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Introduction

The faculty of the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies believe in the mission of the College and the department. This documentation is a reflection of our dedication to the field of Recreation and Leisure Studies and the College. Guidelines concerning faculty performance at rank, renewal, continuing appointment, promotion, and discretionary salary increase (DSI) are described in this document. All faculty are expected to read, understand, and follow these policies as the guide to their performance.

From the College’s Faculty Guide:

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

The following terms are provided to serve as a basis of understanding throughout this document.

Active Program of Scholarship
Faculty must provide evidence of continued scholarly pursuits that encompass an identifiable product and process which represents a high level of disciplined expertise in data collection, breaks new ground, can be replicated and results can be documented and peer reviewed. These products may be in progress, under review, in press, or submitted. This also includes being the principal investigator of external scholarly grants.

Adjudicated Publications
Articles that are subject to a blind review process. Articles are substantive products, not abstracts or non peer-reviewed proceedings. Articles should be related to the faculty member’s area of expertise.

Advisement
Advisement occurs in the department through two main categories: academic and career. Both categories are vitally important in facilitating student success. The department strives to assign advisors based on the student’s academic track. However, students have the right to choose a different faculty member as their advisor.

Academic Advisement
Academic advisement is the process of assisting and providing timely information to students concerning the completion of their chosen major (REL) and concentration. For students to be able to register for their next semester (fall or spring) they must meet with their assigned advisor prior to the registration period. After the advising session is completed, either the student will be registered for REL courses (via majors reservation) or an “advisement key number” will be provided so the student will be able to register on their own according to current College procedures.

Career Advisement
Career advisement is the process of discourse between a student and advisor concerning the student choosing a starting point for their career. Typically, career advisement discussions would include:

- Discussion of career goals
- Credential building
- Networking opportunities
- Discussion of tasks of within specific jobs
- Mentoring

Often, career advisement occurs during the academic advisement meeting each semester. However, the department encourages ongoing career advisement.

Continuing Appointment
According to SUNY Policy, Article XI, Title B, a continuing appointment shall be an appointment to a position of academic rank which shall not be affected by changes in such rank and shall continue until resignation, retirement, or termination. Faculty members appointed at these ranks are eligible for consideration for continuing appointment when they have completed a total of seven years of service in a position of academic rank. At least three of these years must be in academic rank at Brockport.
Dean
For the purposes of this document the term “dean” refers to the dean of the School of Health and Human Performance.

Discretionary Salary Increase (DSI)
DSI is a monetary award given as a result of performance substantially above “performance at rank.” Typically, DSI is awarded every year. However, there is no guarantee that DSI will be awarded as DSI is a function of the United University Professions’ collective bargaining agreement. See the section on the DSI process later in this document.

Faculty
The University and College have categorized faculty into two groups: regular and associate. Depending on the category, faculty have responsibilities of teaching, scholarship, and service, or teaching and service, or teaching only.

The following definitions are provided:

Regular Faculty
“Full time tenured or tenure-track faculty appointed to one of the following titles: Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, or Distinguished Professor.”

Instructor
An individual who has been hired into a tenure track position but as of the hire date has not completely fulfilled the criteria for hiring. Typically, this is an individual who has not completed their terminal degree.

Assistant Professor
Individuals in a tenure track line are often untenured and are seeking tenure. These individuals have the responsibilities of teaching, scholarship, and service. These individuals also have the responsibility of accomplishing milestones as defined in the tenure process. This process typically consists of an initial three-year contract, then renewal for another three-year contract, followed by a one-year contract before continuing appointment (tenure) is granted. Refer to the section on promotions within this document for further information. The term “junior” faculty is often associated with this level.

Associate Professor
This is an individual who typically has been granted continuing appointment (tenure) by the University. These individuals have the responsibilities of teaching, scholarship, and service. These responsibilities are defined later in this document. The term “senior” faculty is often associated with this level.

Professor
This is an individual who has been granted continuing appointment (tenure) by the University. These individuals have the responsibilities of teaching, scholarship, and service above those of an Associate Professor. These responsibilities are defined later in this document. The term “senior” faculty is often associated with this level.
Distinguished Professor

Distinguished Teaching Professor, Distinguished Service Professor, and Distinguished Professor – are governed by the Policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees. These awards are a rank above full professor and only one Distinguished Professorship in each category can be authorized for a campus each year. From: http://www.brockport.edu/hr/appointment/employeetypes.html (Retrieved March 27, 2012)

Associate Faculty

(a) Full time non-tenure-track faculty appointed to one of the following titles: Lecturer, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor.

(b) Part time (paid) or Volunteer (unpaid) faculty appointed as Associate Faculty

(c) SUNY Brockport Emeriti

SUNY Board of Trustees Policies states that Emeritus rank "shall carry with it such of the following privileges which, in the judgment of the chief administrative officer, are feasible: use of library and study facilities, use of office and laboratory space, eligibility for research grants, and representation of the University in professional groups". In practice, Emeriti faculty at Brockport retain all library privileges of current faculty, email privileges, and are entitled to free parking. Emeriti engaged by the College under contractual agreement for the purpose of teaching, service or sponsored research may request the use of office space. Such space would be assigned by the dean depending upon its availability. From: http://www.brockport.edu/acadaff/facguide/wpp/I.html (retrieved May 10, 2012)

Performance at Rank

Performing at rank means that an individual is meeting the minimal standards of their rank as described in this document for the areas (teaching, scholarship and/or service) for which they are contractually responsible.

Prior Service Credit

At the time of appointment, a new appointee may request a maximum of three years of prior service credit for satisfactory full-time service in tenure-track positions at other accredited academic institutions of higher education. Service credit may be requested by the employee to the Dean and the Provost.

Promotion

That act of the University changing (increasing) the rank of Regular or Associate Faculty.

Qualified Academic Rank (QAR)

"Members of the academic staff having ‘qualified academic rank’ have all the terms and conditions of similarly appointed staff having ‘academic rank’ except that the time in qualified academic rank does not count towards meeting tenure requirement and appointees to qualified academic rank cannot, by definition, hold continuing appointments. Qualified academic rank is rank held by those members of the academic staff having titles of lecturer, or titles of academic rank preceded by the designations ‘clinical’ or ‘visiting’ or other similar designations.”

