be active scholars
- As a guideline, tenure candidates should seek to demonstrate that their performance in scholarship has met the criteria for an average rubric score of at least 3 in scholarship from the second year on during the probationary period (or equivalent for those who "bring time") (For those who come up during their 6th year, therefore, the expectation would be that they would have at least four adjudicated papers published.)
- As a guideline, candidates with tenure should demonstrate that they have averaged a rubric score of at least 3 in scholarship since promotion or appointment to assistant professor (although performance over the most recent five year period can be more heavily weighted)

Service

- Successful candidates should be active and effective in service

- As a guideline, tenure candidates should seek to demonstrate that their performance in service has met the criteria for an average rubric score of at least 3 during the probationary period
- As a guideline, candidates with tenure should demonstrate that they have averaged a rubric score of at least 3 in service since promotion or appointment to assistant professor (performance over the most recent five year period can be more heavily weighted)

To Professor

Successful candidates must demonstrate sustained high level performance since attaining the rank of associate professor. Both candidates and evaluators should consult the criteria associated with promotion to professor distributed annually by the Office of Academic Affairs. As a guideline, candidates should seek to demonstrate that they are very good teachers, scholars, and service providers. (The evaluation may require external reviews of the candidate's scholarship). It is expected that successful candidates would be able to demonstrate that their performance clearly has exceeded rubric scores of 3 during their time as an associate professor.

Procedures for DSI Consideration

- 1) Submit Annual Review form and supporting portfolio (try to limit portfolio to one 3–ring binder or less) to the Department secretary’s office by the established deadline. A cover letter asking for DSI consideration and delineating the reasons the candidate believes he/she is qualified should accompany the materials.
- 2) APTD members independently evaluate each file according to the published criteria and record the evaluations on the standard score sheets.
- 3) APTD members review and discuss each file and assigned scores; APTD members have the opportunity to revise scores following this review and discussion.
- 4) An average score is calculated for each of the three categories (teaching, research, service) and recorded on a summary score sheet. The averaged scores are multiplied by the workload/evaluation percentages established for the individual faculty member resulting in a composite score.
- 5) A copy of the summary score sheet is provided to each candidate.
- 6) Candidates may appeal the Committee’s evaluation by contacting the APTD chair.
- 7) All files are forwarded to the department chair’s office along with a copy of the APTD summary score sheet for each file.
- 8) Chair conducts an independent evaluation of the file (including the calculation of a composite score) and provides a copy of his/her summary score sheet to both the candidate and to the chair of APTD.
- 9) The Annual Reports (and portfolios if requested) of candidates whose composite scores equal or surpass the published standards for DSI are forwarded to the Dean’s office.

Procedures for Renewal or Promotion

- 1) Candidates submit a dossier listing career activities in teaching, scholarship, and service by the established deadline. The dossier, in particular, should highlight accomplishments since either the last review or since appointment/promotion to the current rank.
- 2) For renewals, peer review of the dossier will be completed by the standing APTD Committee. For promotions, the dossier is reviewed by either the standing APTD Committee or, if necessary, an ad hoc review committee appointed by either the department chair or, as appropriate, the dean. Under any circumstances, the review committee must have the following characteristics:
 - at least three members;
 - each member must be an associate professor or higher; and
 - in the case of promotion to full professor, at least one member must be a professor (or distinguished professor).
- 3) Dossiers are evaluated according to the criteria by rank established by the Board of Trustees. Committee members also may use the rubrics contained in this document as guidelines for levels of expectation in rank across teaching, scholarship, and service. In the case of promotion to full professor, the committee may seek an external review of the candidate's scholarship. Reviewers should be from institutions with similar teaching missions and from the candidate's sub-discipline. Reviewers may not be former instructors, collaborators, or close personal friends. The department chair or dean (as appropriate) will select reviewers from a list of possibilities supplied by both the applicant and the review committee. Reviewers will be offered a modest stipend to be paid from the departmental budget.
- 4) The review committee will provide a written recommendation summarizing the committee's deliberations to the department chair or dean (as appropriate). A copy of the recommendation is provided to the candidate. (**Note on process:** if College policy so requires, recommendations from the APTD Committee will go back to the Department prior to going to the chair. In such a case the faculty will vote to "endorse" or "not endorse" the recommendation of the committee. The file would then go to the chair with the committee's recommendation and the faculty vote on that recommendation.)

- 5) If the candidate disagrees with the recommendation, he/she may appeal by contacting the committee chair.
- 6) The department chair or dean (as appropriate) conducts an independent evaluation and forwards the dossier with accompanying letters of recommendation to the dean. A copy of the chair's recommendation is provided the candidate.