

2001

Health Science: 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, "Health Science: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation" (2001). *Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation*. 54.

<http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt/54>

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.

Department of Health Science
State University of New York
College at Brockport
Guidelines for APT Decisions:
Renewal, Continuing Appointment,
Promotion, and DSI
Draft #5

Developed by the HLS/APT Committee

May 14, 1999

Committee Members

Linda F. Balog, Chair - Joseph E. Balog

Patti Follansbee - Gary Metz

Revised by the HLS/APT Committee

March 6, 2000

Committee Members

Thomas Golaszewski, Chair - Joseph E. Balog

Gary Metz

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Renewal Guidelines	3
Minimum Performance Criteria for Renewal	3
Continuing Appointment Guidelines	4
Minimum Performance Criteria for Continuing Appointment	5
Promotion to Full Professor	6
Minimum Performance Criteria for Full Professor.....	6
Discretionary Salary Increase (DSI) Guidelines	7
Additional DSI Categories	7
Minimum Performance Criteria of DSI	8
Meritorious Performance Criteria for DSI.....	8
Teaching, Service, and Scholarship Evaluation Guidelines	9
Teaching Activities and Evaluation Guidelines.....	9
Service Activities and Evaluation Guidelines.....	14
Operationally Defining and Quantifying Service Activities.....	14
Additional Information Related to Service	17
Scholarship Activities and Evaluation Guidelines.....	20
Tables	
Table 1. Activities and Rating Scale for Teaching Effectiveness.....	10
Table 2. Activity and Point Values for Service Activities.....	16
Table 3. University, Public, and Professional Service Categories.....	18
Table 4. Activity and Point Values for Scholarly Activities	22
Table 5. Scholarly Activity Requirements for Continuing Appointment: Three Methods for Achieving Minimum Standards	23
Table 6. Scholarly Activity Requirements for Full Professor.....	24

Introduction

The following guidelines for renewal, continuing appointment, promotion, and discretionary salary increase (DSI) were developed to assist members of the Department of Health Science in making long range plans related to APT and personnel decisions. In developing these guidelines, the APT Committee took into consideration the existing departmental guidelines which had been in use for a number of years, input from all HLS faculty (as noted from five 90-minute reviews and discussions of “rough drafts”), the recommendations of the Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee, changes in the College Mission Statement, and memoranda concerning criteria for personnel decisions issued by administrators. The APT Committee incorporated many of the recommendations from the above sources into this document so that Health Science Department criteria will continue to be in harmony with those of the administration, the Faculty Senate, and the goals, mission, and philosophy of the Department of Health Science.

These guidelines are intended to provide guidance to the faculty of the Department of Health Science and SUNY Brockport Administration about the Department of Health Science’s APT standards assuming performance at rank in all three areas, such that teaching is weighted greater than scholarship, which in turn is weighted greater than service . Also, these guidelines are intended to provide Health Science Faculty with a better understanding of the criteria that are used for evaluating a faculty member’s applications for renewal, continuing appointment, promotion to Associate and Full Professor, and DSI. Faculty are reminded that promotion to Assistant Professor in this department from the ranks of Instructor or Lecturer is usually dependent upon an agreement with the faculty member and the administration that he or she obtain a doctorate degree. Therefore, the Committee has not concerned itself with establishing additional criteria for promotion to this beginning professional rank.

Previous discussions with Chairs and Deans, and recent memos from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs have made it very clear to the Committee that all applications for renewal, continuing appointment, promotion, and DSI should be meticulously documented in all respects. A faculty member seeking a personnel action will, in most cases, use the annual report as the framework from which to provide such documentation. Applications that are inadequately documented are not likely to receive favorable administrative consideration. Thus, the APT Committee will use the criteria in this departmental APT document to provide a thorough and complete review in recommending the acceptance or rejection of applications for personnel decisions, and in working with faculty members to advise them on what is necessary for promotion and DSI applications.