From: State University of New York Policies of the Board of Trustees. (November 2009).
Scholarship

"Scholarship/Creative Activity: Encompasses producing an identifiable product subject to systematic internal and external evaluation by professional peers and resulting from:

- The creation of new knowledge or artistic expression within the discipline that has significance by breaking new grounds or is innovative and can be replicated (Discovery). Examples of identifiable products include but are not limited to: original research as reported in articles, books, and presentation of papers; performances; grant proposals; inventions and patents; software development.

- The synthesizing of existing knowledge or creative work within one or more disciplines into new patterns and/or for new audiences (Integration). Examples of identifiable products include but are not limited to: publication of interpretive studies or criticism; critical reviews or editing of scholarly work; development of public policies or of interdisciplinary programs.

- The utilization of discipline-based knowledge to solve problems and requires high level of disciplined expertise (Application). Examples of identifiable products include but are not limited to: development and implementation of innovative clinical practice or public school programs; environmental impact analyses; consultant work in the public or private sector based on the faculty member’s discipline-based knowledge and expertise.”

- The systematic study of teaching and/or learning involves communicating and disseminating complete application of knowledge and research through public sharing. Examples of identifiable products include but are not limited to: peer-reviewed publications; presentations; program development; successful applications of technology to teaching and learning; grant awards; innovative teaching and evaluation methods; professional role modeling.


School

For the purposes of this document the term “School” refers to the School of Health of Human Performance at the College at Brockport, State University of New York.

Service

"Service: Encompasses governance of the department, the school, the college, the university, or the profession, as well as discipline-based or college mission-oriented contributions to the community that are not included in scholarship. Service areas are to the department, school, college, university, profession, and the community.”


State University of New York (SUNY)

For the purposes of this document the term “SUNY or University” refers to the State University of New York.
Teaching

"Teaching/learning: Encompasses promoting, guiding, facilitating, and evaluating student learning. Faculty members are catalysts for creating and adapting learning environments in and outside the classroom that stimulate students to learn, to be curious, to be critical thinkers, effective writers and speakers, and creative problem solvers. Effective teaching and learning are dependent upon faculty utilizing a variety of teaching techniques and designing and revising curriculum to produce student learning outcomes. Included within teaching/learning are the professional development processes of attending workshops, conferences and efforts necessary to maintain mastery of subject matter and teaching methodologies. Also included are the teaching-related activities of independent study and thesis supervision, field supervision, mentoring of students, and student involvement in research."


The College at Brockport

For the purposes of this document the term “College” refers to The College at Brockport.
University Policies Regarding Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

The College at Brockport is part of the State University of New York (SUNY). Many activities such as appointment to the faculty, promotion to a higher rank, and granting of tenure are either exclusively or partially governed by policies developed by the University Board of Trustees. The following web links are provided to permit the reader of this document to review policies which will affect their employment with the University and The College at Brockport.

Policies of the Board of Trustees
http://www.suny.edu/Board_of_Trustees/PDF/Policies.pdf

Academic Rank titles:
http://www.suny.edu/hr/compensation/uclass_titles/AcademicRankTitles.cfm
PERSONNEL DECISIONS

PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS FOR
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL DECISIONS
(Approved by Faculty Senate, 4/2/01)

The department follows the policies defined in the College Faculty Guide to Academic Practices and Policies and the Faculty/Staff Handbook. See the following web link.

http://www.brockport.edu/acadaff/facguide/instructorresp/1.html

Academic personnel decisions will proceed in the following steps for reviews and recommendations to the college president:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Department Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee Structure

The purpose of this committee is to facilitate peer reviewed personnel evaluations and to assure both academic rigor and equity in review. This involves not only a judgment, but also the clear statement of a supporting rationale in the committee’s report. This document is designed to assist the APT committee in making personnel recommendations.

The committee will consist of at least three (3) members who received continuing appointment at the College. In the case that the department does not have the number of qualifying faculty to constitute an internal APT committee, the dean, after consulting the chair and members of the department faculty, will first appoint available emeritus full and/or emeritus associate professors from the department and/or across campus to the APT Committee. Additional makeup of the committee will be drawn from faculty across campus who has received tenure and promotion to at least Associate Professor. Academic credentials and performance should be reviewed by those with similar knowledge and experience.
Time Periods for Evaluations

Individuals will be evaluated on an annual basis by the department chair and the dean according to the annual memorandum listing personnel action dates.

For reappointment, promotion and/or tenure and DSI, faculty must individually submit their portfolio to the department APT committee and meet the deadlines as determined by the personnel action dates memorandum provided by the Office of the Provost. Review of individual portfolios and recommendations will continue as outlined by the personnel action dates deadlines.

Yearly Evaluation of Personnel Performance

Reporting of activity for yearly evaluations occurs through the College annual report process. Currently, this process is performed through the Digital Measures Software System. Faculty should become well versed in the reporting system, the questions asked in the report, and especially, the elements asking for reflective commentary on the teaching, scholarship and service components. Refer to this link: http://www.brockport.edu/acadaff/forms/Professional_Staff_Annual_Report_Form.pdf

With regard to teaching, a major component is the reflection statement on course student learning outcomes, including methodology of assessment, reporting of results, and planned changes in pedagogy, technique or assignments as a result of assessment.

Regular faculty have scholarship as one of their college responsibilities. Faculty need to ensure ALL of their work is reported in the appropriate area within Digital Measures. The reflective statements are important to inform reviewers of both scholarship endeavors that are in process and those that are completed. Additional information to the type of scholarship (discovery, integration, application, or teaching), how one’s scholarship is used to inform teaching, and how the scholarship benefits the profession and/or society in general are also requested.

Both regular and associate faculty who are fulltime are also required to perform service. Reflective statements in this area should discuss their type of participation in the service (leader or member), length of service, and how each element of service provides benefits to the target audience of the service.

If an individual is an instructor or assistant professor, it is incumbent upon the individual to reflect on their progress toward earning continuing appointment (tenure), especially in the years when reappointment would occur.

The remainder of this document is divided into two main sections. The first section is to assist faculty in single year evaluations, and the second section is to assist the faculty member with contract renewals, tenure, and promotion.
Single Year Evaluation

Matching Evaluation to Workload

The overarching policies relating to workload are spelled out in the Faculty Guide to Academic Practices and Policies found at [http://www.brockport.edu/acadaff/facstaff.html](http://www.brockport.edu/acadaff/facstaff.html).

