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DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL STANDARDS

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY

I. Preface

The Department of Kinesiology (hereafter called the "Department") is committed to providing high quality programs that contribute to a broad understanding of human motor performance. Emphasis is on the examination of the entire life span from infancy through the older adult years, with special attention to improving the quality of life and human condition in an ever-changing and multi-cultural society. The Department is also committed to the preeminence of learning and to the establishment of an environment where learning and the expansion of knowledge are central to all activities. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs is the instructional faculty and seeks to promote excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. It is the position of the Department that the maintenance and enhancement of high quality faculty requires clear communication with respect to personnel expectations and evaluation. Therefore, the Department proposes a personnel document, consistent with the University Mission and Goals and with UPS 210.000, which describes the criteria for assessing faculty productivity with respect to retention, tenure, and promotion.

II. Department Structure

The Department of Kinesiology is led by a Department Chair who is selected via a modified UPS 211.100 procedure approved by the President. The Department offers degree programs in Kinesiology (B.S., M.S., and Minor) as well as coursework, which contribute to various specializations, professional credentials and certifications, to general education, and to individual physical development and lifelong health and well being.

III. Scope of Document

This document will summarize policies and procedures with respect to the selection and function of the Department Personnel Committee, the preparation of a Prospectus, and the preparation of Portfolios. This document will also describe criteria to be used in the evaluation of Portfolios during the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process.

IV. Department Personnel Committee

A. Committee Functions

The Department Personnel Committee (hereafter called the "Committee") shall make specific recommendations concerning faculty retention, promotion, and granting of tenure as specified in the UPS 210.000.

B. Committee Structure

The Committee shall consist of three members and one alternate member, all of whom shall be tenured faculty. All committee members shall have a higher rank of classification than those being evaluated, and one member shall have previously served
on the Committee. Committee members are elected for a one year term. No person shall serve as a Committee member during the year in which (s)he is being considered for personnel action. The alternate committee member shall participate on the Committee in the event that a regular committee member cannot complete the term. Should such a vacancy occur, a new alternate shall be elected by the Department faculty.

C. **Election of Committee Members**

1. The Department Chair will conduct the election by the end of the second week of classes in the Fall Semester each year. The election shall be by secret ballot. All tenured faculty who meet the requirements in IV-B above are automatically on the slate of potential committee members except the following: (a) the Department Chair, (b) those who are being considered for personnel action that year, and (c) those who will be on leave during any part of that year.

2. Each full-time tenure track faculty member in the Department may vote (by secret ballot) for three committee members. The three faculty members receiving the highest number of votes shall be elected as "regular" committee members. The person with the 4th highest number of votes shall be the alternate. In the case of a tie, the last regular member and the alternate shall be decided by the flip of a coin (or by drawing names randomly, should the tie involve more than two people).

3. The Committee shall elect its Chair for a one-year term.

D. **Committee Responsibilities**

1. The Committee will review and evaluate Portfolios of faculty members involved in the retention, tenure, and promotion process.

Following a review of the Portfolio, the Committee will prepare a written evaluation describing the candidate's accomplishments under each of the evaluation areas--teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and professional, university, and community service as described in Section VI. of this document.

2. The Committee's evaluation for each area is to be based on information provided in the Portfolio. Each committee member utilizes his/her best professional judgment in assessing how well the established evaluation criteria have been met. The evaluation statement shall represent all points of view held by the committee members. An evaluation will be based on whether the faculty under review is to be considered for retention or tenure and/or promotion.

3. Committee members shall receive and review the Department Chair's evaluation.
4. The Committee shall formulate a recommendation, which states in writing the reasons for the recommendation relative to retention, tenure, and/or promotion. All actions taken by the Committee shall be approved by a simple majority vote.

5. Committee members shall sign the recommendation form in alphabetical order. The order of signatures shall not indicate the way individual members voted.

6. The Committee shall submit its evaluation and recommendation statements to the Department Chair in accordance with the published timelines for the personnel action cycle.

E. Department Chair’s Responsibilities
According to UPS 210.000 the Department Chair has the responsibility to:

1. Communicate the standards and criteria for RTP to all Department faculty members.

2. Inform each new faculty member within two weeks after the assumption of official duties at the University of all personnel procedures including those covered by this document.

