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Introduction

The faculty of the Recreation and Leisure Studies Department unanimously support the redefined mission of SUNY College at Brockport with the primary responsibility of Teaching. This mission aligns with the REL Department’s mission to:

... offer classroom and experiential learning opportunities to future *recreation managers, *recreational therapists, and *tourism managers (pending) as professionals who:

• think critically, analytically, and reflectively;
• communicate fluently;
• embrace diversity and social justice; and,
• facilitate opportunity for personally enriching and socially beneficial recreation and leisure experiences.

*(Occupational titles, Bureau of Labor Statistics)

These guidelines have been developed utilizing the following:
✓ requirements for REL Curriculum Accreditation by NRPA/AALR;
✓ revised College, School of Professions, and REL Department approved vision and mission statements;
✓ Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee Final Report (December 7, 1998);
✓ Memo: “Criteria for Personnel Decisions: Clarification” (March 10, 1999);
✓ consideration of unique characteristics of the REL Department.

REL faculty support the Roles & Rewards Committee recommendation that Teaching should, under normal circumstances, count for at least fifty percent as a measure of overall productivity and effectiveness of individual faculty members. The faculty, believing in the importance of Scholarship will give it a weight of thirty percent, unless special circumstances dictate otherwise (e.g. assigning a faculty member to write the continuing accreditation self-study document, to coordinate a major curriculum revision, or to assume a major leadership role on a college-wide committee after receiving APT committee and chair sanction). Service will, therefore, normally be weighted twenty percent in personnel actions.

REL has the following unique characteristics that impact personnel decisions:
• is one of four nationally accredited programs in the School of Professions;
• has strong professional obligation and affiliation with local, state, national, and international communities that integrates faculty Scholarship with Service (i.e., through peer accreditation review, refereed journal editing, scholarly presentation, publication in journals and magazines, holding organizational offices);
• has a required 15-credit hour undergraduate internship with faculty supervision;
• has an emerging graduate program with corresponding demands for project and thesis supervision;
• meets daily needs of students for sound professional or career advisement;
REL GUIDELINES FOR PERSONNEL DECISIONS

- requires a writing assessment of majors emphasizing excellence in student writing;
- has constantly changing learning content, and accreditation and national certification standards, in a dynamic “discovery” major which requires faculty retooling and continuous monitoring through professional membership;
- is historically highly enrolled and small in number of full-time faculty in comparison to other departments.

It is the final unique feature, the smallness of the full-time faculty group, which most affects departmental guidelines. REL faculty usually function “as a committee of the whole”. The small size of the department creates non-normative performance expectations for faculty, each of whom assume multiple responsibilities distributed more sparingly in larger departments.

The proposed resolution to the issue of smallness, is for all faculty to operate as a “committee of the whole” so that each individual’s professional development agenda is considered in light of students’ needs and department goals and values. REL faculty propose to negotiate individualized workload to meet criteria for personnel decisions (and the Department and College agenda that prioritizes Teaching), with the department “as a whole”, and with approval of the REL Chairperson and Dean, School of Professions. This “negotiation” will be formalized through presentation, discussion, and consensus approval whenever REL faculty members apply for personnel action. While individual course loads may be less than the normal full loads under extraordinary circumstances, teaching will not constitute less than fifty percent of the faculty evaluation for tenure or for DSI.

Two considerations are important for deriving departmental guidelines:

1. REL faculty performance may be negotiated with intermittent prioritization of Service, due to the highly vocational nature of the profession in the context of “scholarship of integration”.

2. Faculty productivity may be mitigated by the necessity for REL faculty to create opportunities for each other to reach performance goals by: requests for support from administrative levels, contributing alternative solutions (e.g. coverage of classes by adjuncts when a faculty member is awarded a leave or sabbatical), or, intermittently assuming additional responsibility.

DEFINITION OF PERFORMANCE AT RANK

Individuals performing at rank means that an individual has met the minimum for all three criteria areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. This would normally mean a weighted balance of at least .5 for teaching, .3 for scholarship, and .2 for service. Different weight balances may be negotiated with the department chair and with the permission of the school dean. Any deviation from the norm stated above should be put in writing with the signed initials or signatures of the faculty member, the department chair, and the school dean. Weights for each of the three criteria will be used as stated above in the absence of any written permission to deviate. The weighting of points will then be adjusted accordingly and shall constitute the point total used for determining performance at rank for that time period.
It should be noted that an individual may fail to meet the minimum point totals for an area(s) during any single evaluation period or even fail to accumulate enough points to meet the overall point total necessary to reflect overall performance at rank for that evaluation period. These periods will be noted during evaluations and can be made up by future work and/or the completion of work still in progress if an immediate decision on re-appointment, promotion, and/or tenure is not pending. An individual failing to accumulate enough points would not be re-appointed, receive promotion, and/or receive tenure.

EXPLANATION OF ADVISING IN REL DEPARTMENT

Advising in Recreation and Leisure Studies is split into two main categories: curriculum and career. Curriculum advising is centralized and is handled primarily by one individual. Students receive advising on course selection, planning of coursework throughout their academic career, help with electives and guided electives, reviewing student progress on eligibility towards internships, and related curriculum advice. Students may choose to have another faculty member as their curriculum advisor by simply picking up her/his folder and requesting curriculum advising from the faculty member of her/his choice. The chair is notified of this change in writing by the new advisor at the earliest reasonable opportunity.

Career advising is a category that is done by all faculty within the department and even support staff at times. Career advising deals with assisting students in achieving their career goals, advising students on work done in their classes, establishing a personal rapport with students, advising, assessing writing abilities, advising graduate students on all matters, and helping students through minor and major crises that affect their academic progress.