The procedure for all recommendations on renewal, continuing appointment, and promotion applications will follow the *Calendar of Personnel Processes*, as distributed by the Vice President of Academic Affairs:

To Departmental APT Committee by designated date
APT Committee Notification to Candidate by designated date
APT Committee Notification to Chair by designated date

Chair Notification to Candidate by designated date
Chair Notification to Dean by designated date
Dean Notification to Candidate by designated date
Dean Notification to Academic Vice President by designated date
Academic Vice President to President by designated date
TARGET DATE FOR NOTIFICATION (usually April of designated year)

When and if monies are available for DSI's, the calendar of process (designated due dates to APT Committee, Chair, Dean, Academic VP) is distributed separately by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

In conclusion, the APT committee recognizes the strengths that each faculty member brings to the Health Science Department in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship. In addition, the committee would like to clarify that "at rank" performance in each of these three areas will be operationally defined as being actively involved on a regular basis in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship.

Renewal Guidelines

Concerning renewal, the applicant requesting consideration should present appropriate evidence of performance in the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service for each year of service being considered for renewal. Unless otherwise specified, the APT Committee assumes that a faculty's renewal application should include evidence of performance over the last two years of appointment at SUNY Brockport. The following information presents performance criteria guidelines for renewal:

Minimum Performance Criteria for Renewal

1. Teaching: evidence of an appropriate level of teaching by earning 5 points per year in Category A (Required Teaching Activities) and an additional 3 points per year in Category B (Additional Teaching Activities) from Table 1 (page 10).
2. University, Public, and Professional Service: evidence of involvement in service as demonstrated by performing at least 5 service activities over a two-year period of time from Table 2 (page 16). This level of activity should include serving on at least 2 departmental activities each year (4 points over two years) and earning at least 4 points over a two-year period from additional service activities that are listed in Tables 2 and 3 (page 18).
3. Scholarship: demonstrate ability to conduct and produce scholarship by earning at least 6 points, or demonstrating the potential (for example, article in review) to earn 6 points and produce peer-reviewed scholarship, over a two-year period from Table 4 (page 22).

Continuing Appointment Guidelines

A recommendation for renewal or continuing appointment (tenure) for an incumbent member of the Health Science Faculty is based primarily on an evaluation of the faculty member's performance in each category identified by the Board of Trustees during the faculty member's appointment at Brockport. A positive recommendation for continuing appointment reflects the expectation that the faculty member has the potential for attaining the highest rank in the Department and that the person's contribution to the program will be significant and necessary in the future.

Criteria for tenure should be at least, if not more rigorous than that for promotion to Associate Professor. Therefore, promotion to Associate Professor will be concomitant with tenure (unless promotion was awarded early).

Concerning continuing appointment, the applicant requesting consideration should present evidence of quality performance in the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service for the five to six years of untenured appointment in the college. The following information presents performance criteria guidelines for continuing appointment (see next page):

Minimum Performance Criteria for Continuing Appointment

1. Teaching: evidence of an appropriate level of teaching by earning 5 points per year in Category A (Required Teaching Activities) and an additional 3 points per year in Category B (Additional Teaching Activities) from Table 1 (page 10).
2. University, Public, and Professional Service: evidence of involvement in service as demonstrated by performing at least 15 service activities from Table 2 (page 16). These 15 activities should include at least 6 activities at the process level of involvement (6 points) and 4 service activities at or above the leadership level of involvement (8 points). In total, faculty must earn at least 20 points in service over a five-year period. Also, faculty should perform service activities in at least 3 of the 5 categories of service – department, school, college, community, and professional.
3. Scholarship: demonstrate ability to conduct and produce scholarship. Faculty can successfully complete the minimum required for scholarship by using one of three different methods as identified in Table 5 (page 23). These three methods include: (1) Method 1 - faculty must earn at least 27 points from scholarly activities as specified in Table 5; (2) Method 2 - faculty must earn at least 25 points from scholarly activities as specified in Table 5; or (3) Method 3 - faculty must earn at least 23 points from scholarly activities as specified in Table 5 (page 23).

Promotion to Full Professor

Concerning promotion to full professor, the applicant requesting consideration should present evidence of active and quality performance for at least a minimum of five years at the rank of Associate Professor in all three areas of teaching, service, and scholarship and demonstrate exceptional performance in at least one of these three areas of faculty responsibilities.

