

12-2-2013

Kinesiology, Sport Studies and Physical Education: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation

The College at Brockport

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Repository Citation

The College at Brockport, "Kinesiology, Sport Studies and Physical Education: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation" (2013). *Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation*. 97.

<https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt/97>

This Document is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @Brockport. It has been accepted for inclusion in Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @Brockport. For more information, please contact kmyers@brockport.edu.



The College at
BROCKPORT
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

**DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY, SPORT
STUDIES AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION**

**GUIDELINES
FOR
PERSONNEL DECISIONS**

**Approved by the faculty, KSSPE APTD
Committee, Chairperson and Senior
Administration at The College at Brockport
Revised and Approved 12/2/13**

Table of Contents

Department of Kinesiology, Sport Studies and Physical Education

Criteria for Personnel Evaluation

APTD Committee

The Department's personnel committee is an elected body comprised of five faculty members. A majority of the committee must have continuing appointment and senior rank. Junior faculty may serve on the committee and participate in DSI evaluations and help to formulate policy. Only senior faculty may evaluate applications for continuing appointment and promotion to associate professor. For promotion to professor, the committee must include at least one full professor. The position of alternate is available for personnel matters affecting a committee member, a conflict of interest, or when a committee member is absent for an extended period of time. Alternate expected to attend meetings only when called upon for action.

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

Matching Evaluation to Workload

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

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

Teaching is the Highest Priority

The percentages assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service are consistent with those that appear in *Roles and Rewards*, where teaching is at least 50% and where teaching > scholarship > service (and where service is at least 10%). The weighting system explained in this document assures that faculty with traditional assignments are evaluated according to these percentages. Exceptions to these percentages occur when faculty receive release time from teaching. In this case the percentage of teaching release should be assigned to either scholarship or service depending on the reason for the release. When faculty receive release time for service it is possible that their weighting for service will be greater than that of scholarship and possibly even teaching when the release time is large.

Values and Rubrics

For each area of a faculty member's responsibilities (teaching, scholarship, service), the criteria for evaluation are described in this document. Initially the Department lists those characteristics that it values within each area of responsibility. These values are then followed by a series of rubrics (i.e., rating scales) which seek to operationalize the values. Rubric scores can range from 0 - 5 (actually 5.33 as explained below) depending on how well the faculty member's papers address the items associated with each level of the rubric. Descriptors within each rubric are arranged so that a 3 is considered at rank for both junior and senior faculty members. Rubrics are not additive; the rating corresponds to the highest level achieved by any of the activities reported. Scores are determined separately for teaching, scholarship, and service. Evaluators have the latitude to assign "plus" or "minus" scores to a rubric score to distinguish among performances at a given level. A plus would result in an additional .25 - .50 points assigned to a rubric score. Hence, 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. Hence, 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. 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) 3.67 will be recommended. To the extent that it may be necessary to distinguish among DSI-eligible faculty at some higher level of deliberation (e.g., School of Health and Human Performance), the degree to which each eligible faculty member exceeds his/her minimum criterion (3.00 or 3.67) will be considered. The APTD Committee is charged with the responsibility of conveying to each faculty member who applies for DSI the rubric scores for each area of responsibility and the calculations of the composite score.

Matching Teaching Assignments to Variable Workload/Evaluation Percentages

Teaching assignments are made by the department chair in consultation with the faculty member. A standard teaching load in the department is 9 credits (or equivalent) for faculty demonstrating an “active program of scholarship” and/or with major or multiple service responsibilities. Faculty who do not demonstrate an “active program of scholarship” should contribute more in the areas of teaching and/or service. Faculty may carry fewer credits when they receive release to perform additional duties in either scholarship (e.g., a grant) or service (e.g., administrative release). Tenured faculty may carry more than 9 credits in response to programmatic need or as the result of negotiation with the chair. In any case, faculty usually will have some degree of latitude in establishing workload and evaluation percentages in scholarship and service. For example, for faculty receiving release time from teaching, or in years of accreditation situations, service could count more than 30% of workload. These percentages are used to weight the rubric scores when calculating a composite score. Faculty can declare their percentages at the time they submit their papers for personnel actions or DSI consideration.

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

Evaluating Faculty Portfolios

Members of the Department's APTD Committee and the chairperson have the responsibility of evaluating faculty performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. That evaluation should take place in accord with the criteria established within this document. Evaluators assign a score for each area of responsibility consistent with the scoring rubrics described below. In addition to assigning whole number scores (ranging from 0-5) evaluators also may assign "plus" and "minus" scores (adding or subtracting .25-.50 from the whole numbers) when they believe that the faculty members performance falls somewhere between rubric levels.