This advising is already performed in this manner within our department. We are in the process of formalizing this process and will implement that formalization in the Fall of 2000.

EXPLANATION OF EVALUATION OF ADVISING

Because advising plays such an important role in student achievement, advising will constitute one fourth of the total evaluation of individuals for their teaching portions of their evaluations. This is done by making advising one of the four areas evaluated when evaluating the teaching of faculty. Materials to support this evaluation are requested at every level within the department.

In addition, as college, school, and department evaluation materials are developed, they will be incorporated into the department process upon approval of the departmental faculty and appropriate college officials. Until those formal assessment tools are available, the method described herein will be utilized.
TIME PERIODS FOR EVALUATIONS

Individuals will be evaluated on an annual basis by the department chair and the dean. The evaluation will be for the one year time period set by the college.

For DSI, faculty members must apply and meet deadlines set by the college and communicated to them by the dean and/or chair. The time period for the evaluation will be for the one year time period set by the college.

For promotion and/or tenure, faculty will be given key deadlines by the dean and/or chair. The time period for the evaluation will be for the time period, except for full professor promotions, spelled out contractually and/or by the college policies dictating specified time periods in the absence of specific contractual language. Associate professors may petition the dean and/or chair for review for promotion to full professor after holding the rank of associate professor for no less than six years (two years minimum at that rank at SUNY Brockport) and having obtained a performance at rank for that time period in all three criteria areas. Note that in order to qualify for promotion and tenure the additional requirements for scholarship spelled out in this document must be met. This is expected above and beyond what is needed for performing at rank.

EXPLANATION OF HOW POINTS ARE ACCUMULATED AND TENURE/ PROMOTION SCHOLARSHIP REQUIREMENTS

Points are obtained by using the tables provided in the DSI section. The point totals necessary for showing achievement of performance at rank follow each of the individual sections of this document. Individuals meeting the point totals will be able to assume that they are performing at the appropriate level for their rank upon verification of these points by the review process.

Tenure and/or promotion require specific scholarship activity above and beyond performing at rank. The details of these requirements are spelled out within the pertinent sections.

This document is meant to be dynamic, meaning that the department faculty with the approval of appropriate school, college, and/or university officials, may choose to add and/or remove items from time to time. In addition, point totals may change over time assuming the same approvals are obtained. Whenever this occurs in the middle of a review period, the faculty may choose to use the old or new standards for their review as they see fit. The standards chosen would be either the old or the new and would be applied to the entire evaluation process.

DOCUMENTATION FOR EVALUATION OF PERSONNEL PERFORMANCE

Documentation required for performance at rank for lecturer, assistant professor, promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, and associate professor to full professor is given in detail immediately following this section. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide the necessary documents for review to the appropriate person and/or committee. It is the responsibility of the department chair and/or the school dean to notify faculty of deadlines pertinent to personnel actions covered in this document.
Performance at the Rank of Lecturer

Achievement of the appropriate degree establishes a person as qualified in the discipline/profession. In addition, there is the expectation that the person has the potential for achieving excellence in the discipline/profession and for achieving high quality teaching and service in the department.

Teaching

The candidate must provide a portfolio of teaching materials that addresses the multiple aspects of the instructional role. This includes demonstration of knowledge of the discipline/profession, skills of pedagogy, including clear and precise communication and methods of instruction, and interest in the educational achievements of students. The materials submitted will serve as indicators of these criteria. Documentation should include course syllabi and materials. Review of these materials will look for demonstration of the use of contemporary sources and good correlation of content, method, and student interest and need; and relationship to the academic standards of the institution.

A. Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Focus
   ✓ This statement should address the candidate’s educational values, ideals, and goals. The statement should also include self-evaluation of success in teaching, efforts to improve teaching generally or in a particular course, assessment and achievement of student learning outcomes, and general and specific course effectiveness. This section should also:
     ✓ List courses taught including contact hours and the number of students enrolled in each course
     ✓ Include other pertinent information directly related to teaching and advisement

B. Student Evaluation.
   ✓ Summary table of IAS ratings on the four core items for all courses taught during the period under review (since the college is transitioning to IDEA, these forms will need to be substituted as they are used)
   ✓ Written comments and/or personal assessment of ratings on other items
   ✓ Department-approved instructor developed feedback related to measuring compliance with standards and student learning outcomes
   ✓ Department-solicited and unsolicited letters of support or comment about teaching

C. Student Outcomes and Accomplishments
   ✓ Table of grade distribution for each course/section including personal interpretation of distributions in light of teaching philosophy
   ✓ Student performance on standardized test related to instructor’s area of expertise, i.e. national professional certification exams
   ✓ Student accomplishments, e.g. conference presentations, published papers, awards, performances, exhibitions, student-faculty research projects

D. Improvement of Teaching
   ✓ Professional development as a teacher (workshops, conferences, professional certifications, etc.)
   ✓ Integration of technology into teaching
kre Revision of course instructional approach

E. Advising
kre Number of curriculum advisees
kre Number of career advisees
kre Independent study
kre Mentoring of students
kre Student involvement in scholarship, publication, and/or presentations resulting from student-faculty collaboration
kre Service on student organization and/or advisory committees
kre Writing assessments for students
kre Number of graduate student advisees
kre Number of field placement students
kre Evaluations of intern applicant materials and/or transcripts

F. Peer Evaluation
kre Internal and external review of course syllabi, assignments, and examinations
kre Contributions to curriculum and course development or revision in keeping with national accreditation standards
kre Awards or recognition related to teaching

Service
kre Statement of all relevant service activities with a brief description of the individual’s responsibilities, participation, and any product developed. Note: Where service is community-based, such activity should have a direct relationship to the candidate’s disciplinary expertise
kre Expected role is that of institutional, professional, and community service, with departmental service as a priority

HOW TEACHING IS EVALUATED

The material presented shall be evaluated using the method described under Teaching on pages 17-18 under Section B. It is expected that the lecturer will achieve a minimum score of at least 9 to be considered as performing at rank.