The following information presents performance criteria guidelines for promotion to Full Professor:

Minimum Performance Criteria for Full Professor

1. Teaching: evidence of an appropriate level of teaching by earning 5 points per year in Category A (Required Teaching Activities) and an additional 3 points per year in Category B (Additional Teaching Activities) from Table 1 (page 10).
2. University, Public, and Professional Service: evidence of involvement in service with a combination of service activities at the process, leadership, and outcome levels that should include the accumulation of at least 25 points from Table 2 (page 16). In addition, to demonstrate exceptional performance in this service, faculty must present evidence of significant contributions at the levels of leadership and outcome that involve school, college, community, or professional service.
3. Scholarship: demonstrate ability to produce scholarship. Faculty should demonstrate that their scholarly activities have a significant value for the profession and are of high quality. To minimally demonstrate exceptional performance in scholarship, faculty must earn 45 points from scholarly activities that include at least 30 points from peer-reviewed publications since being promoted to the rank of Associate Professor (see Table 6, page 24).

Discretionary Salary Increase (DSI) Guidelines

To qualify for consideration for a DSI during a one-year period, a faculty member is expected to present evidence of minimum performance 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 on page eight. In the second category for an individual faculty DSI during a one-year period, a faculty member is expected to present evidence of extraordinary performance in at least one area of teaching, scholarship, or service.

Additional DSI Categories

In addition to the above two categories for individual faculty DSI's for a one-year period, the Final Report of the Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee, also recommends that faculty are eligible for a DSI in the following two areas:

1. **Multi-Year Individual DSI:** Faculty members who have not received a DSI in the previous three consecutive academic years would be eligible to apply at the beginning of the 4th year for a DSI that considers work completed over the previous three-year period. Any award would not exceed the amount awarded for a one-year individual DSI.
2. **Group DSI:** Groups of two or more individuals whose collective achievement in Teaching, Scholarship, or Service is exceptional may be nominated for a Group DSI by the Dean (s) of the School (s) to the College President. Recipients of a Group DSI may be nominated based on collective achievement that spans one to three years. Membership in a group recognized for a Group DSI does not preclude an individual from being awarded a One-Year or Multi-Year Individual DSI based upon exceptional achievement in one or more areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, with performance at an acceptable level in the other roles. Faculty may not be awarded a DSI as an individual and as a member of a group for the same exceptional achievement.

Faculty members wishing to be considered for DSI will submit their annual reports and supporting documentation to the APT Committee. Supporting documentation should demonstrate the quality as well as the quantity of the contributions. The APT committee will review each applicant's file and make recommendations to the department Chair. The Chair will add his/her own recommendations and then along with other chairs of the School of Professions meet with the Dean and recommend DSI recipients.

The following performance criteria for a DSI presents a basic framework that assists faculty in making decisions as to whether or not they meet the minimum qualifications to be considered for DSI. However, faculty should not interpret these standards for a DSI as a guarantee for receiving such a nomination or an award; the DSI process is competitive and functions within a limited budget among other potentially confounding factors.



Minimum Performance Criteria for DSI

1. Teaching: evidence of an appropriate level of teaching by earning 5 points per year in Category A (Required Teaching Activities) and an additional 3 points per year in Category B (Additional Teaching Activities) from Table 1 (page 10).
2. University, Public, and Professional Service: evidence of involvement in service at the process level or higher in service activities (earning at least 3 points) from Table 2 (page 16);
3. Scholarship: demonstrate ability to conduct and produce scholarship by earning a minimum of 5 points from Table 4 (page 22).

Meritorious Performance Criteria for DSI

1. For a teaching DSI, faculty must earn 4 points from Category A (Required Teaching Activities) and an additional 5 points from Categories B (Additional Teaching Activities).
2. For a service DSI, faculty must demonstrate exceptional performance by being involved in service at the leadership or outcome levels and earn at least 4 points from service activities listed in Table 2.
3. For a scholarship DSI, faculty must demonstrate exceptional performance by earning at least 8 points in scholarly activities from Table 4. This scholarly performance must include at least 5 points from published peer-reviewed scholarly activities.