Regular faculty are expected to have a teaching load of 3/3 (9 credits per semester or equivalent), provided the faculty is also demonstrating productivity in scholarship and/or service. Teaching assignments are made by the department chair in consultation with the faculty member. If demonstrated productivity in scholarship and/or service appropriate to the rank is not evident, it is expected that the faculty member will assume additional teaching or service responsibilities with no additional compensation. This decision is made in consultation with the department chair.

The faculty of the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies support the Roles and Rewards Committee (1998) recommendation for the following workload percentages for all fulltime regular faculty and associate faculty:

- Teaching (50%)
- Scholarship (30%)
- Service (20%)

Some of the associate faculty in the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies are classified as QARs. In this department the teaching workload for a QAR normally will be twelve (12) credits per semester or 65%, and the remaining 35% of the workload will be assigned to service.

Adjustment of Workload

Due to the number of full-time faculty within the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, faculty usually functions as a “committee of the whole” based on the emerging tasks. The small size of the department creates wide-ranging performance expectations for faculty, each of whom assumes multiple responsibilities (which are often distributed more sparingly in larger departments).

Faculty may carry fewer credits when they receive release to perform additional duties in either scholarship (e.g., a grant) or service (e.g., administrative release). Tenured faculty may carry more than 9 credits in response to programmatic need or as a result of negotiation with the chair. Different weight balances must be negotiated with the department chair before the beginning of the next academic year/semester. Any deviation from the norm stated above must be put in writing with the signed signatures of the faculty member, the department chair, and the school dean. The weighting of each criteria area will then be adjusted accordingly and shall constitute the criteria used for determining performance at rank for that time period. In the absence of any written permission, the workload percentages outlined in the previous section will be used. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to note any workload adjustments in their application of DSI for the APT Committee to best evaluate performance. Credits taught as an overload that are compensated with increased pay shall not be considered in the total teaching load.
Matching Workload to Evaluation Percentages

The following percentages are to be used in weighting the rubric scores to calculate a composite score for evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Credits</th>
<th>Teaching %</th>
<th>Scholarship % Range</th>
<th>Service % Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30-90</td>
<td>10-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30-80</td>
<td>10-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30-75</td>
<td>10-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30-70</td>
<td>10-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30-65</td>
<td>10-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30-60</td>
<td>10-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30-55</td>
<td>10-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>10-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30-45</td>
<td>10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values and Rubrics

Faculty are evaluated in three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) as described within this document. In the following sections, the department has listed the characteristics that it values for each area of responsibility. These characteristics are followed by a series of scoring rubrics (i.e., rating scales) which seek to quantify the characteristics. Scores range on a scale from 1 to 5. A score of zero may be given if no evidence is present in a given area. Descriptors within each rubric are arranged so that a 3 is considered at rank (median value) for both junior and senior faculty members.

The ratings on the rubrics correspond to the highest level achieved by any of the activities reported. Separate scores are calculated for teaching, scholarship, and service. Evaluators have the latitude to assign “plus” or “minus” scores to a rubric score to distinguish among performances at a given level. A “plus” would result in an additional .25 to .50 points assigned to a rubric score. For example, a 4.0 can be increased to a 4.25 or 4.50. A “minus” would result in the loss of .25 - .50 points from a rubric score. For example, a 4.0 can be decreased to a 3.75 or 3.50.
Weighting the Rubric Scores

After evaluators have assigned a rubric score to each of the three areas of responsibility, a composite score is calculated by multiplying the rubric scores by the percentages allocated for evaluation and summing the products. The process of calculating a composite score is described in the following paragraph.

For the purposes of DSI, junior faculty (lecturers, instructors, assistant professors) with a composite score greater than or equal to 3.0 will be recommended; senior faculty (associate professors and above) with a composite score greater than or equal to 3.5 will be recommended. To the extent that it may be necessary to distinguish among DSI eligible faculty at some higher level of deliberation (e.g., School of Health and Human and Performance), the degree to which each eligible faculty member exceeds his/her minimum criterion (3.00 or 3.5) will be considered. The APT Committee is charged with the responsibility of conveying to each faculty member who applies for DSI the rubric scores for each area of responsibility and the calculations of the composite score.

Evaluation Rubric

The composition of the review is an aggregate rubric based score weighting the percentages among teaching, scholarship and service. A generic rubric that serves as the basis for specific rubrics in teaching, scholarship, and service is presented below:

5 Above Rank A score of 5 indicates a level of performance that is significantly above that which ordinarily is expected for a faculty member at a particular rank.

4 Above Rank A score of 4 indicates a level of performance above that which ordinarily is expected for a faculty member at a particular rank.

3 At Rank A score of 3 indicates a level of performance that is ordinarily expected for a faculty member at a particular rank. (Over multiple years, it is expected that faculty members at a particular rank would “average” a score of 3 for a specific faculty role.)

2 At Rank A score of 2 indicates a minimally acceptable level of performance for a particular academic rank in a single year. Faculty who score a 2 for one of the faculty roles are eligible to be considered for a DSI for performance in other faculty roles. (Over multiple years, faculty who “average” a score of 2 generally would not be considered to be performing “at rank” for that specific faculty role.)

1 Below Rank A score of 1 indicates a level of performance below that which is expected for a faculty member at a particular rank. Ordinarily, faculty who score 1 in a single year evaluation for one faculty role are not eligible to be considered for a DSI regardless of performance in other faculty roles.

Note: when all faculty roles (teaching, scholarship, service) are evaluated on scales that have been set to a common standard (the notion of “at rank”), scores for those roles can be weighted and combined to achieve a composite score to reflect an overall level of performance. Ordinarily, teaching is weighted .50, scholarship is weighted .30, and service is weighted .20. For example, for faculty roles weighted 50% for teaching, 30% for scholarship, and 20% for service, and with rubric scores of 3.00 for teaching, 3.25 for scholarship, and 4.75 for service, the composite score is 3.43 (3.00 x .50 + 3.25 x .30 + 4.75 x .20 = 3.43) indicating an overall performance that is somewhat higher than “at rank.” Associate Faculty who teach four classes and are not required to conduct scholarship ordinarily will be weighted .65 for teaching and .35 for service.
CRITERIA FOR PERFORMING AT RANK (single year evaluation)

Performing at rank is a composite rubric evaluation of teaching, scholarship and service for regular faculty, and a combination of teaching and service for associate faculty. Evaluation occurs yearly in the form of annual reports, DSI application, and culminating for application of tenure and contract renewals.