HOW SCHOLARSHIP IS EVALUATED

A lecturer would not normally be expected to perform scholarship activities as part of her/his duties in this area. However, such work is encouraged as it prepares the lecturer for work at the next level if that is her/his goal, and it makes the lecturer eligible for DSI considerations.

HOW SERVICE IS EVALUATED

The material presented shall be evaluated using the method described under Service on pages 21-23 under Sections B & C. It is expected that the lecturer will achieve a minimum score of at least 5 to be considered as performing at rank in this area.
MINIMUM POINTS NEEDED TO MEET PERFORMANCE AT RANK CRITERIA AT THIS LEVEL
(using weights of teaching at .6 and service at .4)

\[(9 \times 0.6) + (5 \times 0.4) = 7.4.\]
(points accumulated x weighting) + (points accumulated x weighting) = Point Total

NOTE: MINIMUM scores in teaching and service areas **MUST** be obtained to be considered as performing at rank.

**Promotion of Instructor to the Rank of Assistant Professor**

Achievement of the appropriate terminal degree establishes a person as qualified in the discipline/profession. In addition, there is the expectation that the person has the potential for achieving excellence in the discipline/profession and for attaining the highest rank in the department.

**Teaching**

The candidate should provide a portfolio of teaching materials that addresses the multiple aspects of the instructional role. This includes demonstration of knowledge of the discipline/profession, skills of pedagogy, including clear and precise communication and methods of instruction, and interest in the educational achievements of students. Documentation should include course syllabi and materials. Review of these materials will look for demonstration of the use of contemporary sources and good correlation of content, method, and student interest and need; and relationship to the academic standards of the institution.

**A. Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Focus**

- This statement should address the candidate’s educational values, ideals, and goals. The statement should also include self-evaluation of success in teaching, efforts to improve teaching generally or in a particular course, assessment and achievement of student learning outcomes, and general and specific course effectiveness. This section should also:
  - List courses taught including contact hours and the number of students enrolled in each
  - Include other pertinent information directly related to teaching and advisement

**B. Student Evaluation.**

- Summary table of IAS ratings on the four core items for all courses taught during the period under review (since the college is transitioning to IDEA, these forms will need to be substituted as they are used)
- Written comments and/or personal assessment of ratings on other items
- Department-approved instructor developed feedback related to measuring compliance with standards and student learning outcomes
- Department-solicited and unsolicited letters of support or comment about teaching

**C. Student Outcomes and Accomplishments**

- Table of grade distribution for each course/section including personal interpretation of distributions in light of teaching philosophy
- Student performance on standardized test related to instructor’s area of expertise. i.e. national professional certification exams
✓ Student accomplishments, e.g. conference presentations, published papers, awards, performances, exhibitions, student-faculty research projects

D. Improvement of Teaching
✓ Professional development as a teacher (workshops, conferences, professional certifications, etc.)
✓ Integration of technology into teaching
✓ Revision of course instructional approach

E. Advising
✓ Number of curriculum advisees
✓ Number of career advisees
✓ Independent study
✓ Mentoring of students
✓ Student involvement in scholarship, publication, and/or presentations resulting from student-faculty collaboration
✓ Service on student organization and/or advisory committees
✓ Internships supervised
✓ Writing assessments for students
✓ Number of graduate student advisees
✓ Number of field placement students
✓ Evaluations of intern applicant materials and/or transcripts

F. Peer Evaluation
✓ Internal and external review of course syllabi, assignments, and examinations
✓ Contributions to curriculum and course development or revision in keeping with national accreditation standards
✓ Awards or recognition related to teaching

Scholarship
✓ Successful completion of doctoral dissertation or project required for terminal degree
✓ Evidence of commitment to continued scholarship or creative productivity leading to more significant advancements
Service

✓ Statement of all relevant service activities with a brief description of the individual’s responsibilities, participation, and any product developed. Note: Where service is community-based, such activity should have a direct relationship to the candidate’s disciplinary expertise

✓ Expected role is that of participation on departmental committees and initial involvement in College, community, and/or regional professional service

HOW TEACHING IS EVALUATED

The material presented shall be evaluated using the method described under Teaching on pages 17-18 under Section B. It is expected that the instructor will achieve a minimum score of at least 12 to be considered as performing at rank in this area.

HOW SCHOLARSHIP IS EVALUATED

The material presented shall be evaluated using the method described under Scholarship on pages 19-21 under Section C. The lecturer will achieve a minimum score of at least 3 in the year prior to being considered for promotion.

HOW SERVICE IS EVALUATED

The material presented shall be evaluated using the method described under Service on pages 21-23 under Sections B & C. It is expected that the instructor will achieve a minimum score of at least 7 to be considered as performing at rank in this area.

MINIMUM POINTS NEEDED TO MEET PERFORMANCE AT RANK CRITERIA AT THIS LEVEL
(using weights of teaching at .5, scholarship at .3, and service at .2)

\[(12 \times .5) + (3 \times .3) + (7 \times .2) = 8.3.\]

\[(\text{pts. accumulated} \times \text{weight}) + (\text{pts. accumul.} \times \text{weight}) + (\text{pts. accumul.} \times \text{weight}) = \text{Total Pts.}\]

NOTE: MINIMUM scores in ALL three areas MUST be obtained to be considered as performing at rank.