Teaching, Service, and Scholarship Evaluation Guidelines

Teaching Activities and Evaluation Guidelines

Concerning teaching effectiveness, faculty should develop a document or “portfolio” that demonstrates that they are performing at an appropriate level of teaching. This document should include supporting evidence of performance (where appropriate) in two areas of: (1) required teaching activities; and (2) additional teaching activities listed in Table 1. In general, all teaching faculty should perform all the teaching activities in the “required teaching activities” section and earn 5 points per year from this section. In addition, faculty seeking personnel decisions should demonstrate classroom performance by presenting evidence of teaching effectiveness in the areas of “additional teaching activities” (where appropriate). Faculty seeking personnel decisions should perform at least an additional 3 activities from this additional teaching activities section and earn an additional 3 points per year.

Minimum Performance Criteria for Continuing Appointment

1. Teaching: evidence of an appropriate level of teaching by earning 5 points per year in Category A (Required Teaching Activities) and an additional 3 points per year in Category B (Additional Teaching Activities) from Table 1 (page 10).

Table 1. Activities and rating scale for teaching effectiveness

Activity	Yes (1 point)	No (0 points)	Not Applicable
A. Required teaching activities			
1.	Evaluation of classroom performance by students Examples: IAS form (required) “New” & approved IAS form (required when available)		
2.	Grade distribution and analysis		
3.	Provision of course materials Examples: Current and up-to-date course outline that includes course: description, goals, objectives, required and recommended readings, evaluation criteria, assignments, activities, attendance policy, disability statement, schedule, instructor information (office hrs, etc.), and other course requirements		
4.	Performs appropriate course advisement Examples: Provides an appropriate number of office hours Provides appropriate level of course advisement		

5.	<p>Performs Major Advisement</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides appropriate advisement to majors Number of undergraduate advisees ___ Number of graduate advisees __ Faculty is available to students Faculty schedules adequate office hours Faculty volunteers for SOAR Sessions Faculty volunteers for SI Sessions Faculty volunteers of other advisement Activities Faculty provides career advisement Faculty completes documents that support advisement (e.g. internship procedures) 			
6.	<p>Other instruction–related responsibilities</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Practicum Internships Thesis/Major Paper Independent studies Student projects 			
B. Additional teaching activities				
1.	<p>Evaluation of classroom performance by peers</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observation of teaching by peers, using a departmentally approved teaching evaluation form (to be developed) 			
2.	<p>Development of effective course materials</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of effective lesson plans Development of effective learning activities Demonstration of effective teaching methodologies Demonstration of effective integration of technology into course curriculum 			

3.	<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment instruments Competencies assessments Pre & post assessments Demonstration of improvement in knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors Demonstration of student improvement in academic skills Demonstration of quality student projects related to course work and faculty's intervention 			
4.	<p>Teaching lecturing beyond the college</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop presenter Adult education Continuing education Postgraduate and professional groups 			
5.	<p>Invitation of teaching or lecturing</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guest lecturer within the department Guest lecturer within another department Guest lecturer for a college sponsored function Guest lecturer for a student organization 			
6.	<p>Awards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching awards DSI teaching awards 			
7.	<p>Other</p>			
C. Teaching Improvement				
1.	<p>Development of new courses and/or major revision and updating of existing courses</p> <p>Example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of a new required or elective course for the department or college Development of new course objectives, materials and assignments 			
2.	<p>Additional evaluation of classroom performance</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional classroom evaluation instruments Focus group evaluations Additional peer evaluations Other 			

<p>3.</p>	<p>Professional development and continuing education Examples: Workshops attended Professional conferences attended CEUs acquisition Professional development participation Participation in curriculum review/revision Description of strategy or plan for improving instruction</p>			
<p>4.</p>	<p>Development of teaching materials Examples: Publication of textbooks Publication of teaching manuals Publication of textbook aids Publication of CDs and other teaching “technology” aids</p>			

Service Activities and Evaluation Guidelines

Service activities that qualify for APT and personnel actions must be: (1) directly related to the missions of the department and the college, and (2) relevant to the faculty's professional roles and responsibilities in their discipline. Also, in the area of service, faculty should be actively involved in three of the five following areas of service: department, school, college, community, and professional.

Operationally Defining and Quantifying Service Activities

The amount of points that faculty can earn in service are based on the quantity and quality of valuable service activities relative to the faculty's level of performance. In general, faculty level of performance in service is categorized into the following three areas of involvement: (1) process involvement, (2) leadership involvement, and (3) outcome involvement. If faculty believe that their level of productivity in any of the three levels of involvement is worth more recognition than the assigned point value for service activities, then faculty should present an explanation and justification for these claims.