Teaching

Review of teaching can occur as parts of two different reviews. First, every full-time faculty member is required to submit an annual report. The content is governed by the provost. Currently, The College uses a software package called Digital Measures for annual report submission and review. A faculty member’s annual report is reviewed by the department chair and the dean of the school.

Second, a review of teaching will occur if the faculty member submits a portfolio for a DSI. The process of this review is described later in this document.

This section describes the materials that may be used to demonstrate knowledge of the discipline/profession, skills of pedagogy, including clear and precise communication and methods of course design, student outcomes and assessment, student engagement, student reaction to instruction, professional development, and course management.

The materials submitted will serve as indicators of these criteria. Reviewers of these materials will look for demonstration of the use of contemporary sources of knowledge, techniques of best practices and a relationship of content, methods, student interest and need, and the relationship to the academic standards of the College.

Teaching Philosophy

All faculty should have a statement which addresses the faculty member’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, and assessment of student learning outcomes. This should be submitted as part of the portfolio for review, but is not scored.
Teaching Effectiveness

The Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies has identified six components for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness:

- Course design (including syllabi, content and program evaluation)
- Student outcomes and assessment (including progress on student learning outcomes, grade distributions, and student feedback)
- Student engagement (including work with students outside of normal class hour and emphasizing active, collaborative and/or service learning)
- Student reaction to instruction (reflecting instructional delivery skills)
- Professional development (including both on-and off-campus activities designed to improve teaching)
- Course management (including all of the administrative tasks associated with teaching a class). Note: this section is assessed only by the department chair.

These components are weighted differently and combined to arrive at an overall evaluation of teaching; course design and student reaction to instruction carry the heaviest weights, followed by assessment and student engagement, while professional development and course management have the lightest weights.

Each component is evaluated separately using a worksheet based on the information which follows. The evaluator assigns a score for each component by circling a point value among the range of points assigned to a particular component (e.g., 1-5 for course content, 1-3 for assessment, etc.). Associated with each component are a series of bulleted activities that evaluators can use to help structure the evaluation. The bulleted activities are not meant to be used as a checklist, rather they should serve as prompts that provide reminders, to both faculty and evaluators alike, as to the kinds of evidence that can be used to demonstrate proficiency in each category.

Evaluators should consider the depth and breadth of the evidence in each category and assign a score based on a “holistic” assessment of the component, rather than a more prescriptive, checklist-type, assessment. When evaluators believe that the evidence is consistent with what we might reasonably expect from a faculty member given the candidate’s rank, then the evaluator should assign the “middle score” in the range or the whole number just above the middle score (e.g., a 3 for a 0-5 range) when there is an even number of scores in a range. When the evidence is either above or below that expectation, the evaluator assigns a different score according to his/her judgment. Chairs have some latitude in assigning points for the course management section based on their knowledge of circumstances pertaining to this component.

Once all components have been scored, the points are totaled and converted to a rubric score according to the ranges provided in this document. In cases where all components are scored in the middle of the point range (or just above the middle of the point range), the total number of points will yield a rubric score of 3 9at rank).

Junior and senior faculty will use the following rubric. It is in the best interest of the faculty member to provide as much evidence as possible in their annual report or portfolio for consideration.
Rating Sheet for Single Year Teaching Evaluation for Junior and Senior Faculty

Course Design:  5 4 3 2 1

- Syllabi are properly developed and include required components
- Course content is current (revised as appropriate and matched to the level of the class)
- Assignments and activities are rigorous and contribute to student learning (reading, writing, critical thinking, active and/or collaborative activities are emphasized as appropriate)
- Use of technology built into course design in some way
- Course content includes diverse perspectives and/or cultural competence as appropriate
- Methods and materials are appropriate to class size, level, and content
- New course preparation, new course development (not previously part of department offerings), and/or course conversion to online (or hybrid) format
- Other equivalent course design activities

Student Outcomes and Assessment:  3 2 1

- Appropriate tools are used to assess student learning
- Feedback to students is timely and meaningful
- Class progress on student learning outcomes is assessed and appropriate steps are taken for continuous improvement (“closing the loop”)
- Table of grade distribution for each course/section including personal interpretation of distributions in light of teaching philosophy
- Student accomplishments, e.g. conference presentations, published papers, awards, performances, exhibitions, student-faculty research papers
- Student self appraisal of learning
- Assessment of course-based objectives, including assignments and rubrics
- Other equivalent assessment activities

Student Engagement:  3 2 1

- Chairs or serves on graduate project (thesis or research project) committee (beyond assigned teaching load)
- Sponsors independent or directed studies
- Involves students in research or service projects outside of class
- Supervision of graduate and honors thesis
- Mentors students to publish a paper or present at professional conference
- Provides excellent academic advisement
- Other equivalent student engagement activities
Student Reaction to Instruction: 2 1 0

- Personal assessment of ratings on other IAS items besides the four core items
- Use of student feedback to make changes and course revisions
- Time spent outside of class with students, beyond office hours for tutoring, feedback, review sessions, and so forth.
- Student narrative comments (oral or from faculty additional student evaluations)

IAS Ratings: 5 4 3 2 1 0

- Summary table of IAS ratings on the four core items for all courses taught during the period under review.
  - IAS scores generally <.50 (5 points)
  - IAS scores generally <1.00 (4 points)
  - IAS scores generally <1.50 (3 points)
  - IAS scores generally <2.00 (2 points)
  - IAS scores generally <2.50 (1 point)
  - IAS scores generally >2.50 (0 points)

Professional Development: 2 1 0

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

*Course Management: 2 1 0
This component of teaching effectiveness is completed by department chair only.