3. Provide guidance, advice, and support to assist new probationary faculty in preparing their Prospectus.

4. Provide the probationary faculty member with written feedback on the Prospectus prior to May 1.

5. Consult, during the spring semester, with each faculty member for whom a personnel recommendation will be made during the following fall semester to assure that the annual updating of the Portfolio has been initiated and that the compilation is proceeding according to the requirements of this document. Such consultation shall be documented and submitted to The Faculty Affairs and Records Office.

6. Provide an evaluation to the Committee prior to the completion of their evaluation.

Tenured chairs not seeking promotion have additional responsibilities (see UPS 210.000 IV. D. Responsibilities of Department Chairs).

F. Abbreviated Review Files for Third and Fifth Year Probationary Faculty
Faculty members with satisfactory evaluations in their full performance review during year 2 or year 4 would, in the following year (year 3 or year 5, respectively), submit a “Review File.” The Review File comprises only three items: (1) an updated portfolio vita,
(2) statistical summaries of student opinion questionnaires, and (3) grade distributions for the period since the last full performance review. When subject to a periodic review, the faculty member shall submit the Review File by October 1, review of which shall be completed by June 1. The Committee, the Department Chair, and the appropriate administrator shall provide a signed form indicating that the Review File was received and reviewed. The faculty member shall receive a copy of the signed form, and a copy shall be forwarded to The Faculty Affairs and Records Office for placement in the faculty member's Personnel Action File (UPS 210.000, Revision Date 6-20-11). If, upon review, the Committee has concerns regarding the faculty member’s progress towards meeting tenure and promotion requirements, it shall provide a written statement reflecting such concerns. The faculty member, the Department Chair, or the appropriate administrator may request a consultation meeting to discuss the faculty member’s progress.

V. General Guidelines

A. Prospectus
According to UPS 210.000 Section III.A., “During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty member shall write a Prospectus that includes narratives for teaching, scholarly and creative activities and service, not to exceed 500 words each. These narratives shall describe the faculty member’s professional goals, areas of interest, resources required and accomplishments (s) he expects to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the approved Departmental Personnel Standards and/or UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure, and promotion. The Prospectus shall be due in the Department Chair’s office by a date determined annually by the College. The Prospectus will have no formal approval process, but will be reviewed by the Department Chair and the Dean (or equivalent) who will each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the colleges, but prior to May 1st. The Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member’s portfolio for all Full Performance Reviews.”

B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission
It is the responsibility of each faculty member seeking retention, tenure, and/or promotion to prepare the information required for the Portfolio and to deliver the materials to the Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable. A general timetable for submitting the Portfolio is provided in UPS 210.000 I.K. Specific timetables for each year are prepared and distributed by The Faculty Affairs and Records Office early in the fall semester.

C. Portfolio Contents and Organization
According to UPS 210.000 Section III.B.,

1. “The Portfolio, including its Appendices, is the sole basis for RTP evaluations, recommendations, and actions. Although the Portfolio itself shall be submitted in hard copy form in a binder, the faculty member may choose to submit the Appendices via the Electronic Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Process (ERTP).
For Probationary Faculty: The Portfolio and its Appendices shall be cumulative and representative of performance, covering the period from the beginning of probationary service to the first day of the fall semester of the academic year during which RTP action is to be considered. In cases where prior service credit was granted, that time interval shall also be documented in the Portfolio and its Appendices. Faculty Affairs and Records (FAR) will provide each new probationary faculty member with a binder and enumerated tabs (UPS 210.000, Revision Date 6-20-11).

For Tenured Faculty: The Portfolio and its Appendices shall be cumulative and representative of performance, covering the period since the submission of the file for tenure to the first day of the fall semester of the academic year during which RTP action is to be considered (UPS 210.000, Revision Date 6-20-11).

2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure the completeness of the Portfolio and Appendices.

3. In the Portfolio and Appendices, faculty members shall describe and document significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for the period under review. Quality over quantity shall be emphasized; a more limited number of appropriately documented high-quality accomplishments is generally more compelling than a compendium of all activities. Note, however, that all accomplishments shall be listed in the Portfolio Vita (described in UPS 210.000, section III.B.4.e.). A clear connection between the narratives, the Table of Contents of the Appendix, the Portfolio, and the documents or artifacts in the Appendix shall be established (UPS 210.000, Revision Date 6-20-11).