Performance at Rank as an Assistant Professor and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

A person promoted to the rank of associate professor has demonstrated achievement on a continuous basis in the rank of Assistant Professor in all three major performance areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. There must be evidence that the person has made sustained high quality contributions to the department and the College as an Assistant Professor. The person has established a commendable reputation beyond the campus for scholarly work in the discipline/profession. There is expectation that the person has made discernable progress toward achieving excellence in the discipline/profession and for attaining the highest rank in the department.

Teaching
The candidate must provide a portfolio of teaching materials that addresses the multiple aspects of the instructional role. This includes demonstration of knowledge of the discipline/profession, skills of pedagogy, including clear and precise communication and methods of instruction, and
interest in the educational achievements of students. The materials submitted will serve as indicators of these criteria. Documentation should include course syllabi and materials. Review of these materials will look for demonstration of the use of contemporary sources and good correlation of content, method, and student interest and need; and relationship to the academic standards of the institution.

A. **Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Focus**
   ✓ This statement should address the candidate’s educational values, ideals, and goals. The statement should also include self-evaluation of success in teaching, efforts to improve teaching generally or in a particular course, assessment and achievement of student learning outcomes, and general and specific course effectiveness. This section should also:
   ✓ List courses taught including contact hours and the number of students enrolled in each
   ✓ Include other pertinent information directly related to teaching and advisement

B. **Student Evaluation.**
   ✓ Summary table of IAS ratings on the four core items for all courses taught during the period under review (since the college is transitioning to IDEA, these forms will need to be substituted as they are used)
   ✓ Written comments and/or personal assessment of ratings on other items
   ✓ Department-approved instructor developed feedback related to measuring compliance with standards and student learning outcomes
   ✓ Department-solicited and unsolicited letters of support or comment about teaching

C. **Student Outcomes and Accomplishments**
   ✓ Table of grade distribution for each course/section including personal interpretation of distributions in light of teaching philosophy
   ✓ Student performance on standardized test related to instructor’s area of expertise. i.e. national professional certification exams
   ✓ Student accomplishments, e.g. conference presentations, published papers, awards, performances, exhibitions, student-faculty research projects

D. **Improvement of Teaching**
   ✓ Professional development as a teacher (workshops, conferences, professional certifications, etc.)
   ✓ Integration of technology into teaching
   ✓ Revision of course instructional approach

E. **Advising**
   ✓ Number of curriculum advisees
   ✓ Number of career advisees
   ✓ Independent study
   ✓ Mentoring of students
   ✓ Student involvement in scholarship, publication, and/or presentations resulting from student-faculty collaboration
   ✓ Service on student organization and/or advisory committees
✓ Internships supervised
✓ Writing assessments for students
✓ Number of graduate student advisees
✓ Number of field placement students
✓ Evaluations of intern applicant materials and/or transcripts

F. Peer Evaluation
✓ Internal and external review of course syllabi, assignments, and examinations
✓ Contributions to curriculum and course development or revision in keeping with national accreditation standards
✓ Awards or recognition related to teaching

Scholarship
✓ Prepare a scholarship focus and summary which includes:
  ✓ List of each scholarly product
  ✓ Description of peer review process, i.e., editorial review; invited publication; refereed publication; editor selected
  ✓ Brief reflective critique
✓ Must show significant advancement in the area of scholarship beyond the level of Assistant Professor and beyond the presentation of doctoral dissertation results in new areas of investigation
✓ Must include documentary evidence that at least an average of two works are being presented for publication each academic year for the period of Assistant Professor rank and that an average of one has been accepted for publication per year during said period in either refereed professional publications or editor reviewed professional publications of renown and international, national, or state-wide circulation. At least three of these publications must be in national and/or refereed publications; be an accepted federal grant; and/or be a published scholarly book, edited book, chapter in a scholarly book, and/or substantial revision of a pre-existing book. The APT Committee will take into consideration all submitted work in assessing the candidate’s scholarly activity.

Service
✓ Continuous demonstration of service during the period as an Assistant Professor
✓ Prepare summary of service activities including specific responsibilities and leadership roles assumed
✓ Demonstration of service contributions should include one or more of the following:
  ✓ Administrative and or/ leadership roles on departmental, College, community, and/or professional committees
  ✓ Participation in service activities beyond the department. Evidence may be provided through:
    ✓ Peer review
    ✓ Letters from committee chairs citing specific contributions to the work of the committee
    ✓ Substantive letters of recommendation from colleagues and/or community agencies that cite contributions and successful initiatives
    ✓ Active leadership in disciplinary professional organizations

HOW TEACHING IS EVALUATED
The material presented shall be evaluated using the method described under Teaching on pages 17-18 under Section B. It is expected that the assistant professor will achieve a minimum score of at least 13 to be considered as performing at rank in this area.

HOW SCHOLARSHIP IS EVALUATED

The material presented shall be evaluated using the method described under Scholarship on pages 19-21 under Section C. The assistant professor will achieve a minimum score of at least 5 to be considered as performing at rank in this area.

For promotion and tenure, the faculty member will be expected to have successfully completed three (3) items from category 2 of scholarly works listed on pages 19-21. This means any combination of items 1 through 7 which shows nationally and/or internationally refereed scholarly work. This work will have taken place during the period of review for tenure and promotion. NOTE: Faculty may receive credit for only ONE chapter in a book regardless of how many additional chapters they may write AND they may receive credit for only ONE Federal Grant regardless of how many additional Federal Grants they may receive.