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

*This component of teaching effectiveness is evaluated by department chair only.
Evaluation of Teaching
Peer review of the portfolio for both Junior and Senior faculty will be made according to the following rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank Level</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Above Rank</td>
<td>APT Committee: 19-20 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair: 21-22 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above Rank</td>
<td>APT Committee: 16-18 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair: 18-20 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>At Rank</td>
<td>APT Committee: 13-15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair: 15-17 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>At Rank</td>
<td>APT Committee: 10-12 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair: 12-14 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Below Rank</td>
<td>APT Committee: 7-9 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair: 9-11 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Below Rank</td>
<td>APT Committee: fewer than 6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair: fewer than 8 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scholarship
The following are examples of evidence to support the area of scholarship for both junior and senior faculty. It is in the best interest of the faculty member to provide as much information as possible, such as:

- A statement addressing the faculty member’s scholarship focus (e.g. area of expertise and line of research interest). The statement should also include a reflection on the relationship of scholarship to teaching.
- List of each scholarly product including documentary evidence of all works published, under review, in press, or in development
- A statement of scholarly efforts, including works in progress and products published or presented during the current review period
- Copies of any relevant communications with editors, publishers, organizers, and so on that pertain to publications or presentations
- Copies of conference programs for presentations

Evaluation of Scholarship for Junior and Senior Faculty
Faculty members submit as part of their portfolio a scholarly work section which lists and discusses their scholarly activities for a particular year. Peer review of the portfolio will be made according to the following rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Above Rank</td>
<td>Authored an adjudicated book (books contain extensive narrative, and numerous citations; they are adopted by other institutions; they are subject to blind external review, etc. Compilations of class notes, lab worksheets, and production of ancillary materials do not constitute a textbook), or Authored or co-authored three or more adjudicated scholarly papers in respected professional journals, or Recipient of a very large external grant ($50,000+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above Rank</td>
<td>Edited or co-edited an adjudicated book or equivalent, or Authored or co-authored two or more adjudicated papers in respected professional journals or equivalent, or Authored or co-authored two or more book chapters or equivalent, or Peer reviewed presentation at a national or regional conference with appropriate documentation, or Gave keynote address at a major conference or equivalent, or Recipient of a large external grant ($30,000-$49,999), or Submission of a large external grant proposal [(which includes indirect costs and/or salary savings) which was not funded but scored well in the competition (approved but not funded) ($50,000+)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>At Rank</td>
<td>Authored or co-authored one adjudicated paper in a reputable professional journal or equivalent, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authored or co-authored one book chapter or equivalent, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edited a special topics issue in a journal or periodical or equivalent, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gave invited presentation or presentations at national or international conference or symposium or equivalent, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authored or co-authored adjudicated abstract or proceedings paper, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recipient of a medium grant ($10,000 - $29,999), or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of a medium external grant (which includes indirect costs and/or salary savings) which is not funded but has scored well in the competition (approved but not funded) ($30,000 - $49,999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>At Rank</td>
<td>Authored or co-authored adjudicated paper(s) “in press” (evidence required), or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authored or co-authored non-adjudicated paper(s) are published, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authored or co-authored adjudicated abstract or proceedings paper, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gave presentation at state, national, or international conference, symposium, or workshop (includes panel discussions, poster sessions, workshops, etc.) or equivalent, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Documented significant progress</strong> (as deemed appropriate by the APT Committee) towards the completion of a textbook or research project that systematically requires more than one year bringing to full completion, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recipient of a small grant (&lt; $10,000) from an external agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Below Rank</td>
<td>Gave local presentation(s), or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence that a scholarly paper or papers (articles, book chapters, grant applications or equivalent) are in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Below Rank</td>
<td>No scholarly activity is discernible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence of scholarly activity is provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service
The college Faculty Roles & Rewards Committee defined service in December 1998. The following is the current accepted definition.

"Encompasses governance of the department, the school, the college, the university, or the profession, as well as discipline-based or college mission oriented contribution to the community that are not included in Scholarship"”

Faculty are expected to be actively engaged in a diverse array of service activities. Service is highly valued by the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies. A faculty member should consider the following when choosing service activities.

- Is the service aligned with the missions of the department, school and college?
- Is the service relevant to the faculty’s professional interests?
- Is the service directed at promoting the profession?
- Is there a balance among service activities?

Evaluation of service is based on the quantity of service, quality of service activities, and product or outcome of the service engaged in. Faculty are responsible for determining their level of involvement in service. However, in the case of departmental service the chair possesses the authority to assign service activities including:

- “To determine work (not associated with teaching workload) assignments [e.g. assign a faculty member to be a coordinator of a specific activity like REL 307 Coordinator].
- To establish department committee membership”.

From: The College Department Chair Handbook

Examples of Evidence

The following are examples of evidence to support the area of service. It is in the best interest of the faculty member to provide as much information as possible.

- Reflective statement of one’s personal values and beliefs to the component of service.
- Descriptions of activities for department, college, university, professional and/or community.
- Descriptions of extent of involvement including leadership roles.
- Letters of support from relevant individuals.
- Descriptions of products/outcomes.
- Evidence of quality student academic advisement.
Levels of Involvement

- **Participation**: means being a part of something that does not require roles or responsibility; representing a group at departmental and college functions or community activities.

- **Leadership**: means guiding or directing a task or group. Often done in the form of chairing committees or performing significant administrative responsibilities in service activities.

- **Outcome**: means directly contributing to an identifiable product, or recommended changes or outcomes. Possible products or recommended changes or outcomes may be policies, practices, procedures, or programs.

Service Activity Examples

**Departmental**
- Departmental committees (e.g. library/resource, scholarships, webmaster, UUP)
- Participation and support in department “essentials” (e.g. representing the department at SOAR sessions, Open Houses, graduate information nights)
- Providing quality student advisement (assessment of student satisfaction using tools like satisfaction survey)
- Providing quality career advisement
- Coordinator of a departmental program area or advisor to a department student organization
- Supporting the department to promote effective administration at various level from conducting faculty/staff searches to development of departmental strategic direction and policy statements or reports

**School**
- As needed and determined by the dean

**College**
- Ad hoc committees, focus groups, or task forces that serve the college
- College Senate
- Advisor to university, college, or school student organization

**Professional**
- Member or lead of a Council on Accreditation (COAPRT) Accreditation Team
- Member of a professional organization committee
- Editor or reviewer of a textbook/journal (length of service impacts score)
- Development or involvement in activities and services on behalf of larger communities (e.g. local, state, national or international bodies)

**Community**
- Community outreach or service activities
- Governmental elected positions
- Advisory boards
• Academic contribution to community activities either as an individual or representing the university or college.
• Unpaid consultant activities

