

5-2014

Public Health and Health Education: Appointment, Promotion & Tenure Document

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, "Public Health and Health Education: Appointment, Promotion & Tenure Document" (2014).
Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation. 96.
<https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt/96>

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

Department of Public Health and Health Education

Appointment, Promotion & Tenure Document Guidelines for Personnel Recommendations

Version 11

Revised May 2014

By

Dr. Linda Snell, Interim APT Chair
Dr. Priya Banerjee
Dr. Jennifer Boyle

Revised by the HLS/APT Committee
May 1, 2006
Dr. Joseph E. Balog, Chair
Dr. Priya Banerjee
Dr. Tom Golaszewski
Dr. Celia Watt

Developed by the HLS/APT Committee
May 14, 1999
Dr. Linda F. Balog, Chair
Dr. Joseph E. Balog
Dr. Patti Follansbee
Mr. Gary Metz

Table of Contents

Preamble.....3

Introduction4

 Single Year Evaluation Guidelines.....6

 At Rank Performance Criteria for a Single-Year Guidelines.....6

 Renewal Guidelines7

 Minimum Performance Criteria for Renewal8

 Continuing Appointment Guidelines8

 Minimum Performance Criteria for Continuing Appointment9

 Promotion to Full Professor.....10

 Minimum Performance Criteria for Full Professor.....10

Discretionary Salary Increase (DSI) Guidelines11

 Additional DSI Categories11

 Minimum Performance Criteria of DSI12

 Meritorious Performance Criteria for DSI12

Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Evaluation Guidelines13

 Teaching Activities and Evaluation Guidelines.....13

 Minimum Performance Criteria for Continuing Appointment (Teaching)....13

 Scholarship Activities and Evaluation Guidelines.....17

 Minimum Performance Criteria for Continuing Appointment (Scholarship)18

 Service Activities and Evaluation Guidelines23

 Operationally Defining and Quantifying Service Activities.....23

 Minimum Performance Criteria for Continuing Appointment (Service).....24

 Additional Information Related to Service26

Evaluation of Chairperson.....27

Tables

 Table 1. Activities and Rating Scale for Teaching Effectiveness.....14

 Table 2. Activity and Point Values for Scholarly Activities19

 Table 3. Scholarly Activity Requirements for Continuing Appointment.....21

 Table 4. Scholarly Activity Requirements for Full Professor.....22

 Table 5. Activity and Point Values for Service Activities.....25

 Table 6. University, Public, and Professional Service Categories.....27

Appendix

 Appendix A, APT Document Revisions Chair Memorandum29

References.....30

Preamble

(The following paragraph is taken from the *Faculty Guide to Academic Practices and Policies at Brockport* in relation to Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.)

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 (although as a general rule, teaching must always be weighed 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 & Vice President for Academic Affairs. Accordingly, they represent the minimum guidelines agreed to by College Administration in making these decisions. *The 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.

Introduction

The following guidelines for renewal, continuing appointment, promotion, and discretionary salary increase (DSI) were developed to assist members of the Department of Public Health and Health Education in making long range plans related to APT and personnel recommendations. In developing these guidelines, the APT Committee took into consideration the existing departmental guidelines which had been in use for a number of years, the recommendations of the Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee, changes in the College Mission Statement, memoranda concerning criteria for personnel decisions issued by administrators, the “Faculty Guide to Academic Practices and Policies at Brockport: 2005-2006,” input from faculty and more recently the “Guidelines for the Revision of Departmental APT documents” document of October 25, 2011. The APT Committee incorporated many of the recommendations from the above sources into this document so that the Department of Public Health and Health Education criteria will continue to be in harmony with those of the administration, the Faculty Senate, and the goals, mission, and philosophy of the Department of Public Health and Health Education. In particular, this most recent version of the department’s APT document includes alterations made to the criteria for scholarship for continuing appointment.

These guidelines are intended to provide guidance to the faculty of the Department of Public Health and Health Education and The College at Brockport Administration about the Department of Public Health and Health Education’s APT standards assuming performance at rank in all three areas, such that teaching is weighted greater than scholarship, which in turn is weighted greater than service. Currently, the college operationally defines “weighted greater” with the following formula: Teaching > Scholarship > Service where Teaching \geq 50%. In general, the college operationally places this formula into action with a normal expectation of teaching a 3/3 course load and an active program in scholarship and service. In many cases, it is possible for faculty to be engaged in heavy scholarly and service activities that lead to a reduced load in teaching. Likewise, it is possible for faculty to not meet standards for scholarly and service activities leading to an increased load in teaching. Faculty are expected to be involved in an appropriate mix of teaching, scholarship, and service activities throughout a faculty member’s career at Brockport, and it is a responsibility of administration to help create an environment that is conducive to actualizing an appropriate balance of these functions.