Teaching

The Department of Kinesiology, Sport Studies and Physical Education values the following elements of good teaching:

1. evidence of student satisfaction
2. evidence of "student-centered" teaching
3. evidence of student learning/success
4. evidence of rigor and high expectations
5. evidence of knowledge of subject matter and use of effective methodologies and materials
6. evidence of student engagement, in and/or outside the classroom

Evaluation

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

- Evidence of student satisfaction:
 - IAS scores – An average of all IAS scores required; use of specific IAS scores delineated to demonstrate items below
 - APTD Committee discretion in terms of IAS score omission for extenuating circumstances (for example, substantive course modification, new course, etc) explained by faculty member
 - Student narrative comments
 - Other instructor solicited feedback
- Evidence of student centered teaching:
 - use of student feedback to make changes and course revisions;
 - time spent providing feedback;
 - time spent outside of class with students, beyond office hours for tutoring, feedback, review sessions, etc.;
 - "face time"

- Evidence of student learning/success:
 - scores on standardized exams
 - artifacts of student assignments;
 - student self appraisal of learning
 - assessment of course-based objectives

- Evidence of rigor and high expectations:
 - grade distribution (not sufficient evidence of rigor in and of itself, however;
 - quality artifacts produced by students;
 - writing intensive assignments;
 - course syllabi and objectives, including assignments and rubrics
 - average time students spend on course outside of class

- Evidence of knowledge of subject matter and use of effective methodologies and materials:
 - continued professional development – e.g. participation in CELT or other teaching oriented workshops; attendance at conferences
 - consistent course revisions
 - descriptions of innovative approaches to the content
 - use/development of current materials
 - use of technology in teaching
 - peer review of teaching (CELT or others)
 - new course development
 - use of feedback to improve teaching

- evidence of student engagement, in and/or outside the classroom ** See Student Engagement Task Force Report - Spring 2012 - for additional examples.)
 - evidence of active/collaborative learning (i.e., clickers, small group work, etc.)
 - faculty mentorship of students in thesis, independent study, Honor's thesis, directed study, McNair projects, etc.
 - student involvement in conferences or faculty directed scholarship (i.e., Scholar's Day)

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

5

- Student evaluations of IAS means generally $< .85$ or modes generally = 0.00 and strong evidence of at least five of the six remaining portfolio criteria

4

- Student evaluations of IAS means generally < 1.25 or modes generally = 1.00 and strong evidence of at least five of the six remaining portfolio criteria
- Student evaluations of IAS means generally $< .85$ or modes generally = .00 and strong evidence of at least four of the six remaining portfolio criteria

3

- Student evaluations of IAS means generally < 2.25 or modes generally = 2.00 and strong evidence of at least five of the six remaining portfolio criteria
- Student evaluations of IAS means generally < 1.25 or modes generally = 1.00 and strong evidence of at least four of the six remaining portfolio criteria
- Student evaluations of IAS generally $< .85$ or modes generally = .00 and strong evidence of at least three of the six remaining portfolio criteria

2

- Student evaluations of IAS means generally < 2.75 or modes generally = 2.00 and strong evidence of at least five of the six remaining portfolio criteria
- Student evaluations of IAS means generally < 2.25 or modes generally = 2.00 and strong evidence of at least four of the six remaining portfolio criteria
- Student evaluations of IAS means generally < 1.25 or modes generally = 1.00 and strong evidence of at least three of the six remaining portfolio criteria
- Student evaluations of IAS means generally $< .85$ or modes generally = .00, but no/little evidence (two of out five) of any of the remaining portfolio criteria

1

- Student evaluations of IAS means generally < 3.25 or modes generally = 3.00 and strong evidence of at least four of the six remaining portfolio criteria
- Student evaluations of IAS means generally < 2.75 or modes generally = 2.00 and strong evidence of at least three of the six remaining portfolio criteria
- Student evaluations of IAS means generally < 2.25 or modes generally = 2.00 and strong evidence of at two of the six remaining portfolio criteria

- Student evaluations of IAS means generally < 1.25 or modes generally = 1.00, but no/little evidence (zero or one out of six) of any of the remaining portfolio criteria