Faculty members may duplicate categories with the exceptions noted above. This means that an individual would meet the criteria for tenure by completing, for example, category 1 three times. However, chapters in books and Federal Grants CANNOT be repeated for additional credit. Each can count as ONE successful completion in this category.

At the end of the tenure review period specified contractually or within the college's policies and procedures, the faculty member up for promotion and/or tenure will be expected to have accumulated an average of performance at rank for the time period under review. An individual who fails to have achieved this average will be considered as not being acceptable in scholarship.
Please note that two deficient years in a row in scholarship will also count as not being acceptable for promotion and/or tenure.

**HOW SERVICE IS EVALUATED**

The material presented shall be evaluated using the method described under Service on pages 21-23 under Sections B & C. It is expected that the assistant professor will achieve a minimum score of at least 11 to be considered as performing at rank in this area.

**MINIMUM POINTS NEEDED TO MEET PERFORMANCE AT RANK CRITERIA AT THIS LEVEL**

(13 x .5) + (5 x .3) + (11 x .2) = 10.2.

**(pts. accumulated x weight) + (pts. accumul. x weight) + (pts. accumul. x weight) = Total Pts.**

**NOTE:** MINIMUM scores in ALL three areas MUST be obtained to be considered as performing at rank. For tenure and promotion, the additional completion of three (3) items from category 2 on pages 19-20 MUST be completed as well as described above.

**Performance at Rank as an Associate Professor and Promotion to the Rank of Professor**

A person promoted to the rank of Professor has demonstrated professional growth and excellence on a continuous basis in the rank of Associate Professor in all three performance areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. The evidence must clearly support the person’s role as an established leader in the department and in the College and that his/her contributions are of high quality and have been sustained over a reasonable period of time as an Associate Professor. The reasonable period of time shall normally be considered no less than six years at the rank of Associate Professor regardless of whether the individual has performed at rank or above during that time period. Normally the faculty member who has performed at rank for the period of review and who has met the specific requirements for scholarship would be able to successfully petition the chair and dean to be considered for promotion and would receive promotion. Again, note that in order to qualify for promotion and tenure the additional requirements for scholarship spelled out in this document must be met. This is expected above and beyond what is needed for performing at rank.

**Teaching**

The candidate must provide a portfolio of teaching materials that addresses the multiple aspects of the instructional role. This includes demonstration of knowledge of the discipline/profession, skills of pedagogy, including clear and precise communication and methods of instruction, and interest in the educational achievements of students. The materials submitted will serve as indicators of these criteria. Documentation should include course syllabi and materials. Review of these materials will look for demonstration of the use of contemporary sources and good correlation of content, method, and student interest and need; and relationship to the academic standards of the institution.
A. Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Focus

- This statement should address the candidate’s educational values, ideals, and goals. The statement should also include self-evaluation of success in teaching, efforts to improve teaching generally or in a particular course, assessment and achievement of student learning outcomes, and general and specific course effectiveness. This section should also:
  - List courses taught including contact hours and the number of students enrolled in each course
  - Include other pertinent information directly related to teaching and advisement

B. Student Evaluation.

- Summary table of IAS ratings on the four core items for all courses taught during the period under review (since the college is transitioning to IDEA, these forms will need to be substituted as they are used)
- Written comments and/or personal assessment of ratings on other items
- Department-approved instructor developed feedback related to measuring compliance with standards and student learning outcomes
- Department-solicited and unsolicited letters of support or comment about teaching

C. Student Outcomes and Accomplishments

- Table of grade distribution for each course/section including personal interpretation of distributions in light of teaching philosophy
- Student performance on standardized test related to instructor’s area of expertise, i.e. national professional certification exams
- Student accomplishments, e.g. conference presentations, published papers, awards, performances, exhibitions, student-faculty research projects

D. Improvement of Teaching

- Professional development as a teacher (workshops, conferences, professional certifications, etc.)
- Integration of technology into teaching
- Revision of course instructional approach

E. Advising

- Number of curriculum advisees
- Number of career advisees
- Independent study
- Mentoring of students
- Student involvement in scholarship, publication, and/or presentations resulting from student-faculty collaboration
- Service on student organization and/or advisory committees
- Writing assessments for students
- Number of graduate student advisees
- Number of field placement students
- Evaluations of intern applicant materials and/or transcripts
F. Peer Evaluation
✓ Internal and external review of course syllabi, assignments, and examinations
✓ Contributions to curriculum and course development or revision in keeping with national accreditation standards
✓ Awards or recognition related to teaching

Scholarship
✓ In order to be considered, the level of scholarly activity for promotion to Associate rank must be demonstrated to have increased, with evidence of acceptance of a manuscript for at least one book (written while at Associate Professor rank)—or a combination of other scholarly products as identified in the Faculty Roles and Rewards document approved December 7, 1998—that relates directly to the assigned academic area, i.e. recreation, leisure, parks, or tourism.
✓ Successful scholarship has led by now to publication or creative work that has been subject to further review
✓ Significance of the person’s accomplishment is attested to by the profession and peers both locally and nationally:
  ✓ Recognition of the quality of the work should be evident and available in the form of:
    ✓ Reviews and comments
    ✓ Off-campus assessment by recognized authorities as solicited by the department
    ✓ Invitations from leaders in the field to contribute to publications, conferences, and exhibitions
    ✓ Invitations to serve on editorial boards and to review books, etc.
  ✓ Supported relevance of publication source to the discipline
  ✓ Honors and awards that serve to recognize the person’s contributions for long term work in the field and/or new interpretations and applications of scholarship