During any given year, a faculty may exceed or fall short of minimum expectations based on workload norms of the department. However, over a three-year period it is expected that an appropriate mix of teaching, scholarship, and service activities will be reached unless extenuating circumstances exist to justify imbalances. Faculty engaged in demanding responsibilities in any one area of teaching, scholarship, or service should be given the opportunity of a reduced load elsewhere, which may include an adjustment to the minimum expectation for earned points in one or more areas for at rank status in yearly evaluation, renewal, and/or continued appointment/promotion. For example, the position of departmental chair, president of the College Senate, president/board member of a national professional organization, chair of a major college service activity, or equivalents of the preceding are defined as an unusually demanding service and warranting a reduced load in teaching or scholarship. Conversely, faculty not meeting scholarship or service standards may be given increases in teaching or service responsibilities.

The Department of Public Health and Health Education's guidelines also are intended to provide its faculty with a better understanding of the criteria that are used for evaluating a faculty member's applications for renewal, continuing appointment, promotion to Associate and Full Professor, and DSI. Faculty are reminded that promotion to Assistant Professor in this department from the ranks of Instructor or Lecturer is usually dependent upon an agreement with the faculty member and the administration that he or she obtain a doctorate degree. Therefore, the Committee has not concerned itself with establishing additional criteria for promotion to this beginning professional rank.

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

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

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

In addition to their annual performance review, faculty in the Department of Public Health and Health Education must submit an application to be evaluated at the following points during their appointment at the College at Brockport, unless otherwise negotiated with the administration.

Tenure Calendar for faculty with no prior service credit

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8
Fall	Appointment							Tenure date
Spring		Review for Renewal for a term of 3 years*			Review for renewal for one more year **	Review for tenure**		Continuing Appointment (Tenure)

*If negative, year 3 is terminal year; **If negative, year 7 terminal year;

If the review is positive, tenure is effective after completion of year 7.

For more details: <https://www.brockport.edu/acadaff/facguide/persaction/B.html>

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

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

Single Year Evaluation Guidelines

All faculty in the Department of Public Health and Health Education are evaluated annually in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service. Faculty are expected to maintain a performance *at least* “at rank” every year. Faculty should submit their Annual Report for single year evaluations.

At Rank Performance Criteria for a Single-Year Evaluation

1. Teaching (Assistant Professor and QAR level): evidence of an appropriate level of teaching by earning 5 points per year in Category A (Required Teaching Activities), one point in Category B (IAS/teaching evaluation) and an additional 3 points per year in Category C (Additional Teaching Activities) and 2 points from Category D (Teaching Improvement) for a total of **11 points per year**.
Teaching (Associate and Full Professor level): evidence of an appropriate level of teaching by earning 5 points per year in Category A (Required Teaching Activities), one point in Category B and an additional 4 points per year in Category C (Additional Teaching Activities) and 3 points from Category D (Teaching Improvement) for a total of **13 points per year**.

2. Scholarship (Assistant Professor level): demonstrate the ability to conduct and produce scholarship by earning **at least 1 point from Table 2**, demonstrating an active program of scholarship*. *Note, that in preparation for the second Renewal, Assistant faculty must have in hand, at least one-three point, published journal article and one more (2 or 3 point) article in-press.*

Scholarship (Associate and Full Professor level): demonstrate the continuation of an active program of scholarship* by earning **at least 2 points from Table 2**.

*(*An active program of scholarship is defined as: An annual “at rank” performance and a minimum of 1 peer-reviewed 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.)*

3. University, Public and Professional Service (Assistant Professor and QAR level): evidence of involvement in service demonstrated by performing at least 3 service activities totaling **4 points from Table 5**. This level of activity should include serving on at least 2 departmental activities each year (2 points per year), and additional service activities listed in Tables 5 & 6.

University, Public and Professional Service (Associate and Full Professor level): evidence of involvement in service demonstrated by performing at least **4** service activities totaling **6 points from Tables 5 & 6**. This level should include serving on at least 2 departmental activities each year and earning at least 3 points each year from additional service activities that are listed in Tables 5 & 6.