Evaluation of Service for Junior and Senior Faculty

For a single-year evaluation, each faculty member will submit an annual report outlining and providing reflection on their service activities. For all other evaluations, each faculty must submit a portfolio documenting their involvement in service activities for the years they are seeking review.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | Above Rank | Engaged in at least three on-going service activities out of the four service activity areas (departmental, college, professional, community) with:  
  a. evidence of leadership involvement in at least two,  
  b. evidence of process- and outcome-level involvement in all, and  
  c. supported by evidence of involvement with departmental “essentials” and quality advisement |
| 4     | Above Rank | Engaged in a at least three on-going service activities out of the four service activity areas (departmental, college, professional, community) with:  
  a. evidence of leadership level involvement in at least one,  
  b. evidence of process and outcome level involvement in at least two, and  
  c. supported by evidence of involvement with departmental “essentials” and quality advisement.  
OR  
Engaged in at least three on-going service activities out of the four service activity areas (departmental, college, professional, community) with:  
  a. evidence of process and outcome level involvement in all, and  
  b. supported by evidence of involvement with departmental “essentials” and quality advisement |
| 3     | At Rank    | Engaged in at least two on-going service activities out of the four service activity areas (departmental, college, professional, community) with:  
  a. evidence of leadership level involvement in at least one,  
  b. evidence of process and outcome level involvement in all, and  
  c. supported by evidence of involvement with departmental “essentials” and quality advisement  
OR  
Engaged in at least three on-going service activities out of the four service activity areas (departmental, college, professional, community) with:  
  a. evidence of process and outcome level involvement in all, and  
  b. supported by evidence of involvement with departmental “essentials” and quality advisement |
| 2     | At Rank    | Engaged in a at least two on-going service activities out of the four service activity areas (departmental, college, professional, community) with:  
  a. evidence of process and outcome level involvement in all, and  
  b. supported by evidence of involvement with departmental “essentials” and quality advisement |
OR
Engaged in at least one on-going service activity out of the four service activities (departmental, college, professional, community) with:
   a. evidence of leadership-level involvement, and
   b. supported by evidence of involvement with departmental “essentials” and quality advisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below Rank</th>
<th>Below Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Engaged in one on-going service activity out of the four service activity areas (departmental, college, professional, community) at the participation and/or process level and supported by evidence of involvement with department “essentials” or quality advisement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service activities at any level in any service area. Failure to participate in departmental “essentials” or failure to provide quality advisement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Year Evaluation

Promotions in the School of Health and Human Performance

The rubric-based scoring system has been established primarily for the evaluation of a single year (e.g., DSI or a one-year renewal), but has some applicability in determining a faculty member’s eligibility for promotion (especially to associate professor). While the department may wish to explore extending the utility of the rubric system to promotions in the future, the following will serve as guidelines until that time. While these guidelines are indicators of what is minimally necessary for promotion and tenure, they should not be interpreted as sufficient criteria to ensure tenure and/or promotion.

Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor (with tenure, as appropriate)

The individual has demonstrated achievement on a continual basis while at the rank of assistant professor in all three performance areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. There must be evidence that the individual has made sustained high quality contributions to the department and the college as an assistant professor. The individual 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.

General

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

Teaching

- Portfolio must include evidence of (including reflective statements on) the following elements (parenthetical “e.g.” prompts, where provided, are meant to suggest examples of aspects of the teaching elements for which faculty could offer evidence and/or reflection; there is no expectation that all prompts within an element require evidence and/or reflection, but there is an expectation that effectiveness in all elements will be demonstrated in some way):
  - **Instructional delivery** (e.g., IAS scores must be provided for all, or almost all, course sections taught, and scores, at minimum, should be below 1.75 for the most recent 5-year period; assessments and IAS scores should indicate faculty using rigor and relevant instruction methods, evidence of teaching excellence may be confirmed by classroom observation, structured reflective questionnaires, content analysis of teaching materials, fairness in grading and in assessment).
  - **Evidence of teaching excellence** may be confirmed by departmental colleagues who are directly familiar with the candidate’s work or augmented by peer review of teaching, provided multiple visits are conducted and included in any formal reports)
• **Course design** [e.g., syllabi are properly developed and include required components; course content is current (revised as appropriate) and matched to the level of the class; assignments and activities are rigorous and contribute to student learning (reading, writing, critical thinking, active and/or collaborative activities are emphasized as appropriate); use of technology is built into course design in some way; course content includes diverse perspectives and/or cultural competence as appropriate; methods and materials are appropriate to class size, level, and content; new course preparation, new course development (approved by curriculum committee), and/or course conversion to online (or hybrid) format or evidence of a major contribution to the department or college-wide instructional program; etc.]

  o **Assessment** (e.g., appropriate tools to assess learning, timely and meaningful feedback to students, appropriately rigorous grading patterns, clearly stated learning outcomes within the courses with appropriate assessment procedure, indices of student learning/success with direct ties to faculty member)

  o **Student engagement** (e.g., supervision of thesis or other graduate projects, independent/directed studies, student involvement in research and/or service learning outside the classroom, mentors honors thesis and students to publish, present, or attend graduate school, etc.)

  o **Professional development** (e.g., CELT workshops, webinars, professional teaching conferences, etc.)

  o **Course management** (e.g., all course-related deadlines are met, regular office hours maintained, reasonable availability to students outside of class, class meets for entire scheduled time, etc.)

• When all teaching elements are assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate is a very good teacher

**Scholarship**

• Evidence of publication of no fewer than 4 adjudicated papers (or equivalent)
  o All papers must appear in peer reviewed journals respected in the discipline or related disciplines
  o Regardless of equivalencies suggested below, the candidate must have at least 2 adjudicated papers published in respected refereed journals in the discipline or related disciplines
  o Suggested equivalencies to adjudicated papers for this purpose:
    ▪ One book chapter ("first edition") can count as an equivalent
    ▪ One external grant application that includes indirect costs and has a significant narrative with bibliography can be considered equivalent
    ▪ Authored or edited books can be considered equivalent to multiple papers (not to exceed 2)

• Evidence of no fewer than 3 presentations (or equivalent) at appropriate state-level or higher professional conferences
  o At least 1 of the 3 presentations must be at the national (or international) level
  o Suggested equivalencies to state-level or higher presentations for this purpose:
• Two local presentations can be equivalent to 1 state-level presentation or higher (a maximum of 1 time)

• When scholarship is assessed, the conclusion must be that quality is good, that productivity likely will be sustained, and that the candidate has the potential to reach the scholarship guidelines associated with the rank of professor.