Service
✓ Accomplishment in this area should be greater than was expected to achieve the rank of Associate Professor
✓ Consistently play a constructive role in the departmental leadership, student advisement and college-wide faculty governance since the last promotion
✓ Is an acknowledged leader in the Department, the College, and the profession
✓ This may be demonstrated by:
  ✓ Increased complexity in administrative duties, e.g., chairing a variety of committees inside and outside the department
  ✓ Excellence of his/her contributions to the committee is testified to by colleagues and can be illustrated in tangible ways
  ✓ The work/product of the committee is substantive to the College or professional organization
HOW TEACHING IS EVALUATED

The material presented shall be evaluated using the method described under Teaching on pages 17-18 under Section B. It is expected that the associate professor will achieve a minimum score of at least 14 to be considered performing at rank in this area.

HOW SCHOLARSHIP IS EVALUATED

The material presented shall be evaluated using the method described under Scholarship on paged 19-21 under Section C. The faculty member will achieve a minimum score of at least 7 to be considered as performing at rank in this area.

ALSO, for promotion to full professor, the faculty member must complete a total of five (5) items from category 2 on pages 19-21 during the period of review. The period of review is from the time the faculty member was promoted to associate professor. This work must come after the faculty has officially received tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor whether at SUNY Brockport or at the college or university level elsewhere. This means any combination of items 1 through 5 which shows nationally and/or internationally refereed scholarly work totaling five (5) or more. In addition, the faculty member may count one and ONLY one chapter for publication in a book as ONE of the items in category 2. And one and ONLY one accepted Federal Grant may be counted towards the total of five in category 2 as well.

Faculty members may duplicate items 1-5 of category. Items 6 and 7 can ONLY count ONCE in each category for a total of no more than TWO. This means that an individual would meet the criteria for promotion by completing, for example, item 1 five times. Or by any combination totaling five (5), during the tenure review period from items 1-5.

The faculty member can petition the chair and the dean for consideration for promotion to full professor at the end of six years of service at the rank of associate professor. This service can be at SUNY Brockport and/or at the university or college level elsewhere (with a minimum of two years at SUNY Brockport). The faculty member will be expected to have accumulated enough points to show performance at rank for each and every year of review at SUNY Brockport (allowing for deficient years to be made up for an average of performance at rank during the review period).

HOW SERVICE IS EVALUATED

The material presented shall be evaluated using the method described under Service on pages 21-23 under Sections B & C. It is expected that the associate professor will achieve a minimum score of at least 13 to be considered performing at rank in this area.
MINIMUM POINTS NEEDED TO MEET PERFORMANCE AT RANK CRITERIA AT THIS LEVEL
(using weights of teaching at .5, scholarship at .3, and service at .2) –

\[(14 \times .5) + (7 \times .3) + (13 \times .2) = 11.7.\]

\[(\text{pts. accumulated} \times \text{weight}) + (\text{pts. accumul.} \times \text{weight}) + (\text{pts. accumul.} \times \text{weight}) = \text{Total Pts.}\]

NOTE: MINIMUM scores in ALL three areas MUST be obtained to be considered as performing at rank.

GUIDELINES FOR THE GRANTING OF THE DESCRIOTIONARY SALARY INCREASE (DSI)
DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND LEISURE STUDIES

Teaching

A. **Introduction:** All faculty of the department who wish to be considered as a candidate for the granting of the DSI in the area of teaching are required to submit to the APT Committee a teaching portfolio. The portfolio will be used by the Committee, the chairperson, and unit heads to assess the quality of the teaching performance and as the basis for the decision as to the granting of the DSI. The portfolio shall include two major types of materials: 1) narrative statements which address the candidate’s teaching performance; i.e. desired and achieved student outcomes, course effectiveness, the courses taught, the number of students, the manner by which course(s) was assessed, and other information that will illuminate the teaching effectiveness of the candidate and; 2) evidence which will support the claims being made by the candidate. The faculty supports the recommendation of the Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee pertaining to the importance and content of the portfolio.

B. **Content Specifics and Rating:** The portfolio shall include materials which address four main areas with respect to support. Each of these areas will be rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = evidence does not support and 5 = evidence strongly supports. The four main areas are:

1.) **Student Evaluations (classroom and field teaching)**
   ~100% feedback, including IAS scores for all courses taught (if appropriate) and instructor developed and departmental approved course assessments for all courses taught during the period being considered. (since the college is transitioning to IDEA, these forms will need to be substituted as they are used)
   ~IAS scores shall be in the Very Good to Excellent range (mean score of 1.3 or less). (the mean score may need to be adjust when the use of the IDEA form becomes prevalent)

2.) **Evidence of Student Outcomes (classroom and field teaching)**
   ~Samples of student products: papers, projects, theses, community service.
   ~Presentations by students done in collaboration with the teacher.
   ~Table of grade distribution, including the size of the class.

3.) **Evaluation by Peers**
   ~Review of syllabi, assignments, examinations.
   ~Evidence of some integration of technology.
   ~Professional development as a teacher as evidenced by the earning of CEUs or
attendance/participation in 5 hours of training/workshops/presentations relevant to instructional related areas.
~Evidence of the candidate’s contributions to the department’s curriculum and course developments and/or revisions.
~Evidence of mentoring of part-time and new faculty, including faculty outside the department.
~Evidence that the courses taught are addressing the competencies required for the continued national accreditation of the curriculum.