Renewal Guidelines

Concerning renewal, the applicant requesting consideration should present appropriate evidence of performance in the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service for each year of service being considered for renewal. Unless otherwise specified, the APT Committee assumes that a faculty’s renewal application should include evidence of performance over the last year of appointment for the initial renewal for a term of 3 years and in the 5th year for the second renewal for a term of 1 year prior to tenure at The College at Brockport, SUNY. The following information presents performance criteria guidelines for renewal:

Minimum Performance Criteria for Renewal

1. Teaching: evidence of an appropriate level of teaching by earning 5 points per year in Category A (Required Teaching Activities), one point per year in Category B (IAS/teaching evaluation), and an additional 3 points per year in Category C (Additional Teaching Activities) and 2 points per year in Category D (Teaching Improvement).
2. Scholarship: demonstrate the ability to conduct and produce scholarship by earning at least 3 points, or demonstrating the potential (for example, article in review) to earn 3 points and produce peer-reviewed scholarship, over the renewal periods from Table 2. At the second renewal period prior to tenure, at least one three-point article must have been published and another (2 or 3 point) article must be in-press.
3. University, Public, and Professional Service: evidence of involvement in service as demonstrated by performing at least 6 service activities that total 8 points over a two-year period of time from Table 5. This level of activity should include at least 2 departmental activities each year (4 points over two years) and earning at least 4 points over a two-year period from additional service activities that are listed in Tables 5 and 6.

Continuing Appointment Guidelines

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

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

Concerning continuing appointment, the applicant requesting consideration should present evidence of quality performance in the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service for the five to six years of untenured appointment in the college. In addition, faculty applying for continuing appointment and promotion must, in the area of scholarship, demonstrate significant advancement in the area of scholarship beyond the level of Assistant Professor and beyond the presentation of doctoral dissertation results to new areas of investigation. In the Department of Public Health and Health Education, this expectation is operationally defined by a faculty having to publish four peer-reviewed articles where at least one article represents research beyond the candidate's dissertation results. The following information presents performance criteria guidelines for continuing appointment:

Minimum Performance Criteria for Continuing Appointment

1. Teaching: evidence of an appropriate level of teaching by earning 5 points per year in Category A (Required Teaching Activities) for a total of 25 points over 5 years, one point per year in Category B (IAS/teaching evaluation)* for a total of 5 points over 5 years, and an additional 3 points per year in Category C (Additional Teaching Activities) for a total of 15 points over 5 years and 2 points per year in Category D (Teaching Improvement) for a total of 10 points over 5 years. **3 out of the 5 points in Category B (IAS/teaching evaluation) should come from IAS scores.*
2. Scholarship: demonstrate ability to conduct and produce scholarship. Faculty must publish four peer-reviewed articles. Three out of the four peer-reviewed articles must be “3-point” articles, and the fourth article can be a two-point article (see Table 2). In addition, faculty must accumulate an additional 7 points in scholarship, with 5 of these points earned from scholarly presentations. Finally, faculty must show significant advancement in the area of scholarship beyond the level of Assistant Professor and beyond the presentation of doctoral dissertation results to new areas of investigation. In the Department of Public Health and Health Education, this expectation is operationally defined and met by the candidate publishing new research beyond the study and results of his or her dissertation in at least one of four, peer-reviewed articles.
3. University, Public, and Professional Service: evidence of involvement in service as demonstrated by performing at least 15 service activities from Table 5 (page 25). These 15 activities should include at least 4 activities at the process level of involvement (8 points) and 5 service activities at or above the leadership level of involvement (10 points). In total, faculty must earn at least 30 points in service over a five-year period. Also, faculty should perform service activities in at least 3 of the 5 categories of service – department, school, college, community, and professional.

Promotion to Full Professor

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

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

Minimum Performance Criteria for Full Professor

1. Teaching: evidence of an appropriate level of teaching by earning 5 points per year in Category A (Required Teaching Activities), one point per year in Category B (IAS/teaching evaluation), and an additional 3 points per year in Category C (Additional Teaching Activities) and 2 points per year in Category D (Teaching Improvement) from Table 1. In addition, exceptional teaching may be indicated by earning additional points.
2. Scholarship: demonstrate ability to produce scholarship. Faculty should demonstrate that their scholarly activities have a significant value for the profession and are of a high quality. To minimally demonstrate appropriate performance in scholarship, faculty must earn 30 points from scholarly activities that include at least 18 points from peer-reviewed publications since being promoted to the rank of Associate Professor (see Table 2). In addition, exceptional scholarship may be indicated by earning additional points.
3. University, Public, and Professional Service: evidence of involvement in service with a combination of service activities at the process, leadership, and outcome levels that should include the accumulation of at least 30 points from Table 5, since being promoted to the rank of Associate Professor. To demonstrate appropriate performance in this service, faculty must present evidence of significant contributions at the levels of leadership and outcome that involve school, college, community, or professional service. In addition, exceptional service may be indicated by earning additional points.

Discretionary Salary Increase (DSI) Guidelines

To qualify for consideration for a DSI during a one-year period, a faculty member is expected to present evidence of single-year “at rank” performance for the appropriate level (assistant or QAR and associate or full) of faculty designation in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and present evidence of exceptional performance in at least one area of either teaching, scholarship, or service. In the second category for an individual faculty DSI during a one-year period, a faculty member is expected to present evidence of extraordinary performance in at least one area of teaching, scholarship, or service.