0

- No student evaluations submitted
- Student evaluations of IAS means generally > 3.25 or modes generally greater than 3.00
- Student evaluations of IAS means generally < 3.25 or modes generally = 3.00, but strong evidence for less than four of the remaining six portfolio criteria
- Student evaluations of IAS means generally < 2.75 or modes generally = 2.00 and 3.00, but strong evidence for less than two of the six remaining portfolio criteria
- Student evaluations of IAS means generally < 2.25 or modes generally = 2.00, but no/little evidence (zero to one) of any of the remaining portfolio criteria

Scholarship

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

- All forms of scholarship (basic, applied, integration, application, action, teaching, etc.) are recognized, but written works (including electronic formats) take precedence over presentations and adjudicated works take precedence over non-adjudicated works
- Quality (where adjudication takes the form of internal and external review processes)
- Volume (e.g., multiple quality scholarly products receive more credit than a single quality product)
- Significance (as evidenced by its professional impact, contribution to the body of knowledge, etc.)
- Scholarly activities that result in the acquisition of funds from external agencies which can be used to support research, training, or direct services under the direction of a faculty member
- Evidence of student engagement – published research with student(s), student involvement in the research process ** (see Student Engagement Task Force Report - Spring 2012 - for additional examples.)

Note: An active program of scholarship is defined as:

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

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

Refereed publications:

- Articles are subject to blind review
- Articles are substantive, not abstracts or non peer-reviewed proceedings
- Articles are related to the faculty member's area of expertise
- First or second author counts heavier than third or beyond, except in some areas (exercise physiology) where last author counts most heavily

Evaluation

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

5

- Authored an adjudicated book (books contain extensive narrative, and numerous citations; they are adopted by other institutions; they are subject to external review, etc. Compilations of class notes, lab worksheets, and production of ancillary materials do not constitute a textbook)
- Authored or co-authored three or more adjudicated scholarly papers in respected professional journals
- Recipient of a very large grant (\$50,000+)

4

- Edited or co-edited an adjudicated book or equivalent (case can be made to move to 5 based on evidence of major contribution beyond editing)
- Authored or co-authored two or more adjudicated papers in professional journals or equivalent
- Authored or co-authored two or more book chapters or equivalent
- Gave keynote address at a major conference or symposium or equivalent
- Recipient of a large grant (\$30,000 - \$49,000)
- Submission of a large 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) (\$50,000+)

3

- Authored or co-authored one adjudicated paper in a reputable professional journal or equivalent
- Authored or co-authored one book chapter or equivalent
- Edited a special topics issue in a journal or periodical or equivalent
- Gave invited presentation or presentations at national or international conference or symposium or equivalent
- Documented significant progress (as deemed appropriate by the APTD Committee) towards the completion of a textbook or research project that systematically requires more than one year to bring to full completion. This justification of a rubric rating of a 3 cannot be used for more than one year.
- Recipient of a moderate grant (\$10,000 - \$30,000)
- Submission of a large 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 - \$49,000)

2

- Authored or co-authored adjudicated paper or papers are “in press” (evidence required)
- Authored or co-authored non-adjudicated paper or papers are published
- Authored or co-authored adjudicated abstract
- Gave presentation at state, national, or international conference, symposium, or workshop (includes panel discussions, poster sessions, clinics, etc.) or equivalent
- Presentations are subject to blind review
- Recipient of a small grant (< \$10,000) from an external agency

1

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

0

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

Service

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

- Involvement with departmental “chores” (representing the department at SOAR sessions, transfer days, Open Houses, community colleges, high school “college nights,” graduate information nights and the like is a necessary component of every faculty members service portfolio)
- Quality student advisement (where student satisfaction, as evidenced by satisfaction survey, is a necessary condition)
- Active participation over simple attendance (indicate involvement)
- Leadership over active participation
- Involvement at multiple levels (departmental, college, university, professional, and community) (Community service, however, must be linked to the faculty member’s professional expertise.)
- Valuable products/outcomes are generated (e.g., successful searches completed, development of policy statements or reports, or goals attained)
- Volume (e.g., multiple quality service contributions receive more credit than single quality contributions)
- Community outreach is a legitimate service contribution
- Editorship of journal (length of service impacts score)/textbook
- Guest reviewer of a journal/textbook
- Evidence of student engagement - faculty leadership of community service activities, clubs, etc ** See Student Engagement Task Force Report - Spring 2012 - for additional examples.)