4.) Evidence of Advising
~Mentoring of students, as supported by student letters.
~Career, employment, graduate school counseling activities.
~Evidence of faculty/staff development instructional activities.
~Evidence of advising a significant number of students for curriculum and/or career advising.
~Evidence of significant assessment activities related to writing performance of students.
~Evidence of significant review of student applications for internships, field placements, scholarships, and similar activities.
~Evidence of significant involvement with students outside of the classroom with projects, field trips, research, and related activities.

C. Rating: The candidate’s portfolio will be assessed by the APT Committee and the Department Chairperson, using the 1 to 5 rating scale. The following minimum ratings are required in order for the candidate’s credentials to be forwarded for further consideration:

Professor 16 points
Associate Professor 14 points
Instructor/Assistant Professor 12 points
Lecturer 10 points

D. Relationship of Teaching to Scholarship and Service: For a faculty member in Recreation and Leisure Studies to be considered in the areas of scholarship and service there must be a statement from the APT Committee that the candidate’s teaching is average or above average based on department criteria (rationale provided), yet it is not necessary for a teaching portfolio to be either developed or forwarded.

Scholarship

A. Definition of Scholarship: The Department supports the definition provided in the Final Report of the Faculty Roles & Rewards Committee.
B. Categories and Minimum Scholarly Achievements Required: For the purpose of consideration for the DSI in Scholarship faculty will be categorized as being either Category 1: Full Professor, Category 2: Associate Professor/Assistant Professor for more than 7 years, or Category 3: Assistant Professor for 7 years or less or Instructor. Within these categories minimal achievements are required of candidates for the DSI. These are as follows:

**Category 1**

1. An Original Book
   or
2. A Revised Book Evidencing Substantial Revision
   or
3. An Edited Textbook
   or
4. An Article in National or International Journals
   or
5. National or International Refereed Proceedings
   AND
Six points as listed in Indices of Value

**Category 2**

1. A Book of Original Nature
   or
2. A Revised Book Evidencing Substantial Revision
   or
3. An Edited Book
   or
4. An Article in National or International Journals
   or
5. National or International Refereed Proceedings
   or
6. One chapter in a Published Book or a Revised Chapter Evidencing Substantial Revision (Credit may be granted for only ONE Chapter REGARDLESS of how many additional chapters the faculty member completes.)
   Or
7. Acceptance of a Federal Grant
   (Credit may be granted for only ONE Federal Grant REGARDLESS of how many additional Federal Grants the faculty member completes.)
   AND
Five points as Listed in Indices of Value

**Category 3**

1. A Book of Original Nature
2. A Revised Book Evidencing Substantial Revision
   or
3. An Edited Book
   or
4. Two Articles in National or International Journals
   or
5. National or International Refereed Proceedings
   or
6. Two Articles in Regional/State Journals
   or
7. Regional or State Refereed Proceedings
   or
8. One Chapter in a Published Book or a Substantially Revised Chapter
   AND
   Three Points as Listed in Indices of Value

Notes:
~With respect to multiple authorship, each will receive the appropriate percentage of the points to be determined through negotiations or by supporting documentation.
~National Journal refers to an academic, refereed journal published by a national professional association, publication house, etc.
~International Journal refers to a refereed journal published in the U.S. or another country having a global focus and containing articles published by scholars residing in different countries.
~Regional/State Journal refers to an academic, refereed journal published by regional or state associations.
~For consideration under scholarship all articles must be published in a journal recognized by the professional community which is refereed or which selects articles by editorial committee.
~A book or article accepted for publication but not yet published cannot be used as a basis for applying for an award of DSI.

C. Indices of Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarly Activity</th>
<th>Point Value (*Value to be determined by APT Committee)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Book</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Edited Book</td>
<td>7-10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Revised Book With Substantial Revision</td>
<td>8-10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Article in National/International Journal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Monograph on Subject in Discipline</td>
<td>2-4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Article in Regional/State Journal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Authorship of Federal Grant</td>
<td>6-8*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Authorship State/Regional/Local/Foundation Grant 4-6*
10. Authorship International Grant 1-2*
11. Chapter in Published Book 3
12. A Review of Book, Software, Media Published in a Journal 1-2*
13. Presentation of Original Research at a National, International, Regional, State, Local Professional Meeting (Original Presentation Only) 1-4*
14. Presentation Published in Refereed Proceedings 2
15. Paid or Unpaid Editorial Review of a Manuscript for a Publishing Company 3
17. Paid or Unpaid Consultations Requiring Written or Expert Testimony Response Evidencing Substantial Research 2-4*
18. Instructor’s Manual 3
19. Article in a Professional Magazine 2-3*
20. Article in a Popular Magazine or Newspaper Pertaining to One’s Area(s) of Expertise 1-2*
21. Respondent, Critic or Discussant on a Panel: Requires Documentation of Critique of the Papers Presented on or to the Panel 1
22. Developed and “Published” Media or Software Materials, i.e. audio tapes, video tapes, CDs, Disc, etc. 1-3*
23. Unfunded Grant Proposals 1-2*
24. Primary author or editor of REL Accreditation Document 4-6*
25. Other (Requires Prior Approval by APT or Chair) TBA

D. Relationship to Service and Teaching: In order for a faculty member in Recreation and Leisure Studies to be considered for DSI in either Service or Teaching the minimal number of points that must be earned in Scholarship are:

- Full Professor 7
- Associate Professor 5
- Assistant Professor 3
- Lecturer 0 (not part of assigned duties)

Service

A. Definition of Service: The faculty supports the definition provided in the Final Report of the Faculty Roles & Rewards Committee.
**B. Service Criteria:** For service activities to be considered for DSI in the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies they must:

- be directly related to either the missions of the State University, the college, School of Professions, and the department.
- be primarily voluntary in nature, although paid activities may be considered as long as they make up a minor portion of the faculty member’s service application.
- be relevant to the faculty member’s professional responsibilities to the discipline of Recreation and Leisure Studies/Services.
- be reflective of activity in departmental service and in at least two of the following areas: university, college, school, community, and profession.