Additional DSI Categories

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

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

Faculty members wishing to be considered for DSI will submit their annual reports and supporting documentation to the APT Committee. Supporting documentation should demonstrate the quality as well as the quantity of the contributions. The APT committee will review each applicant's file and make recommendations to the department Chair.

The Chair will add his/her own recommendations and then along with other chairs of the School of Professions meet with the Dean and recommend DSI recipients.

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

Minimum Performance Criteria for DSI

Evidence of an appropriate level of teaching, scholarship and service by meeting “at rank” performance criteria in a single-year appropriate for each level (assistant or QAR, and associate or full) of faculty designation (see pages 6 & 7 for “at rank” performance criteria).

Meritorious Performance Criteria for DSI

- **For a teaching DSI**, assistant and QAR faculty must earn 5 points from Category A (Required Teaching Activities), one point from Category B (IAS/teaching evaluation) and an additional 6 points from Categories C (Additional Teaching Activities) & D (Teaching Improvement) for a total of 12 points, from Table 1.
- Faculty at the associate or full professor level must earn 5 points from Category A (Required Teaching Activities), one point from Category B (IAS/teaching evaluation) and an additional 8 points from Categories C (Additional Teaching Activities) & D (Teaching improvement) for a total of 14 points, from Table 1.
- **For a scholarship DSI**, assistant and QAR* faculty must demonstrate exceptional performance by earning at least 4 points in scholarly activities from Table 2. This scholarly performance must include at least 3 points from peer-reviewed scholarly activities (e.g. funded scholarly grant or published, peer-reviewed scholarly journal article). (**Note: typically, QAR faculty do not have expectations in scholarship, but it is possible for QAR faculty to earn a DSI in scholarship, if they earn sufficient points in scholarship and are performing “at rank” in the other two areas.*)
Faculty at the associate or full professor level faculty must demonstrate exceptional performance by earning at least 5 points in scholarly activities from Table 2. This scholarly performance must include at least 3 points from peer-reviewed scholarly activities (e.g. funded scholarly grant or published, peer-reviewed scholarly journal article).
- **For a service DSI**, assistant and QAR faculty must demonstrate exceptional performance by being involved in service at the leadership or outcome levels and earn at least 8 points from service activities listed in Table 5.
Faculty at the associate or full professor level must demonstrate exceptional performance by being involved in service at the leadership or outcome levels and earn at least 10 points from Tables 5 & 6.

Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Evaluation Guidelines

Teaching Activities and Evaluation Guidelines

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

Minimum Performance Criteria for Continuing Appointment

Teaching: evidence of an appropriate level of teaching by earning 5 points per year in Category A (Required Teaching Activities) for a total of 25 points over 5 years, one point per year in Category B (IAS/teaching evaluation)* for a total of 5 points over 5 years, and an additional 3 points per year in Category C (Additional Teaching Activities) for a total of 15 points over 5 years and 2 points per year in Category D (Teaching Improvement) for a total of 10 points over 5 years. *3 out of the 5 points in Category B (IAS/teaching evaluation) should come from IAS scores.

Table 1. Activities and rating scale for teaching effectiveness

Activity		Yes (1 point)	No (0 points)	Not Applicable
A. Required teaching activities				
1.	Evaluation of classroom performance by students utilizing the approved college instructor evaluation form.			
2.	Grade distribution and analysis (1 point)			
3.	Provision of course materials (1 point) Examples: Current and up-to-date course outline that includes course: description, goals, objectives, required and recommended readings, evaluation criteria, assignments, activities, attendance policy, disability statement, schedule, instructor information (office hours, etc.), and other course requirements; faculty completes course-related book orders, midterm progress reports, and grade submissions			
4.	Performs appropriate course advisement (1 point) Examples: Provides required number of office hours Provides course advisement			
5.	Performs Major Advisement (1 point) Examples: Provides appropriate advisement to majors Number of undergraduate advisees ____ Number of graduate advisees ____ Faculty is available to students Faculty schedules adequate office hours Faculty provides career advisement Faculty completes documents that support advisement (e.g. internship procedures)			

B. IAS/ teaching evaluation		Yes (1 point)	No (0 point)
1.	IAS Scores ≤ 2.0 , computed as an average of the first 4 items on the IAS per course, for 65% (4 out of 6 for tenure-track and 6 out of 8 for QAR faculty) of courses taught annually.		
2.	Evaluation of teaching by Department Chairperson.		