Evaluation

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

5

- Actively engaged in at least four service activities from three different levels (departmental, college, university, professional, community) with:
 - a) evidence of leadership on at least one,
 - b) evidence of effectiveness (products, outcomes, etc.) on all, and
 - c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement

4

- Actively engaged in at least three service activities from two different levels with:
 - a) evidence of leadership on at least one,

- b) evidence of effectiveness on all, and
 - c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement
- Actively engaged in at least three service activities from three different levels with:
 - a) evidence of effectiveness on all, and
 - b) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement

3

- Actively engaged in at least three service activities from two different levels with:
 - a) evidence of effectiveness on all, and
 - b) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement
- Actively engaged in at least two service activities from two different levels with:
 - a) evidence of leadership on at least one,
 - b) evidence of effectiveness on all, and
 - c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement

2

- Actively engaged in at least two service activities at any level with:
 - a) evidence of effectiveness on all, and
 - b) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement
- Actively engaged in at least one service activity at any level with:
 - a) evidence of leadership on at least one,
 - b) evidence of effectiveness on all, and
 - c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement

1

- Actively engaged in at least one service activity at any level and supported by evidence of involvement with department chores or quality advisement

0

- No service activities at any level
- Failure to participate in departmental chores or failure to provide quality advisement

- Note: Active involvement in multiple levels of service activities –
 - Departmental, School, College, University, Professional, Community – more levels and more activities = more credit
 - Leadership at one or more levels; more if leadership is for a large committee, school or university-wide committee, or at a state, national, or international level
 - Production of artifacts – e.g. PPR, accreditation self-studies, assessment materials, etc.

Weighting the Results of the Portfolio Evaluation

Each faculty member is evaluated through peer review on teaching, scholarship, and service. A score from 0-5.5 is assigned to each category based on the criteria associated with the rubrics. Rubric scores are then multiplied by the appropriate workload (or evaluation) percentage and added. Composite scores are then applied to criteria for “at rank” and “above rank.” Junior faculty (lecturers, instructors, and assistant professors) would need a composite score of 3 to be at rank, and a composite score of 3.00 or higher to be above rank for the purpose of DSI. Senior faculty (associate professors and higher) would need a composite score of 3 to be at rank and a composite score of 3.67 or higher to be above rank for the purpose of DSI.

* Please note: For DSI and renewal purposes, the expectation is that QARs with split appointments will perform some service for KSSPE.

Examples:

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

Teaching = 2.7
Scholarship = 3.1
Service = 1.0

Composite score = $2.7(.5) + 3.1(.4) + 1.0(.1)$
= 2.79

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

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

Teaching = 4.6
Scholarship = 3.0
Service = 4.1

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

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

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

Teaching = 3.9
Service = 2.2

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

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

Suggestions for Portfolio Development

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

Teaching

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

Scholarship

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

Service

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

Promotions

While these guidelines are indicators of what's minimally 'necessary' for promotion and tenure, they should not be interpreted as 'sufficient' criteria to ensure tenure and/or promotion.

** With regard to scholarly work performed prior to employment at The College at Brockport, as a general rule, if a faculty member's name and the Brockport Institution appear on a scholarly product the product should count towards tenure and/or promotion.

** With regard to faculty who are hired at The College at Brockport and bring time in from another institution, as a general rule, the faculty member is permitted to bring in a maximum of two scholarly publications from their most recent position (1-3 years typically) to count toward tenure and/or promotion.

Guidelines for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor (with tenure, as appropriate) in the Department of Kinesiology, Sport Studies and Physical Education

For teaching, KSSPE requires that junior faculty meet 4 of the 6 portfolio items in order to achieve the highest rubric score.

Candidates may solicit and include supplemental materials that guide primary evidence of productivity.

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** [i.e., IAS scores must be provided for all course sections taught at least over the most recent 5-year period and scores, at minimum, generally should be below 1.75; 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.]
 - **Assessment** [e.g., appropriate tools are used to assess student learning; feedback to students is timely and meaningful; grading patterns are appropriately rigorous; indices of student learning/success with direct ties to faculty member; class progress on student learning outcomes is assessed and appropriate steps are taken for continuous improvement (“closing the loop”); etc.]
 - **Student engagement** [e.g., chairs or serves on graduate project (thesis, synthesis, major paper, etc.) committee (beyond assigned teaching load); sponsors independent or directed studies; mentors Honors or McNair students; involves students in research or service projects outside of class; mentors students to publish a paper, present at professional conference, attain employment, or gain admission to graduate school; provides excellent academic advisement; etc.]
 - **Professional development** [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