Service

• Portfolio must include:
  o Evidence of involvement in at least 2 on-going departmental committees/initiatives at least over the most recent 2-year period
  o Evidence of at least 1 leadership role with good outcomes on service-related assignments in the department
  o Evidence of at least 2 on-going committees/initiatives outside the department (and 1 of those activities must be at the college level)
  o Evidence of effective student advisement
  o Evidence of departmental representation at various events (e.g., SOARs, open houses, open registration, community colleges, high schools, commencement, honors and awards ceremonies, etc.)

• When service is assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate has demonstrated a willingness and ability to participate in departmental governance and the potential to provide effective leadership to the department and beyond
Promotion to the Rank of Professor

An individual 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.

It is expected that successful candidates would be able to demonstrate that their performance clearly has exceeded rubric scores of 3 during their time as an associate professor.

General

• At minimum, candidates must serve 5 years at the rank of associate professor before applying for the rank of professor

• Guidelines pertain to performance since promotion to associate professor

• Guidelines are not fixed criteria; every portfolio will have unique aspects and evaluators will need to interpret the guidelines, judge equivalencies, and consider special circumstances, where appropriate

Teaching

• Portfolio must include evidence of (including reflective statements on) the following elements (parenthetical “e.g.” prompts, where provided, are meant to suggest examples of aspects of the teaching elements for which faculty could offer evidence and/or reflection; there is no expectation that all prompts within an element require evidence and/or reflection, but there is an expectation that effectiveness in all elements will be demonstrated in some way and that applicants for professor can show effectiveness in the prompts that are italicized, where appropriate):
  o Instructional delivery (e.g., IAS scores must be provided for all, or almost all, course sections taught at least over the most recent 5-year period and scores, at minimum, should be below 1.75; assessments and IAS scores should indicate faculty using rigor and relevant instruction methods, evidence of teaching excellence may be confirmed by classroom observation, structured reflective questionnaires, content analysis of teaching materials, fairness in grading and in assessment).
  o Evidence of teaching excellence may be confirmed by departmental colleagues who are directly familiar with the candidate’s work or augmented by peer review of teaching, provided multiple visits are conducted and included in any formal reports)
  o Course design [e.g., appropriate syllabi, current content, rigor of assignments, appropriate and/or innovative methods and materials, use of technology is built into course design in some way, inclusion of diverse perspectives, new course preparation, new course development (approved by curriculum committee), and/or course conversion to online (or hybrid) format or evidence of a major contribution to the department or college-wide instructional program; etc.]
  o Assessment (e.g., appropriate tools to assess learning, timely and meaningful feedback to students, appropriately rigorous grading patterns, clearly stated learning outcomes within the
courses with appropriate assessment procedures, indices of student learning or success with
direct ties to faculty member; class progress on student learning outcomes is assessed and appropriate steps
are taken for continuous improvement ("closing the loop"); etc.

- Student engagement (e.g., chairs or serves on graduate project (thesis, synthesis, major paper, etc.)
committee (beyond assigned teaching load); mentors Honors or McNair students, sponsors
independent or directed studies, student involvement in research and/or service learning,
mentors students to publish, present, or attend graduate school, etc.)

- Professional development (e.g., CELT, webinars, professional teaching conferences,
serves as a faculty or CELT mentor, etc.)

- Course management (i.e., all course-related deadlines are met, regular office hours
maintained, reasonable availability to students outside of class, class meets for entire
scheduled time, etc.)

- When all teaching elements are assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate is a very good
teacher and has contributed positively to the instructional program both inside and outside the
classroom

Scholarship

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

- And portfolio must include evidence of no fewer than 3 national or international presentations (or
  equivalent) at appropriate professional conferences, at least 2 of which must have presentation dates
  within 5 years of the application
  - Suggested equivalencies, not to exceed 1 for this purpose, may include the following:
    - Four presentations at local conferences may be considered equivalent to 1
    - Two presentations at state conferences may be considered equivalent to 1

- When scholarship is assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate has produced a "body of
  work," that productivity has been sustained, that quality is very good, and that the candidate has a
  national reputation in their field.
Service

- Portfolio must include:

  Evidence of on-going involvement in at least 2 committees/initiatives either inside or outside the department each year at least over the most recent 5-year period

  - Evidence of effective student advisement
  - Evidence of continued departmental representation at various events (e.g., SOARs, open houses, open registration, community colleges, high schools, commencement, honors and awards ceremonies, etc.)
  - Evidence that at least 1 service activity since promotion to associate professor was with a national professional organization
  - Evidence of multiple leadership roles since promotion to associate professor with good outcomes (successfully meeting the “charge” or goals of the service activity) on service-related assignments both inside and outside the department
    - At least 1 leadership role must include chairing a departmental committee (or equivalent)
    - At least 1 leadership role must include chairing a college-wide committee (or equivalent)
    - At least 1 leadership role must be in community or professional service
  - When service is assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate is a leader in the department and beyond, and contributes in significant and on-going ways to the governance of the department, college, community, and profession

Promotion to the Rank of Distinguished Professor

Promotion to the highest ranks – Distinguished Teaching Professor, Distinguished Service Professor, and Distinguished Professor – is governed by the Policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees. These awards are a rank above full professor and only one award in for Distinguished Teaching and Distinguished Service Professorship can be given by our campus each year.

Guidelines are available for each of these programs and successful nomination packages from previous years can also be reviewed; contact the Director of Grants Development at (585) 395-5118. A campus committee is convened each January to review nominations for each award. Nomination packages must have the approval of the departmental APT Committee and Chair and Dean prior to being sent to the review committee.
**Review and Reappointment for QAR**

Faculty designated as QAR within the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies will adhere to the teaching and service workload guidelines set within this document as indicated in the appropriate sections. Annual reports and submission of a portfolio for reappointment is expected.

The following guidelines direct the portfolio content for the multi-year contract renewal process.