C. Additional teaching activities (each activity=1 pt.; maximum of 3 points per category)				
1.	Evaluation of classroom performance by students utilizing the approved college instructor evaluation form IAS scores generally ≤ 1.00 (3 points) IAS scores generally ≤ 1.50 (2 points)			
2.	Evaluation of classroom performance by peers Examples: Observation of teaching by peers, using a departmentally approved teaching evaluation form (to be developed).			
3.	Development of effective course materials Examples: Development of effective lesson plans Development of effective learning activities Demonstration of effective teaching methodologies Demonstration of effective integration of technology into course curriculum			
4.	Student Learning Outcomes Examples: Assessment instruments Competencies assessments Pre & post assessments Demonstration of improvement in knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors Demonstration of student improvement in academic skills Demonstration of quality student projects related to course work and faculty's intervention			
5.	Invitation of teaching or lecturing to The College at Brockport students in a credit bearing course.			
6.	Awards Teaching awards DSI teaching awards (for promotion or renewal)			
7.	Other instruction-related responsibilities (no maximum) Examples: Additional Advisement Practicum Internships Thesis/Major Paper (Chair-1 pt. at completion, 1/2 pt. each semester registered; reader-1/2 point at completion) Directed/Independent studies Student projects			
7.	Other			

D. Teaching Improvement		(maximum of 3 points per category)		
1.	<p>Development of new courses and/or major revision and updating of existing courses</p> <p>Example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of a new required or elective course for the department or college Development of new course objectives, description, materials and assignments 			
2.	<p>Additional evaluation of classroom performance</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional classroom evaluation instruments Focus group evaluations Additional peer evaluations Other 			
3.	<p>Professional development and continuing education</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshops attended Professional conferences attended CEUs acquisition Professional development participation Participation in curriculum review/revision Description of strategy or plan for improving instruction 			
4.	<p>Development of non-peer reviewed teaching materials</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publication of textbooks Publication of teaching manuals Publication of textbook aids Publication of CDs and other teaching “technology” aids 			
5.	Evaluation of Advisement			

Scholarship Activities and Evaluation Guidelines

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

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

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

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

Scholarship of **Teaching**, according to Boyer (1990) is defined as scholarly activity centered around students, designed to stimulate active learning, critical and creative thinking. It is a dynamic activity that bridges the gap between a teacher's understanding and the students' learning in an attempt to answer the question: "What are effective ways to represent and present the discipline in a meaningful way?" (Cranton, 2011). Further, Walker, Baepfer & Cohen (2008) state that scholarship of teaching has three foundational facets, namely: 1) engaging with scholarship – keeping abreast of the most current in educational scholarship in the faculty's discipline, 2) putting scholarship into action – applying the most current educational research in their teaching and most importantly, 3) contributing to scholarship by reporting on the success or failure of pedagogical experiments using tools of traditional research. Thus, Scholarship of Teaching is demonstrated by (but not limited to): scholarly activities that explore, test, practice and communicate improved pedagogies, curricula, policies and learning materials in the discipline (as cited in Vardi & Quin, 2011).

Thus, all forms of scholarship (discovery, integration, application and teaching) are recognized, and peer-reviewed, published work has the highest value.

An active program of scholarship is defined as: An annual "at rank" performance and a minimum of 1 peer-reviewed 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. Note that expectations for continuing appointment and/or renewal are different from performance at rank in a single year and maintaining a minimum standard of active scholarship. It is the responsibility of the untenured faculty to understand the requirements for renewal and continuing appointment and prepare to meet them.

Faculty must document their scholarly activities. In most cases, this documentation should be in the form of qualitative and quantitative products that can be peer-reviewed through refereed and peer-reviewed journals, books, chapters in books, monographs, presentations, symposia, and other acceptable, professional, refereed and peer-reviewed products. Table 2 presents common scholarly activities that can be placed into the categories of discovery, integration, and application. Each scholarly activity in Table 2 has a point value to demonstrate its relative importance in the area of scholarship and to the department. Faculty who believe that a scholarly activity has additional merit may provide evidence to justify the awarding of additional points for such scholarly products. Faculty can and should be involved with a variety of scholarly activities to report in their personnel documents. However, faculty should note, especially faculty who are seeking personnel decisions, such as renewal, continuing appointment, promotion, and DSIs decisions, that peer-reviewed products in the form of professional journal articles are essential products to have in one's performance documentation. Alternative forms of refereed and peer-reviewed scholarly products will be considered as evidence of scholarship; however, faculty must present the supporting evidence that demonstrates the credibility, quality, and value of such work.

Concerning the essential criteria for continuing appointment, the information below presents the minimum standard for being considered for continuing appointment. Faculty seeking continuing appointment should meet the below minimum standards within a projected six-year period of employment at The College at Brockport, SUNY.