Process involvement is defined by participating in service activities such as: (1) performing active and useful committee membership; (2) providing information and/or analysis that contributes to committee assignments and/or the delivery of services; and (3) delivering and replicating service programs, seminars and/or workshops. One point is awarded for each activity in this category.

For example, a faculty member can earn 1 point for being an active and effective member of a department's APT Committee or 1 point for delivering a workshop that had been previously developed and implemented on other occasions.

Leadership involvement is defined by active participation in the form of chairing committees or performing significant administrative responsibilities in service activities. Two points are awarded for each activity in this category.

For example, a faculty member can earn 2 points for chairing a Faculty Senate Standing Committee, 2 for being a coordinator of a program area or 2 points for being a key member on a site accreditation team that involves specific leadership involvement.

Outcome involvement is defined by active participation in the form of producing a product that significantly impacts on such things as knowledge, policies, practices, procedures, programs, and the profession. Three points are awarded in this category for each activity.

For example, a faculty member can earn 3 points for producing and being the primary author of a specific product that offers a significant service contribution, e.g. an "Ad Hoc Committee Report on How to Integrate Multiculturalism into SUNY Brockport's Curricula" or for being an active and productive officer of an national professional organization.

Note: a faculty member can not receive duplication of points for a service activity. For example, a faculty member can not receive one point for being a member of a committee and additional points for chairing the same committee or writing this committee's report.

Table 2 presents examples of service activities and their point value related to level of performance. Table 2 is not an all inclusive list of service activities; however, the list should help in identifying appropriate service activities and their point values.

Minimum Performance Criteria for Continuing Appointment

1. University, Public, and Professional Service: evidence of involvement in service as demonstrated by performing at least 15 service activities from Table 2 (page 16). These 15 activities should include at least 6 activities at the process level of involvement (6 points) and 4 service activities at or above the leadership level of involvement (8 points). In total, faculty must earn at least 20 points in service over a five-year period. Also, faculty should perform service activities in at least 3 of the 5 categories of service – department, school, college, community, and professional.

Table 2. Activity and point values for service activities

	Activity	Process (1 point)	Leadership (2 points)	Outcome (3 points)
1.	Member of department, school, or college committee	1		
2.	Advisor to department, school, college or student committee or organization	1		
3.	Convener/leader of subsequent workshops that are the same as previous workshops	1		
4.	Chair of panels/sessions for a college-wide program	1		
5.	Officer of a local, state, national, or international professional organization		2	
6.	Officer of the board of directors of a local, state, national, or international		2	
7.	Member of the board of directors of a local, state, national or international professional organization		2	
8.	Chairperson of a department, school, or college committee		2	
9.	Member of a local, state, national, or international committee		2	
10.	Invited consultant and evidence of leadership involvement		2	
11.	Coordinator of a program area		2	
12.	Head of an important service activity, such as program accreditation		2	
13.	Member, site/accreditation team		2	
14.	Convener/leader of an original workshop		2	
15.	Special task assignment (e.g., undergraduate advisement coordinator, library coordinator)		2	
16.	Chairperson on an local, state, national, or international committee with evidence of outcome involvement		2	
17.	Chairperson of a SUNY Brockport ad hoc committee and author of a report that impacts and improves college and/or professional practice			3
18.	Chairperson or member of a site/accreditation team with evidence of outcome involvement (e.g. author of a report)			3
19.	Chairperson of a department, school, or college committee with evidence of significant leadership and important outcome product (e.g., department leader of assessment activities, including the assembling of an assessment report; leader of department accreditation activities including the assembling or an accreditation document)			3
20.	Other committees/service activities that are professional and related to the faculty member's discipline			

Additional information related to service

According to the administration, service will be evaluated as rigorously as teaching and scholarship. In addition, the administration believes that faculty should be involved in three categories of service: (1) University service which includes departmental, school, and college activities; (2) Public service which includes the offering of professional service activities to the community groups and organizations that are related to the faculty member's discipline; and (3) Professional service which includes the offering of service activities to a faculty member's professional organizations. The following Table 3 presents examples of these three categories of service:

Table 3. University, College, Public & Professional Service Categories

University Service	
A. Departmental Service: Department of Health Science Examples	
1.	Effective participation on standing, ad-hoc, or other committees or units of department governance.
2.	Leadership and/or administrative responsibilities on standing, ad-hoc, or other committees or units of departmental governance.
3.	Effective contributions to professional growth of students, and to positive student-departmental interaction through such activities as recruitment of majors, accurate academic advisement information about college activities and advisement of student service activities.
B. School, College-wide and/or University-Wide Service	
1.	Effective participation on inter-departmental or college-wide standing, ad-hoc, or other committees or units of college governance.
2.	Leadership and/or administrative responsibilities on interdepartmental or college-wide standing, ad-hoc, or other committees or units or college governance.
3.	Effective participation on regional or state-wide standing, ad-hoc, or other committees or units of SUNY governance
4.	Leadership and/or administrative responsibilities on regional or statewide standing, ad-hoc, or other committees or units of SUNY governance.
Public Service	
1.	Effective participation as a professional consultant or resource to a significant public event or activity of a community, state, regional, or national organization
2.	Developer and presenter of a health-related workshop for professional or community groups and organizations.
3.	Effective participation as a member of an advisory board or other committee, or of a Board of Directors or similar body of community, state, regional, or national organization.
Professional Service	
1.	Effective participation on committees, task forces, Board of Directors, or other units of local, regional, state, or national organizations related to the professional discipline of the faculty member.
2.	Editorial reviewer for professional publications (manuscripts, software, etc.)
3.	Leadership and/or administrative responsibilities on committee task forces, Board of Directors, or other units of local regional, state, or national organizations related to the professional discipline of the faculty member.

Note: Evidence of performance of service activities may include, but not be limited to, the following materials: Description of the activity and the applicant's specific role in it; a quantitative summary of the time period of the activity, number of meetings, amount of time required for participation; copies of materials produced by the activity with specification of the applicant's role in their preparation, and activities which may have resulted from the applicant's performance.

Scholarship Activities and Evaluation Guidelines

Scholarship will continue to be measured in terms of products subject to external peer review reflecting, as in Boyer's model, *Scholarship Reconsidered*) "discovery", "integration", and "application."

Scholarship of **Discovery** is defined as original work that contributes to existing knowledge in one's discipline. It seeks to find answers to "what is to be known, what is yet to be found?" and demonstrated by (but not limited to): scholarly activities that offer research and evidence of commitment to knowledge for its own sake that is deemed new and contributing to the body of knowledge in one's discipline.

Scholarship of **Integration** asks the question, "What do the findings mean?" It includes the synthesizing of existing knowledge or creative work within one or more disciplines into new patterns and/or new audiences. Thus, the scholarship of Integration is demonstrated by (but is not limited to): scholarly activities that integrate or interpret knowledge from other disciplines into the faculty member's own discipline. This scholarship should enhance the knowledge in one's own discipline or add new meaning and insights into one's own discipline.

Scholarship of **Application** is defined as the use of discipline-based knowledge to solve problems in response to the following questions: "Can practice based upon knowledge from one's discipline be used to resolve problems of consequence?" "In what ways does one's discipline-based knowledge help individuals as well as institutions?" "In what ways does one's discipline-based practice in coping with social problems lead to generating scholarly investigation?" Thus, the scholarship of Application is demonstrated by (but not limited to): scholarly activities that apply knowledge in one's own discipline to solving meaningful and practical problems found in health-related disciplines, fields, and practices.

Faculty must document their scholarly activities. In most cases, this documentation should be in the form of qualitative and quantitative products that can be peer-reviewed through refereed and peer-reviewed journals, books, chapters in books, monographs, presentations, symposia, and other acceptable, professional, refereed and peer-reviewed products. Table 4 presents common scholarly activities that can be placed into the categories of discovery, integration, and application. Each scholarly activity in Table 4 has a point value to demonstrate its relative importance in the area of scholarship and to the department. Faculty who believe that a scholarly activity has additional merit may provide evidence to justify the awarding of additional points for such scholarly products. Faculty can and should be involved with a variety of scholarly activities to report in their personnel documents. However, faculty should note, especially faculty who are seeking personnel decisions, such as renewal, continuing appointment, promotion, and DSIs decisions, that peer-reviewed products in the form of professional journal articles are essential products to have in one's performance documentation. Alternative forms of refereed and peer-reviewed scholarly products will be considered as evidence of scholarship; however, faculty must present the supporting evidence that demonstrates the credibility, quality, and value of such work.