**C. Indices of Values:** The number of points to be earned for a specific service activity is based upon the quantity and quality of the service activity, as determined by the APT Committee, after review of supporting documentation. The faculty member cannot receive duplicate points for an area of service. For example, the faculty member cannot receive one point for being a committee member and then receive two points for serving as chairperson for the same committee. Recognized activities and point values are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Activities</th>
<th>Point Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Member of university, college, school, or department committee</td>
<td>1-2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advisor to university, college, school, or department student organization</td>
<td>1-2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Member of NRPA/AALR Accreditation Team</td>
<td>3-5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Member of International, National, State, or Regional/State Committee</td>
<td>2-5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Member of Board of Directors of an International or National Professional Organization</td>
<td>3-5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Member of Board of Directors of a State, Regional, or Local Professional Organization</td>
<td>1-3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Convener/Leader of an Original Workshop or Symposium</td>
<td>3-5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Convener/Leader of a Subsequent Workshop</td>
<td>1-2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Officer of an International or National Professional Organization</td>
<td>4-6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Officer of a State, Regional, or Local Professional Organization</td>
<td>1-3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Committee Chairperson of an International or National Professional Organization</td>
<td>4-6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Committee Chairperson of a State, Regional, or Local Professional Organization</td>
<td>1-3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Chairperson of a University, College, School, or Departmental Committee</td>
<td>3-6*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Chairperson of a Campus Ad Hoc Committee or Task Force and Author of a Report That Impacts and Improves College Outcomes 6-8*
15. Chairperson/Team Leader of a NRPA/AALR Site Accreditation Team 5-7*
16. Chairperson of an International or National Committee (Standing or Ad Hoc) That Evidences Outcomes of Involvement 6-8*
17. Chairperson of a State, Regional, or Local Committee (Standing or Ad Hoc) That Evidences Outcomes of Involvement 3-5*
18. Chairperson of Panels/Focus Groups for College-wide Issue or Program 1-2*
19. Coordinator of a Departmental Program Area; i.e. Optional, Track, Specialization 2-5*
20. Invited Consultant with Evidence of Leadership Involvement or Contributions 2-5*
21. Other Service Activities That are Professionally Related to the Faculty’s Discipline TBA

D. Faculty Rank and Minimum Points for DSI Eligibility: The faculty ranks to be addressed are: Full Professor, Associate/Assistant Professor with 7 or more years at Brockport, Assistant Professor with less than 7 years at Brockport, Instructor, and Lecturer. The minimum number of points required are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Assistant &amp; 7 or more years</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant &amp; less than 7 years</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Relationship to Teaching and Scholarship: To be considered for a DSI in the areas of teaching and scholarship, the minimum number of points in service shall be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Assistant Professor &amp; 7 or more years at Brockport</td>
<td>11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor &amp; less than 7 years at Brockport</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*must include service at the department, school, or college level.

Source: Proposed Criteria for DSI Awards, School of Professions, November, 1995
Appendix on Instructional Support Associate

DEFINITION OF PERFORMANCE AT RANK

Performance at Rank requires a point total of 10 points divided into criteria areas of: Teaching, Scholarship and Service. The position of Instructional Support Associate was created exclusively to provide the Department two components of the criteria areas, Teaching and Service. Additionally, the position description of an Instructional Support Associate does not include any requirement for scholarship. Therefore weighting for criteria areas will be the following: Teaching - .5 and Service - .5.

DOCUMENTATION FOR EVALUATION OF PERSONNEL PERFORMANCE

Performance at the Rank of Instructional Support Associate

Teaching

The College is in the process of changing the method of evaluating Teaching. The College is (Fall 2000) in transition from the IAS system to the IDEA system. The College year of 2000-2001 is a period in which the IDEA system scores will not count, as a result an appropriate score cannot currently be determined. Therefore page 5 section B. 1.) will have to be revised when the College and the Department determine the new definition of Very Good to Excellent Range.

The criteria for evaluation purposes will be the same for the performance of the Rank of Lecturer. See the criteria listed on pages 5-6 under the heading of performance at the Rank of Lecturer.

Service

The criteria for evaluation purposes will be the same for the performance of the Rank of Lecturer. See the criteria listed on pages 6-7 with the following differences.

MINIMUM POINTS NEEDED TO MEET PERFORMANCE AT RANK CRITERIA AT THIS LEVEL
(using weights for teaching of .5, and service of .5).

\[(9 \times 0.5) + (5 \times 0.5) = 7.0\]
(points accumulated x weighting) + (points accumulated x weighting) = Point Total

NOTE: MINIMUM scores in teaching and service areas MUST be obtained to be considered as performing at rank.

For DSI: The Instructional Support Associate will be considered for DSI awards in the same manner as individuals holding the rank of lecturer.

For Tenure: The Instructional Support Associate will follow the same criteria as that used for promotion from lecturer to assistant professor.
For Performance of Rank after Tenure: The Instructional Support Associate will be held to the same criteria for assistant professors with the expectation that a score of 3 be achieved in the area of scholarship rather than the level assigned for assistant professors.