Minimum Performance Criteria for Continuing Appointment

1. Scholarship: demonstrate ability to conduct and produce scholarship. Faculty must publish four peer-reviewed articles. Three out of the four peer-reviewed articles must be "3-point" articles, and the fourth article can be a two-point article (see Table 2) for a total of 11 points. In addition, faculty must accumulate an additional 7 points in scholarship, with 5 of these points earned from scholarly presentations. Finally, faculty must show significant advancement in the area of scholarship beyond the level of Assistant Professor and beyond the presentation of doctoral dissertation results to new areas of investigation. In the Department of Public Health and Health Education, this expectation is operationally defined and met by the candidate publishing new research beyond the study and results of his or her dissertation in at least one of four peer-reviewed articles.

Table 2. Activity and point values for scholarly activities

	Activity	Points
1.	Article – peer-reviewed, national/international journal a. 1 st or 2 nd author, original contribution (3 points) b. Additional points can be added up to a total of 5 points based on: the tier of the journal (i.e., a tier one journal such as the American Journal of Public Health can add point values), impact of the article, frequency of citations, etc. c. 3 rd or further author, original contribution (2 points) d. Regional or state journal articles earn 2 points e. Brief reports, research briefs earn 2 points	1 - 5
2.	Book – of discovery, integration, application and peer-reviewed (authorship, literary composition., 1 st or repeat edition)	3 - 5
3.	Monograph – peer-reviewed, national/international journal	3 - 5
4.	Funded scholarly grant (points are based on: scholarship, authorship, rank, source of funding, amount of money, contribution to new knowledge, peer-reviewed)	3 - 5
5.	Presentation – peer-reviewed, national/international conference with appropriate documentation (scholarly presentation, poster, panel discussant with prepared text, solo, keynote, invited)	2 - 3
6.	Published presentation – peer-reviewed, national/international conference with appropriate documentation such as published proceedings (abstract, article-like; no duplicate points for “presentation” , #5 above)	2 - 4
7.	Chapter in a published book, peer-reviewed (1 st or revised edition, authorship)	2 - 5
8.	Article – peer reviewed, regional, state, local journal (see #1 criteria)	2
9.	Edited book – related to discipline & peer-reviewed (original chapter, collected readings, author’s text)	1 - 3
10.	Presentation – peer-reviewed, regional, state, local conference with appropriate documentation (see #5 above)	1 - 3
11.	Development and publication of media or software materials such as CDs, audio tapes, teaching materials, etc., peer-reviewed (product must create something new in terms of knowledge – new meaning and insights; faculty need to	1 - 3

	identify if it is scholarship, teaching, or service)	
12.	Scholarly review – of a single book, software, media, published in a peer-reviewed journal (note: a review of literature normally belongs under #1 & #7)	1
13.	Respondent/discussant/panel member – written and documented critique of the papers presented at professional conference, peer-reviewed.	1
14.	Submitted/Pending scholarly grant (points are based on: scholarship, authorship, rank, source of funding, amount of money, contribution to new knowledge, peer-reviewed; for other types of grants see “Service”)	1-2
15.	Accepted peer-reviewed article or papers “in press” (note: points can only be used to achieve at rank status but not meritorious status)	1
16.	Other: activities or evidence of scholarly or creative accomplishment (editorships, consulting, reviews, etc.)	1 - 3

Table 3. Scholarly Activity Requirements for Continuing Appointment

Faculty must produce a minimum of four peer-reviewed journal articles where the first three are three point, journal articles, published in national or international peer-reviewed journals. The fourth article can be a two-point article in a peer-reviewed journal (see Table 2), for a total of 11 points. In addition, faculty must accumulate an additional 7 points in scholarship, with 5 of these points earned from scholarly presentations. Finally, faculty must show significant advancement in the area of scholarship beyond the level of Assistant Professor and beyond the presentation of doctoral dissertation results to new areas of investigation. In the Department of Public Health and Health Education, this expectation is operationally defined and met by the candidate publishing new research beyond the study and results of his or her dissertation in at least one of four peer-reviewed articles.

Table 4. Scholarly Activity Requirements for Full Professor

Promotion to Full Professor
<p>Faculty must demonstrate the ability to produce scholarship by producing scholarly activities that have a significant value for the profession and are of a high quality. To minimally demonstrate appropriate performance in scholarship, faculty must earn a minimum of 30 points from scholarly activities that include a minimum of an additional 18 points from published peer-reviewed articles and/or published peer-reviewed books of discovery, integration, application, or teaching since being promoted to the rank of Associate Professor (see Table 2). In addition, exceptional scholarship may be indicated by earning additional points.</p>

Service Activities and Evaluation Guidelines

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

Operationally Defining and Quantifying Service Activities

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

Participation involvement is defined as attending and/or volunteering for various types of departmental and college functions such as graduation, honors ceremonies, SOARS, Open Houses, Graduate Advisory Boards, convener, writing letters of recommendations for students, etc. Each of these items would be worth .50 points, with a maximum cap of 2 points in this category per year.