Concerning the essential criteria for continuing appointment, Table 5 presents three methods that faculty can use to meet the minimum standard for being considered for continuing appointment. With regard to Method 1, faculty must produce a minimum of three peer-reviewed journal articles and produce 12 points from the remaining peer-reviewed products. With regard to Method 2, faculty must produce a minimum of two peer-reviewed articles in top-tier professional journals and a minimum of 15 points from the remaining peer-reviewed products. With regard to Method 3, faculty must produce a minimum of one seminal article in a top-tiered, peer-reviewed journal and produce a minimum of 18 points from the remaining peer reviewed products. Faculty seeking continuing appointment should meet the above minimum standards within a projected five-year period of employment at SUNY Brockport. Note: the faculty of the Department of Health Science are in the process of identifying and rating peer-reviewed journals and establishing point values for scholarly products by using a relative value scaling method.

Minimum Performance Criteria for Continuing Appointment

1. **Scholarship:** demonstrate ability to conduct and produce scholarship. Faculty can successfully complete the minimum required for scholarship by using one of three different methods as identified in Table 5 (page 23). These three methods include: (1) Method 1 - faculty must earn at least 27 points from scholarly activities as specified in Table 5; (2) Method 2 - faculty must earn at least 25 points from scholarly activities as specified in Table 5; or (3) Method 3 - faculty must earn at least 23 points from scholarly activities as specified in Table 5 (page 23).

Table 4. Activity and point values for scholarly activities

	Activity	Points
1.	Article – peer-reviewed, national/international journal	5
2.	Book – of discovery, integration, application and peer-reviewed	5
3.	Monograph – peer-reviewed, national/international journal	5
4.	Presentation – peer-reviewed, national/international conference with appropriate documentation	3
5.	Published presentation – peer-reviewed, national/international conference with appropriate documentation such as published proceedings	3
6.	Chapter in a published book, peer-reviewed	3
7.	Article – peer-reviewed, regional, state, local journal	3
8.	Edited book – related to discipline & peer-reviewed	3
9.	Authorship of funded grants that involves a scholarly grant proposal of discovery, integration, and application theoretical frameworks	3
10.	Presentation – peer-reviewed, regional, state, local conference with appropriate documentation	1
11.	Development and publication of media or software materials such as CDs, audio tapes, teaching materials, etc., peer-reviewed	1
12.	Scholarly review – book, software, media, published in a peer-reviewed journal	1
13.	Authorship of unfunded grants that involves a scholarly grant proposal of discovery, integration, and application theoretical frameworks	1
14.	Respondent/discussant/panel member – written and documented critique of the papers presented at professional conference, peer-reviewed	1
15.	Subsequent editions of peer-reviewed books	1
16.	Other	

Table 5. Scholarly Activity Requirements for Continuing Appointment: Three Methods for Achieving Minimum Standards

Method 1.
<p>Faculty must produce a minimum of three national peer-reviewed journal articles (first or second authorship). Two of these articles should appear in a tier 1 or tier 2 journal.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">plus</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A minimum of 12 points from the remaining peer-reviewed products listed in Table 4</p>
Method 2.
<p>Faculty must produce a minimum of two peer-reviewed articles in tier 1 professional journals (first or second authorship).</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">plus</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a minimum of 15 points from the remaining peer-reviewed products</p>
Method 3.
<p>Faculty must produce a minimum of one seminal article in a top-tiered, peer-reviewed journal (first author) or produce one seminal and scholarly book.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">plus</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a minimum of 18 points from the remaining peer-reviewed products</p>

Table 6. Scholarly Activity Requirements for Full Professor

Promotion to Full Professor
<p>Faculty must earn a minimum of 30 points from published peer-reviewed articles and/or published peer-reviewed books of discovery, integration, or application.</p> <p>plus</p> <p>earn a minimum of an additional 15 points from the scholarly activities listed in Table 4</p> <p>plus</p> <p>demonstrate that scholarly activities have a significant value for the profession and are of high quality</p>