Scholarship

- Portfolio must include evidence of publication of no fewer than 4 adjudicated papers (or equivalent)
 - All papers must appear in journals respected in the discipline
 - Regardless of equivalencies suggested below, the candidate must have at least 2 adjudicated papers published in respected journals in the discipline
 - Suggested equivalencies to adjudicated papers for this purpose:
 - One book chapter (“first edition”) can count as an equivalent
 - One funded external grant application greater than \$5,000 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)
- And portfolio must include evidence of no fewer than 3 presentations (or equivalent) at appropriate state-level or higher professional conferences
 - At least 1 of the 3 presentations must be at the national (or international) level
 - Suggested equivalencies to state-level or higher presentations
 - Two local presentations can be equivalent to 1 state-level presentation or higher (a maximum of 1 time)
- When scholarship is assessed, the conclusion must be that quality is good, that productivity likely will be sustained, and that the candidate has the potential to reach the scholarship guidelines associated with the rank of professor

Service

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

Guidelines for Promotion to the Rank of Professor in the Department of Kinesiology, Sport Studies and Physical Education

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):
 - **Instructional delivery** [i.e., IAS scores must be provided for all course sections taught at least over the most recent 5-year period and scores, at minimum, generally should be below 1.5; 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.*]
 - **Assessment** [e.g., appropriate tools are used to assess student learning; feedback to students is timely and meaningful; grading patterns are appropriately rigorous; indices of student learning/success with direct ties to faculty member; *class progress on student learning outcomes is assessed and appropriate steps are taken for continuous improvement (“closing the loop”); etc.*]
 - **Student engagement** [e.g., *chairs or serves on graduate project (thesis, synthesis, major paper, etc.) committee (beyond assigned teaching load);*

sponsors independent or directed studies; mentors Honors or McNair students; involves students in research or service projects outside of class; mentors students to publish a paper, present at professional conference, attain employment, or gain admission to graduate school; provides excellent academic advisement; etc.]

- **Professional development** [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.]
- For teaching KSSPE senior (tenured) faculty are required to meet 5 of the 6 portfolio items in order to achieve the highest rubric.
 - 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)
 - One funded external grant greater than \$10,000 or one external grant application that exceeds \$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

Multi-year Evaluation Material for Contract Renewal – Full Time (100%) QAR

Portfolio Content for the Department of Kinesiology, Sport Studies and Physical Education Personnel Review File for Contract Renewal

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

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

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

Teaching Requirements for Contract Renewal (65%)

The faculty member is expected to:

1. Teach a 4/4 course load or contribute more to service by assuming an advisement load greater than usual baseline for the department, 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 student learning (?)outcomes.
3. IAS scores where 100% 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 DSI Consideration

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

Procedures for Renewal or Promotion

- 1) Candidates submit a dossier listing career activities in teaching, scholarship, and service by the established deadline. The dossier, in particular, should highlight accomplishments since either the last review or since appointment/promotion to the current rank.
- 2) For renewals, peer review of the dossier will be completed by the standing APTD Committee. For promotions, the dossier is reviewed by either the standing APTD Committee or, if necessary, an ad hoc review committee appointed by either the department chair or, as appropriate, the dean. Under any circumstances, the review committee must have the following characteristics:
 - at least three members;
 - each member must be an associate professor or higher; and
 - in the case of promotion to full professor, at least one member must be a professor (or distinguished professor).
- 3) Dossiers are evaluated according to the criteria by rank established by the Board of Trustees. Committee members also may use the rubrics contained in this document as guidelines for levels of expectation in rank across teaching, scholarship, and service.
- 4) The review committee will provide a written recommendation summarizing the committee's deliberations to the department chair or dean (as appropriate). A copy of the recommendation is provided to the candidate. (**Note on process:** if College policy so requires, recommendations from the APTD Committee will go back to the Department prior to going to the chair. In such a case the faculty will vote to "endorse" or "not endorse" the recommendation of the committee. The file would then go to the chair with the committee's recommendation and the faculty vote on that recommendation.) The vote tally will be made available to the candidate following the decision.
- 5) If the candidate disagrees with the recommendation, he/she may appeal by contacting the committee chair.
- 6) The department chair or dean (as appropriate) conducts an independent evaluation and forwards the dossier with accompanying letters of recommendation to the dean. A copy of the chair's recommendation is provided the candidate.