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

For example, a faculty member can earn 1-2 points for being an active and effective member of a department's APT Committee or 1-2 points for delivering a workshop that had been previously developed and implemented on other occasions.

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

For example, a faculty member can earn 2-3 points for chairing a Faculty Senate Standing Committee, 2-3 points for being a coordinator of a program area or 2-3 points for being a key member on a site accreditation team that involves specific leadership involvement.

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

For example, a faculty member can earn 3-4 points for producing and being the primary author of a specific product that offers a significant service contribution, e.g. an “Ad Hoc Committee Report on How to Integrate Multiculturalism into SUNY Brockport’s Curricula” or for being an active and productive officer of an national professional organization.

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

Table 5 presents examples of service activities and their point value related to level of performance. Table 5 is not an all inclusive list of service activities; however, the list should help in identifying appropriate service activities and their point values.

Minimum Performance Criteria for Continuing Appointment

1. University, Public, and Professional Service: evidence of involvement in service as demonstrated by performing at least 15 service activities from Table 5 (page 24). These 15 activities should include at least 4 activities at the process level of involvement (8 points) and 5 service activities at or above the leadership level of involvement (10 points). In total, faculty must earn at least 30 points in service over a five-year period. Also, faculty should perform service activities in at least 3 of the 5 categories of service – department, school, college, community, and professional.

Table 5. Activity and point values for service activities

	Activity	Participation (.50)	Process * (1-2 points)	Leadership (2-3 points)	Outcome (3-4 points)
1.	Participation at professional functions (e.g. graduation, honors ceremonies, convocation, SOARS, Open Houses, Saturday Information Sessions, Graduate Advisory Boards, convener, writing letters of recommendations for students, interviews, etc.)	.50- max. of 2			
2.	Member of department, school, or college committee (an additional point may be earned in extraordinary circumstances)		1 - 2		
3.	Advisor to department, school, college or student committee or organization		1 - 2		
4.	Chair of panels/sessions for a college-wide program		1 - 2		
5.	Teaching/lecturing outside a credit bearing course of The College at Brockport, SUNY; Examples include: Workshop presenter Adult & Continuing Education Professional groups Guest lecturer (not in a College at Brockport, SUNY credit- bearing course) Guest lecturer for college event/student organization		1 - 2		
6.	Authorship of unfunded grants that involves a non-scholarly grant proposal		1 - 2		
7.	Member of the board of directors of a local, state, national or international professional organization		1 - 2		
8.	Member of a local, state, national, or international committee		1 - 2		
9.	Member, site/accreditation team		1 - 2		
10.	Editorial reviewer for professional publications (manuscripts, software, etc.)		1 - 2		
11.	Officer of a local, state, national, or international professional organization			2 - 3	
12.	Officer of the board of directors of a local, state, national, or international			2 - 3	
13.	Invited consultant and evidence of leadership involvement			2 - 3	
14.	Coordinator of a program area			2 - 3	
15.	Head of a major service activity, such as program accreditation			2 - 3	
16.	Chair, site/accreditation team			2 - 3	
17.	Convener/leader of an original workshop			2 - 3	

	Activity	Participation (.50)	Process * (1-2 points)	Leadership (2-3 points)	Outcome (3-4 points)
18.	Special task assignment (e.g., undergraduate advisement coordinator, library coordinator, department leader of assessment activities) (1-4 points)				
19.	Chairperson on an local, state, national, or international committee with evidence of outcome involvement			2 - 3	
20.	Chairperson of a College at Brockport, SUNY ad hoc committee and author of a report that impacts and improves college and/or professional practice				3 - 4
21.	Chairperson or author of a report of a site/accreditation team with evidence of outcome involvement (e.g. author of a report)				3 - 4
22.	Chairperson of a department, school, or college committee with evidence of significant leadership and important outcome product (e.g. leader of department accreditation activities including the assembling of an accreditation document)				3 - 4
23.	Authorship of funded grants that involves a non-scholarly grant proposal (does not involve “discovery, integration and application of theoretical frameworks”).				3 - 4
24.	Chairperson of a department (see below for administrative duties of Chairperson)	2x meritorious threshold			

***An example of 2 points in “Process” would be having a specific responsibility and contribution, actually writing something, etc.**

Additional information related to service

According to the administration, service will be evaluated as rigorously as teaching and scholarship. In addition, the administration believes that faculty should be involved in three categories of service: (1) University service which includes departmental, school, and college activities; (2) Public service which includes the offering of professional service activities to the community groups and organizations that are related to the faculty member’s discipline; and (3) Professional service which includes the offering of service activities to a faculty member’s professional organizations. The following Table 6 presents examples of these three categories of service:

➤ **Evaluation of Chairperson**

The APT committee will make a qualitative assessment of the typical activities that a chairperson performs in that role. These roles and responsibilities (Section 122.01 of the Faculty Handbook) include:

- Academic Planning
- Personnel
- Students
- Budget
- Space and Equipment
- General Operations

A detailed description of each of these roles can be found in the Faculty Handbook, Sections 122.02-122.07.