**Introduction:** Current faculty who possess the rank of QAR and are up for contract renewal must submit materials to the APT committee and the department chair. The chair will initiate the process by contacting the faculty member in writing (email is acceptable) as soon as HR has notified the chair that a faculty member is up for renewal. Evaluation materials are due according to the dates set by the Provost, and typically is the semester of **year two** of the currently contracted three year agreement cycle. It is the responsibility of the individual undergoing the renewal review process for gathering all required evaluative materials.

These materials will be organized into a portfolio which will be the official “set of documents” used by the department APT committee and the department chair to determine fitness for renewal. This “portfolio” will be forwarded to the Dean after both the APT committee and department chair have made their respective recommendations.

While this process is taking place a second “document holder” will be constructed by the department. This document will be in the form of a manila folder. This document holder will the device sent forward to the Dean and to the Provost after the Dean has made a recommendation. Contained in this manila folder will be the following items:

- **Evaluative material:** annual reports from “Digital Measures” for the past three years (note: if this is the first renewal only two annual reports will be provided, if this is a subsequent renewal, then three are required with the oldest being from the previous contract period),

- **Service plan for the next contract period:** this is a narrative intended and/or current service (note: this “service plan” should be discussed with the chair in advance and agreed to by the faculty members and the chair),

- **Memorandum from the Dean:** (when set to the Provost for determination).

- **College/University Appointment form:** (note: to be printed on ecru or ivory paper or the current HR approved color).

**Minimum Components of the Portfolio:** (used by the APT committee and the chair)

- **An updated vita,**

- **copies of the most recent three annual reviews with chair’s comments,**

- **Evidence of quality teaching:** including the IAS summary report forms for the current contract period (suggested evidence: a reflective narrative of teaching, syllabi, a reflective statement of assessment [assisting to accomplish departmental Program Learning Outcomes, and student accomplishment of Course Learning Outcomes]),
• **Evidence of service**: (suggested evidence: and a reflective narrative of service for the current contract period, letters of appreciation),

• **A plan of service for the next contract period**,

• **Copies of the APT review letter**: (after notification),

• **Chair review letter** (after notification).

**Teaching Requirements for Contract Renewal (65%)**
The faculty member is expected to:

1. Teach a 4/4 course load or contribute more to service by assuming an advisement load greater than usual baseline for the department, assuming a leadership role on at least one committee, assume additional departmental administrative responsibilities, or actively participate on more committees than is the usual departmental expectation or serve on more than one campus-wide or community-wide committee.

2. Have positive evidence of course learning outcomes.

3. IAS scores where at least seventy percent of the individual global questions included in the review period have a mean rating of 1.75 or lower.

4. Have evidence of continued professional development supporting the assertion that the candidate is remaining current in his or her instructional field(s).

**Service Requirements for Contract Renewal (35%)**
The faculty member is expected to actively participate in department and level meetings and be on at least one additional department committee per academic year. He or she is expected to foster the department’s relationships with the community agencies where she/he teaches. Faculty at this level are also expected to participate in the college service of SOAR, Saturday Information Sessions, advisement, and registration.
Procedures for Renewal or Promotion

These procedures are applicable to both junior and senior faculty.

1. The candidate for reappointment will be notified by the college of reappointment (i.e., renewal) and the timing of submissions by the candidate.

2. The candidate will submit to the department’s APT committee a cover letter and portfolio that will be used by the reviewers for assessing the candidate in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The portfolio, in particular, should highlight accomplishments since either the last review or since appointment/promotion to the current rank.

3. Once the APT committee has made its evaluation, the APT committee chair will provide the department chair with a memorandum detailing strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, the results of a vote determining if the committee does or does not recommend the candidate for reappointment, and the committee’s recommendation. Note on process: if college policy so requires, recommendations from the APT committee will go back to the department prior to going to the chair. In such a case the faculty will vote to “endorse” or “not endorse” the recommendation of the committee. The file would then go to the chair with the committee’s recommendation and the faculty vote on that recommendation.

4. The department chair will review the candidate’s portfolio and the APT committee report. Then the chair will write a memorandum detailing the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, the results of a vote by the faculty, and the chair’s recommendation. A copy of the chair’s recommendation is provided to the candidate. The candidate’s portfolio and a dossier (with content as defined by the Office of the Provost) will be forwarded to the dean for evaluation.

5. The dean will review the candidate’s portfolio and make a recommendation to the provost. The dean will then submit the dossier to the provost.

6. The provost will make a recommendation to the President of the College, who will in turn make a recommendation to the Chancellor of the University.
DISCRETIONARY SALARY INCREASES

DSI is a monetary award given as a result of performance substantially above “performance at rank”. Typically, DSI is awarded every year. However, there is no guarantee that DSI will be awarded as DSI is a function of the collective bargaining agreement.

Applying for a DSI

If DSI is to be awarded, the Division of Academic Affairs will notify faculty by memorandum at the beginning of the fall semester. Due dates for submissions will be included in the memo.

It is expected that all candidates for DSI will submit their DSI portfolio by the due date to the chair. At a minimum, the portfolio must include the following:

- A cover letter
- The previous year’s annual report
- The candidates’ philosophy of teaching, scholarship, and service
- Course syllabi
- Grade distributions for all courses taught
- Course IAS reports
- Discussion of student learning outcomes assessment including results and planned changes

DSI Evaluation Process

1. Submit annual review form and supporting portfolio (try to limit portfolio to one 3-ring binder or less) to the department secretary’s office by the established deadline. A cover letter asking for DSI consideration and delineating the reasons the candidate believes he/she is qualified should accompany the materials.

2. APT committee members independently evaluate each file according to the published criteria and record the evaluations on the standard score sheets.

3. APT committee members review and discuss each file and assigned scores; APT members have the opportunity to revise scores following this review and discussion.

4. An average score is calculated for each of the three categories (teaching, research, service) and recorded on a summary score sheet. The averaged scores are multiplied by the workload/evaluation percentages established for the individual faculty member resulting in a composite score.

5. A copy of the summary score sheet is provided to each candidate.

6. Candidates may appeal the committee’s evaluation by contacting the APT committee chair.

7. All files are forwarded to the department chair’s office along with a copy of the APT committee’s summary score sheet for each file.
8. Chair conducts an independent evaluation of the file (including the calculation of a composite score) and provides a copy of his/her summary score sheet to both the candidate and to the chair of APT committee.

9. The Annual Reports (and portfolios if requested) of candidates whose composite scores equal or surpass the published standards for DSI are forwarded to the Dean's office.