4. The Portfolio shall be organized as directed in UPS 210.000 Section III.B.4.

VI. Criteria and Weighting for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

Faculty members will be evaluated within three performance categories – (1) teaching, (2) scholarly and creative activity, and (3) professional, university, and community service. High quality performance is expected of each faculty member in all three areas. However, in support of the "learning is preeminent" mission of the University, and in compliance with UPS 210.000, the primary emphasis in the retention, tenure, and promotion process shall be on teaching performance. Scholarly and creative activity, also an essential part of faculty activity, is the second most important performance category.

Probationary faculty being reviewed for retention will be evaluated on his or her PROGRESS towards meeting the criteria in each category as Excellent, Good, or Unsatisfactory. Criteria for each of these ratings appear below.
Faculty being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion will be evaluated on his or her PERFORMANCE towards meeting the criteria in each category as Excellent, Good, or Unsatisfactory. Criteria for each of these ratings appear below.

A. Teaching Performance

The Department of Kinesiology expects that all faculty shall demonstrate effective teaching (both in and outside of the classroom) at all levels of review. Students' opinions of teaching are an important (though not decisive) means of assessing the quality of teaching. Also important are peer evaluations, quality of instructional materials, documentation of student learning, effective methods of evaluating and grading students, and evidence of ongoing professional development both with respect to maintaining currency in the field and to pedagogical growth.

Each level of review shall evaluate the Portfolio and Appendices according to the criteria that follow. Rather than relying largely on a single measure, written evaluations at all levels of review shall be based on and include commentary on multiple indicators of teaching performance (UPS 210.000, Revision Date 6-20-11). These shall include the following mandatory indicators and at least two of the four additional indicators listed below.

The following indicators and criteria are used in evaluating teaching performance:

1. Mandatory Indicators

To be included in the Portfolio:

a. Self-assessment (limited to 1000 words) - shall include a reflective discussion of the faculty member's teaching philosophy and performance, as well as future goals and directions. The self-assessment statement may include a discussion of teaching objectives, methods, and evaluation procedures (including grading distributions relative to academic standards). Also, it shall address on-going professional activities with respect to development both within the discipline (professional conferences) and pedagogical development (seminars and workshops). Also, when areas of concern have been identified in previous RTP evaluations, the faculty member shall include in the self-assessment a discussion of specific strategies that have been used to address these concerns.

b. List of courses taught - shall include a semester-by-semester listing of all courses taught during the review period. The listing shall include the course number, name, and unit value. If assigned time was received, the weighted teaching unit value shall be listed along with an explanation of the assigned-time activity.

c. Statistical summaries of student opinion questionnaires - Student Opinion Questionnaires contribute significantly to the evaluation
of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. However, they shall not be used by any level of evaluation as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness (UPS 210.000, Revision Date 6-20-11). The University-provided statistical summaries for all courses taught during the period of review shall be included. If data are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair. Similar data shall also be provided for all service-credit years. If not available, a written explanation, verified by the faculty member's former supervisor, shall be included.

Evaluations of teaching performance shall address student opinions of instruction contained in responses to objective questions on Student Opinion Questionnaires and contained in written comments on these forms. The evaluations shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.). The evaluation also shall take into account any efforts to improve teaching performance (UPS 210.000, Revision Date 6-20-11).

d. Statistical summaries of grade distribution - Faculty members are expected to maintain high standards regarding student achievement in all courses taught. The University-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution for each class shall be provided. If the University-provided distributions are not available, the faculty member shall calculate and provide these statistics. The Committee evaluation of teaching performance shall address the evidence in the Portfolio relating to academic standards including summaries of grades awarded in each class taught. Grade distributions for courses shall range between 2.3-3.2 for lower division courses, 2.5-3.3 for upper division courses, and 3.2-3.8 for graduate courses. If a course has lower or higher grade distributions, the faculty member shall provide a rationale for higher or lower grade distributions than Department standards and include in the Portfolio specific plans to remedy the problem.

To be included in the Appendix:

e. Course syllabi and materials - A representative sample of syllabi and supplemental materials shall be included for each course taught.

f. Individual student opinion questionnaires - The original, student-completed student opinion questionnaires for each course shall be
provided. If data are missing, a written explanation shall be
provided and verified by the Department Chair. Similar data, if
available, shall also be provided for all service-credit years.
Patterns of objective responses in written comments obtained in
different courses over several semesters shall be considered more
informative than isolated, individual comments.

2. **Additional Indicators**
   a. **Pedagogical Approach and Methods** - The primary objective of
      pedagogy is to help students to learn. Peer evaluation of teaching
      performance shall address those factors that contribute to effective
      pedagogy including the following: the appropriateness of the
      breadth and depth of course content to the level of each course
      taught; the currency of the topics and relevancy of the assignments;
      and the effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment, and
      grading procedures (UPS 210.000, Revision Date 6-20-11).
      Faculty members may contribute to student learning by such
      activities as: 1) academic advising, 2) development of new
      courses/curriculum, 3) use of innovative approaches to teaching,
      fostering, and/or assessing student learning, such as development
      of instructional technology, 4) organization of pedagogical
      workshops, 5) mentoring and/or supervision of internships and
      independent studies, 6) supervision of student theses / projects /
      comprehensive exams, or 7) other similar activities supporting
      teaching effectiveness.

   b. **Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher** - Each faculty
      member is expected to show evidence of an ongoing program to
      maintain and improve teaching effectiveness. This program shall
      include self-assessment of teaching objectives and methods and
      student achievement, participation in pedagogical seminars and
      workshops, and familiarity with the pedagogical literature in the
      faculty member's discipline. When specific weaknesses have been
      identified in prior evaluation(s), the faculty member shall include
      in the Portfolio specific plans to remedy these weaknesses (UPS
      210.000, Revision Date 6-20-11).

   c. **Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline** - All faculty
      members are expected to maintain currency in their disciplines by
      conference participation and/or other interaction with their
      colleagues. Scholarly and creative activities are expected to be
      reflected, as appropriate, in teaching methods and student
      participation in collaborative research and creative undertakings
      (UPS 210.000, Revision Date 6-20-11).
d. **Classroom Visitations** - Classroom visitations by Department colleagues may provide additional information regarding teaching effectiveness and interaction with students. Written reports of such visits shall address clarity of presentation, communication with students, student interaction, effective use of classroom time, and appropriateness of presentation methods. Assessment shall be in the context of the level and objectives of the course. Assessments by external evaluators may be included (UPS 210.000, Revision Date 6-20-11).

3. **Rating Criteria**

Based upon the total evidence provided in both mandatory and optional indicators, the reviewers will rate the faculty member's overall teaching performance as **excellent, good, or unsatisfactory**. It shall be noted that each faculty member's teaching performance generally is rated according to the same criteria across all ranks. However, according to UPS 210.000, the evaluation **shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional, etc.).** The evaluation shall also take into account the faculty member's overall level of experiences and his or her efforts to improve teaching performance.

**Criteria for assignment of ratings for Teaching:**

**"Excellent":** clear and thoughtful self-assessment of teaching; student opinion questionnaires of all classes average to 90% or more A and B ratings (or 60% or more A ratings); grade distributions that fall within the Department guidelines; and documented evidence of excellence in mandatory and additional indicators of teaching effectiveness.

**"Good":** clear and thoughtful self-assessment of teaching; student opinion questionnaires of all classes average to 75-89% A and B ratings; grade distributions that fall within the Department guidelines; and documented evidence of good quality in additional indicators of teaching effectiveness.

**"Unsatisfactory":** unclear self-assessment of teaching; <75% of student opinion questionnaires at A and B ratings; grade distributions that do not fall within the Department guidelines; and additional indicators that are below the standard for good.

The department acknowledges that changes in SOQ administration (e.g. in-class vs. online) might affect SOQ scores. In these cases, the faculty member shall address the SOQ scores in the portfolio narrative and evaluators reserve the right to exercise a degree
of flexibility in overall evaluation of teaching. The Department favors target standards for SOQ scores, but not at the expense of fairness and commonsense whereby sincere effort, creativity, and innovation might be unduly penalized where a type of SOQ administration (in-class vs. online) affects the scores.

B. Scholarly and Creative Activities
Faculty members at every level are expected to engage in focused, ongoing scholarly and creative activities. It is the position of the University and this Department that such activities enhance the professional growth and teaching effectiveness of the individual faculty member, contribute to the advancement of the field, provide increased learning opportunities for students, and enhance the overall reputation of the Department and the University. The faculty member shall provide a 1000 word self-evaluation narrative statement describing (1) his/her scholarly agenda, (2) accomplishments during the period of review, (3) work in progress, and (4) future plans. The self-assessment shall be supported by appropriate documentation, with any collaborative work clearly described in terms of individual contributions.

The Department recognizes that scholarly and creative activities may be evidenced through (1) creation of new knowledge, (2) integration of knowledge, and/or (3) dissemination of knowledge. It is expected that over the period of review faculty members' scholarly and creative endeavors will result in high quality, peer-reviewed works -- i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles, chapters, books, or other comparable works. External grants submitted, especially those awarded, will strengthen performance in this category. Other indicators to support a faculty member's scholarly and creative accomplishments are works in progress and non peer-reviewed publications and achievements.

It is expected that those evaluating the Portfolio will consider the quality as well as the quantity of performance. When the scholarly activity has made a major impact on the discipline or on professional practice, it may be appropriate to assign additional weight to it. In all cases, it is the responsibility of faculty members to describe and document the importance of their work, as well as the quality of the publications/outlets where their work appears.

It is the position of the Department, in line with the University Mission and Goals, that collaborative research/scholarly efforts are of benefit to the institution as well as to the individual. All co-authors on projects shall be identified, with their respective contributions clearly described. It is required that, for tenure and/or promotion, each faculty member shall author at least three high quality, peer-reviewed publications, assuming the role of first or sole author on at least one such publication.

As with all evaluation categories, a faculty member's scholarly and creative contribution shall be rated as excellent, good, or unsatisfactory. The following categorization of activities is presented as an example of several "hierarchical" indicators of performance. In general, Level I includes evidence of work in progress and on-going activity. Level II includes accomplishments that are an important part of one's scholarly agenda such as
scholarly presentations, book reviews, and external fund-raising, but generally are one step below that of Level III. Level III includes the publication of one's work in high quality, peer-reviewed journals, books, or other comparable outlets, as well as obtaining major external grants.

**Level I**
- Research in progress
- Papers submitted for publication/presentation
- Grant proposals submitted
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

**Level II**
- Scholarly presentations at professional meetings
- Published peer-reviewed abstracts
- Papers published in conference proceedings
- Technical articles, notes, summaries (peer-reviewed)
- Published book reviews
- Articles/chapters/books (non peer-reviewed)
- Peer-reviewed publications accepted, with required changes
- Peer-reviewed publications (as a minor author)
- Minor externally funded and internally funded grants
- Other comparable types of activities judged to be of significance to the field (e.g., digital projects, curriculum development, software development, etc.)

**Level III**
- Articles published or in press (as sole, lead, or major author) in major peer-reviewed scholarly journals*
- Peer-reviewed books/book chapters published or in press (as lead author or major author)
- Major externally funded grants (as Principal Investigator or Co PI)
- Other comparable types of published, peer-reviewed activities judged to be of significance to the field – e.g., digital projects, software development, etc.

* Although multiple indicators are listed in Level III, it shall be noted that peer-reviewed articles best represent the scholarly work in the field and, thus, are required to be part of a faculty member's accomplishments at each level of review.

**Criteria for assignment of ratings for Scholarship and Creative Activity:**

In all cases, the *quality* of the scholarly work shall be considered in the evaluation process. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the quality of his/her accomplishments. Examples of quality indicators are journal acceptance records, publication distribution figures, the scope of the publication (regional, national, or international), the quality of the editorial board and review process (blind vs. non-blind), and the extent of the faculty member's contribution in the case of co-authored work.
"Excellent": appropriate rating when a faculty member has two or more high quality activities in Level I, four or more high quality activities in Level II and four or more high quality activities in Level III, thus clearly surpassing the requirements for a rating of "good".

"Good": appropriate rating when a faculty member has one or more high quality activities in Level I, three or more high quality activities in Level II, and at least three high quality activities in Level III.

"Unsatisfactory": appropriate rating when a faculty member has not met the standards for either excellent or good ratings outlined above.

A probationary faculty member being reviewed for retention will be evaluated on his or her PROGRESS towards meeting the criteria in each of these categories. A faculty member being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion will be evaluated on his or her PERFORMANCE of meeting the criteria in each category.

Note: Many exceptions to the above ratings are possible. For example, in any category it is possible that any one activity may be so important (qualitatively or quantitatively) that it deserves as much weight as would normally be assigned to two or three activities. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document such exceptions and to document why special consideration shall be given.

C. Professional, University, and Community Service
All faculty members are expected to participate in appropriate professional, university, and community service activities. In the area of professional service, such activity is expected to surpass that of simply belonging to relevant organizations and attending conferences. As faculty members progress through their careers, it is expected that they increasingly engage in professional activities such as serving on professional committees, assuming leadership positions, serving as a program planners, conducting seminars and workshops, and serving as professional consultants, on editorial boards, and/or as reviewers of scholarly/professional materials.

Similarly, faculty are expected to actively serve the needs of the university and community by participating in a broad range of campus activities and in external community activities. All faculty, after their first probationary year, are expected to increasingly make noteworthy contributions towards the "work" of the Department, College, and University as it conducts its business and serves its community clientele. The following represents a sample breakdown of typical service activities into hierarchical categories.

In determining the number of activities that a faculty member completes, positions which entail terms of multiple years are awarded at a rate of one activity per term. For example, a three year term on a professional committee would count as one Level II activity.
**Level I**
- Membership in professional organizations
- Attendance at conferences/workshops
- Membership on Department committees
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

**Level II**
- Membership on professional committees
- Reviewer of professional journals/conference papers/books
- Program planner, session organizer at professional conferences
- Workshop/seminar coordinator
- Conference/workshop presentations
- Speaking to community groups
- Consultant activities
- Member of advisory boards/expert panels
- Member of major Department committee
- Member of College/University committees
- Media interviews
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

**Level III**
- Chair of major Department committee
- Academic program coordinator/lab or Center director
- National/regional officer of professional association
- Editorial board of professional journal
- Chair of national/regional committee
- Program chair, professional conference/workshop
- Chair of College/University committee
- Organizer of major community functions/workshops
- Exceptional service as documented by honors, awards, etc.
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

**Criteria for assignment of ratings for Professional, University, and Community Service:**

"Excellent": appropriate rating when a faculty member has five or more high quality activities in Level I, five or more high quality activities in Level II and three or more high quality activities in Level III, thus clearly surpassing the requirements for a rating of "good".

"Good": appropriate rating when a faculty member has four or more high quality activities in Level I, four or more high quality activities in Level II, and at least two high quality activities in Level III.

"Unsatisfactory": appropriate rating when a faculty member has not met the standards for either excellent or good ratings outlined above.
A probationary faculty member being reviewed for retention will be evaluated on his or her PROGRESS towards meeting the criteria in each of these categories. A faculty member being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion will be evaluated on his or her PERFORMANCE of meeting the criteria in each category.

**Note:** Many exceptions to the above ratings are possible. For example, in any category it is possible that any one activity may be so important (qualitatively or quantitatively) that it deserves as much weight as two or three activities normally would. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document such exceptions and to document why special consideration shall be given.

**VII. Guidelines for Evaluation Criteria in Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Decisions**

A. **Retention during Probationary Years**
   A recommendation for retention throughout the probationary period is contingent upon making adequate progress toward the requirements for tenure and promotion.

B. **Tenure Requirements**
   A person recommended for tenure shall be evaluated as "excellent" in either teaching or scholarly activity, with no less than a "good" rating in the other two categories.

C. **Promotion to Associate Professor**
   Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure.

D. **Early Promotion to Associate Professor**
   A person recommended for early promotion to Associate Professor shall demonstrate sustained accomplishment and be evaluated as "excellent" in teaching and scholarly and creative activities with at least a "good" rating in service.

E. **Early tenure**
   In any case that involves early tenure, a faculty member shall demonstrate sustained accomplishment, receive “excellent” ratings in all three evaluation areas, and substantially exceed all the requirements for full term tenure.

F. **Promotion to Full Professor**
   The decision to grant promotion to the rank of professor shall be based on a record of sustained growth and commitment to high quality performance in all categories. At a minimum, a person recommended for promotion to Full Professor shall be evaluated as "excellent" in two categories and at least "good" in the third category.

G. **Early Promotion to Full Professor**
   In any case that involves early promotion to full professor, a faculty member shall demonstrate sustained accomplishment and receive “excellent” ratings in all three evaluation areas.