The APT committee also reserves the right to decrease these points if there is not a majority vote that the chairperson is fulfilling the typical chair responsibilities. Every member of the committee would vote on the number of points the chairperson gets, and the final score would be the average. Each APT committee member would anonymously vote (within the 0-2x meritorious range).

Table 6. University, College, Public & Professional Service Categories

University Service	
A. Departmental Service: Department of Public Health and Health Education Examples	
1.	Effective participation on standing, ad-hoc, or other committees or units of department governance.
2.	Leadership and/or administrative responsibilities on standing, ad-hoc, or other committees or units of departmental governance.
3.	Effective contributions to professional growth of students, and to positive student-departmental interaction through such activities as recruitment of majors, accurate academic advisement information about college activities and advisement of student service activities.
B. School, College-wide and/or University-Wide Service	
1.	Effective participation on inter-departmental or college-wide standing, ad-hoc, or other committees or units of college governance.
2.	Leadership and/or administrative responsibilities on interdepartmental or college-wide standing, ad-hoc, or other committees or units or college governance.
3.	Effective participation on regional or state-wide standing, ad-hoc, or other committees or units of SUNY governance
4.	Leadership and/or administrative responsibilities on regional or statewide standing, ad-hoc, or other committees or units of SUNY governance.

Public Service	
1.	Effective participation as a professional consultant or resource to a significant public event or activity of a community, state, regional, or national organization
2.	Developer and presenter of a health-related workshop for professional or community groups and organizations.
3.	Effective participation as a member of an advisory board or other committee, or of a Board of Directors or similar body of community, state, regional, or national organization.
Professional Service	
1.	Effective participation on committees, task forces, Board of Directors, or other units of local, regional, state, or national organizations related to the professional discipline of the faculty member.
2.	Editorial reviewer for professional publications (manuscripts, software, etc.)
3.	Leadership and/or administrative responsibilities on committee task forces, Board of Directors, or other units of local regional, state, or national organizations related to the professional discipline of the faculty member.
<p><u>Note:</u> Evidence of performance of service activities may include, but not be limited to, the following materials: Description of the activity and the applicant’s specific role in it; a quantitative summary of the time period of the activity, number of meetings, amount of time required for participation; copies of materials produced by the activity with specification of the applicant’s role in their preparation, and activities which may have resulted from the applicant’s performance.</p>	

Appendix A

To: Christine Murray, Ph.D.
Dean, School of Professions

From: Douglas Scheidt, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Health Science

Date: 5/19/05

Re: APT Document Revisions

In the spring of 2004, the Deans Council requested that the Health Science evaluate “at rank” performance in teaching, scholarship and service for continuing at a 3/3 course load. The department, by past practice, had been using the minimum criteria established for DSI for this purpose. According to the Department of Public Health and Health Education’s criteria for minimum performance for DSI in the area of scholarship the threshold was at one point. Despite previous use of this threshold for DSI and annual reports, the Dean of the School of Professions requested that the department establish an increased threshold for scholarship to match the threshold for continuing appointment at a meeting on April 6, 2005. According to the Department of Health Science’s criteria for minimum performance for continuing appointment in scholarship, the threshold was an average of three points per year from scholarly activities as described in “Table 2. Activity and point values for scholarly activities.” The APT committee recommended, and all faculty present (4/19/05) unanimously accepted the recommendation, that the threshold should be determined by the department.

The department acknowledges the mandate that it needs to clearly state in the HLS/APT document that there exists, for all faculty, an expectation for successful teaching, scholarship and service throughout faculty careers. In particular, the department also agrees with the Dean’s position that it reaffirms that scholarship is important, and when and where appropriate, scholarly activities should lead to publications. The amount and type of scholarly activities that are performed on a continuing and ongoing basis should be determined by the department especially considering the demands that teaching and service responsibilities place on Health Science faculty throughout their careers.

References

- Cranton, P. (2011). A transformative perspective on the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Higher Education Research & Development, 30*(1), 75-86, DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2011.536974
- Vardi, I. & Quin, R. (2011). Promotion and the scholarship of teaching and learning, *Higher Education Research & Development, 30*(1), 39-49, DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2011.536971
- Walker, J. D., Baepler, P. & Cohen, B. (2008). The scholarship of teaching and learning paradox. Results without rewards. *College Teaching, 56*(3), 183-189. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier.