2027
Athens State Promotion/Tenure Portfolio Development Guidelines

Introduction and Overview

Faculty at Athens State University are a highly valued asset of the institution. The thorough and transparent evaluation of faculty ensures the continued success of the university. In the interest of this important evaluation, it is necessary that the faculty member, the faculty as a collective, represented by the University Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee (UFTPC), and the administration of the university, undertake the process of evaluation with the deserved transparency. This preamble to the Tenure and Promotion rubric embodies an effort to assist and guide the candidate as they move through the process of preparing an application for tenure and promotion. This document therefore stands as a clarification of the concepts appearing in the rubric, and an exposition, in their broadest terms, of the three categories of evaluation.

Categories of Evaluation

- **Teaching Effectiveness:** Activities that demonstrate excellence and growth in preparing students with knowledge and skills needed for success in current and future phases of their professional and academic life.
    - **or Professional Effectiveness (for librarians only):** Activities that demonstrate excellence in contributions to the educational and research mission of the University.
- **Scholarly Activities:** Activities that give back to the academic field to allow other academic professionals to expand their knowledge and skills in pedagogy and academia in general.
- **Service:** Activities that ensure effective and continuing operation of the university and enhance its prestige in the perception of the academic, professional, and civic communities.

Promotion and Tenure: The Difference

Since this evaluation process includes both Promotion and Tenure, and these rankings are evaluated by the University Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee (UFTPC), it is necessary to explain here the difference between these concepts. Information about tenure and promotion is taken from the university policies which define tenure (Continuation of Appointment), and promotion.

Tenure

 "The granting of tenure is never automatic, and is based on the expectation that the consistently high professional competence required to achieve tenure will continue once tenure is awarded. Tenure is a long-term commitment by the University, aimed at assuring academic freedom: the freedom to teach,

inquire, create, debate, and dissent without fear of penalty." … "Tenure may be awarded to individuals appointed to the faculty on tenure-track appointments."

In most cases, tenure is granted within either of two contexts. Context 1) The case of a faculty member hired as a beginning Assistant Professor. In this case the tenure clock is set according to policy. In most of these cases tenure also involves an assessment of suitability for promotion to Associate Professor.

Context 2) The case of a faculty member hired with advanced standing, either experience or advanced rank. In this case the tenure clock is set by the administration.

As per the definition above, the concept of tenure in both contexts indicates a ranking granted by the university on the bases of evidence drawn from the applicant's performance since being hired, and otherwise evidenced in the portfolio submitted for promotion.

> **Basis #1**: That, since their hire, the faculty member has shown convincing evidence of excellence in at least two of the three categories (Teaching Effectiveness / Professional Effectiveness, Scholarly Works, and Service). Within these two categories of excellence, all faculty must reach excellence in Teaching Effectiveness / Professional Effectiveness.

> **Basis #2**: That the faculty member shows sufficient potential which indicates that the institution may have reasonable "expectation that the consistently high professional competence required to achieve tenure will continue once tenure is awarded." Thus, certain items (i.e. presentations, grant applications, service terms, etc.) may be considered for tenure, but may not necessarily be considered for promotion. Additionally, since the university grants tenure on the expectation of consistency, this basis may be considered a more subjective set of criteria than basis #1.

Promotion

"Promotion is an important step in a faculty member's professional career. A faculty member who successfully meets the minimum requirements … [as documented in the Promotion and Tenure rubric] … will be evaluated for promotion on the quality of professional performance and service appropriate for each rank. Promotion in rank is granted to faculty by the President of the University."

Value of Categories for Faculty Growth

Athens State University is declared to be a teaching university. Simultaneously, the institution recognizes that the faculty consists of professionals with a wide range of talents and abilities and maintains the desire to assist in the nurturance of these diverse abilities. Part of faculty growth includes collaboration. Collaboration is a skill much valued in academia and encouraged at Athens State University. Collaboration refers to the capacity of an individual to contribute effectively in a group. Effective collaboration involves a division of labor with participants who are engaged in active discourse that results in a compilation of their efforts (Scoular et al., 2020) which, in the context of this rubric, is an

artifact. Collaboration outside of an institution is important because it increases the footprint of the institution, increases the stature of the applicant, and improves the rigor of the project.

The path towards promotion offers a range of options that affords faculty the opportunity to grow and receive promotion while preserving their individual academic strengths. Faculty growth in rank is therefore broadly subsumed within the categories of evaluation. For a successful career at Athens State University, faculty are advised to evaluate their own abilities and commit themselves to a trajectory along the pathways afforded by the categories of growth. Promotion is awarded on the basis of convincing evidence of excellence in Teaching or Professional Effectiveness, one of the other categories of evaluation, and strength in the third category.

Guiding Principles

Beyond the functional areas of evaluation, the following principles are embedded in the tenure and promotion processes:

- Each faculty member brings a unique set of skills, perspectives, and knowledge to his/her discipline and position.

- Candidates should have the opportunity to fully showcase their strengths.

- As a teaching institution, Athens State University values effective teaching, which is rooted in growth and reflection.

Instructions and Guidelines

Candidate Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of the applicant to use artifacts as evidence of having reached the required level of performance in each category, and to provide an explanation and/or exposition in reference to each artifact that clearly highlights the value of the artifact, in identifying the specific accomplishment or skill. In terms of this tool, artifacts are defined as empirically detectable items or objects that represents bon-a-fide evidence of an activity that has been carried out. Thus, artifacts and expositions should therefore be clearly and conceptually linked to an activity.

Required Categories and Activities

The three categories of Teaching Effective or Professional Effectiveness, Scholarly Works, and Service must have activities associated with them to reach the minimal specified point values necessary for promotion and tenure. Within those categories, numerous activities are described to allow a faculty member to accumulate the necessary points.

Per the Guiding Principles of this document, each listed activity is not required to be completed unless the activity is specified as a required activity in the activity description found in this document (ex: Teaching Effectiveness – Course Evaluations and Reflection). Faculty members should focus on activities that best satisfy their aptitude, skills, or interests.

Rules for Categorizing Accomplishments

The Tenure and Promotion Rubric Tool is to be used as an ESTIMATION of the faculty member's performance or achievement on his/her path towards Tenure and Promotion at Athens State University. Ultimately, the recommendation(s) gained through the evidence presented by the tool are combined with narrative statements from the University Tenure and Promotion Committee (UFTPC), and submitted as a recommendation to the Dean of the College or Library Director and Provost of the university. Per the University Tenure and Promotion Committee Practices, Expectations, and Procedures policy, this recommendation is then used by the Deans, Library Director, Provost, and President to make a final decision on whether Tenure and/or Promotion is awarded. The tool serves as an indication to the position of a faculty member on his/her path, but it is not a guarantee of Tenure and Promotion acceptance or denial.

1. The Tenure and Promotion Rubric measures three areas of a faculty member's work and service – Teaching or Professional Effectiveness, Scholarly and Creative Work, and Service. All three categories are unique, and each of the three categories carries a possible total of 1,000 points. To have a successful recommendation from the tool, a faculty member should strive for Excellence (900+ points) in Teaching or Professional Effectiveness; Excellence (900+ points) in either Scholarly and Creative Work or Service; and Strength (700+ points) in the third category.

2. The tenure and promotion committee will review two types of activities throughout the Tenure and Promotion Rubric – Absolute Items and Scaled Items. Absolute Items are counted on an all or nothing point value. If the committee deems documentation was insufficient to validate an absolute activity, the activity will be graded as a zero. Otherwise, full credit is awarded. For scaled items, the committee is allotted a point range in which to judge the quality of the submission. Partial points can be submitted on scaled items. These items will be graded throughout the Tenure and Promotion Rubric Tool.

3. Due to possible variability in the utility of the tool as a measure of self-evaluation by the faculty member, and the Tenure and Promotion committee's use of the tool as an evaluating instrument for tenure and/or promotion, it is strongly recommended that faculty members give themselves latitude for variability between what the faculty member and the committee considers sufficient, by striving to exceed the standards of Excellence in Teaching or Professional Effectiveness and the other chosen category, and strength in the third category, if possible.

4. Activities are to be tallied only when the activity is completed. For example, accepted conference presentations that have not been delivered should be marked as an "Upcoming

Project" and not tallied until the presentation is delivered. At that point, it will move into the "Completed Projects" field and the points for the activity will be tallied.

5. Faculty members must provide artifacts and conceptually linked documentation or explanations to verify the activities used in the portfolio calculations. An artifact is an empirically detectable item or object that represents bona-fide evidence that the activity has been carried out.

6. An activity can only be used once in calculations for the portfolio. However, activities can build off of the same data sets or into new activities. For example, if the faculty member Implements a New Technique into a course as an activity of Teaching Effectiveness, and then presents the technique at a conference, its presence in the Scholarly and Creative Work category as an activity is appropriate. The faculty member may then teach the technique at a training and place it as a second activity in the category of Scholarly and Creative Works. In this example, three unique activities will have been developed from the same concept and each unique activity can be counted.

7. Unless otherwise noted, items are only counted once in the reporting five-year period.

Instructions

1. **Complete Activity**
    a. Unless otherwise specified in the document, an activity is considered complete when the final task of the activity has been performed or the minimum time spent on the activity has been passed. For example, a presentation is complete when the presentation is delivered. A grant is complete when the award letter is received. Service is complete when the minimum time served on a committee has elapsed. These requirements and timeframes are found in the definitions sections of the activities in this document.

2. Find an Appropriate Category & Activity
    a. Upon completion of the task, find the category and activity area in this document of which the activity best fits. Try to ensure the activity fits in the appropriate spot. Since activities can only count once, if the activity happens to fit in two spots, choose the one that most benefits you.

3. Gather Artifacts
    a. Ensure you have collected appropriate artifacts of the completed activity. An activity without appropriate artifacts will be considered incomplete and thus not tallied into the tool. Be aware that certain artifacts will not persist online indefinitely, so it is the responsibility of the candidate to obtain an appropriate artifact in a timely manner and in a format that they can save and use in the future. It is not recommended to simply rely on website addresses as those can change in the future.

4. Place in Portfolio

a. Once you have obtained your artifacts, place the activity and all corresponding information and artifacts in the appropriate spot in your portfolio. It is recommended to link all information to verifiable sources (i.e. Peer Review Status, Audience Level, etc.) to avoid any misinterpretations by the committee.

5. Place in Point Tally
a. Once your activity has been added to your portfolio, place it in the tallying tool to see where your current tally stands. Remember that your self-evaluation using the tool may produce different point values than how the committee judges the activities; however, with due diligence and supplying the appropriate artifacts, the numbers should be relatively close.

Teaching Effectiveness Activities

Implementation of New Knowledge and Teaching Techniques

Updating the content and teaching strategies in courses is crucial for several reasons including ensuring that your course concepts remain relevant, the course is engaging for students, and the instruction being taught is as effective as possible.   This requires faculty members to gain new knowledge and stay current in the field and with emerging teaching techniques to provide the newest and most accurate information to students in the most efficient way possible. Ultimately, the implementation of new knowledge and techniques helps improve the quality of education and better meet the needs of students in a rapidly evolving educational landscape.

When reviewing the implementation of new knowledge or teaching techniques, criteria considered include the method of knowledge acquisition, a detailed description of how the knowledge or techniques were implemented in a course, a reflection of how the information or techniques were received, and future plans on expanding on the information or further implementation of the techniques.

Additional Credentials Outside of Promotion Requirements

Certifications, licenses, and credentials are crucial for teaching effectiveness as they signify that educators have undergone additional formal training, acquired necessary skills, and met established standards in various industries. These items also contribute to the credibility of educators, instill trust among students and stakeholders, and facilitate compliance with legal and regulatory requirements. Overall, certifications and credentials are essential in maintaining high standards, enhancing teacher quality, and promoting successful learning outcomes in educational settings.

When reviewing activities, only activities that do not trigger the ability to be promoted will be considered. For example, if a CPA allows a faculty member to be eligible for promotion, the CPA license cannot be used as an artifact within the tool. Within those activities, criteria considered include proof of acquired certification, license, or credential. Only the initial acquisition will be

considered. Annual renewals will not be considered, although continuing education activities required to maintain these activities can be included in the *Implementation of New Knowledge and Teaching Techniques* activity.

Peer Review of Courses

Peer reviews of course design and teaching play a valuable role in improving educational practices and the overall quality of teaching by involving colleagues or fellow educators and having them evaluate each other's teaching methods, course materials, and classroom performance for suggestions on future improvements. Course reviews can provide detailed outside feedback from multiple sources which include ways to potentially increase the effectiveness of course design, teaching techniques, course materials, and teaching techniques for students. Reflection and implementation of improvement suggestions from these reviews can strengthen the student experience in courses.

When reviewing peer reviews of courses, criteria considered include the type of peer review (Course Design or Teaching), the average score of the review, a reflection on the feedback provided by the review, and an implementation plan based on feedback from the review.

Course Evaluations and Reflection

REQUIRED SECTION

Course evaluations provide valuable feedback from students about various aspects of a course, including the instructor's teaching style, course content, and assessment methods. They provide a valuable feedback loop that helps faculty members refine their instructional methods, enhance the learning experience for students, and contribute to the overall quality of education within an institution. Course evaluations should be viewed over multiple semesters and iterations of the course to determine growth trends and patterns in addition to the standard review of the individual course evaluation reports. Due to validity concerns associated with course evaluations, reflection and ideas for improvement should be considered from these feedback items and an action plan should be developed for future semesters rather than the raw scores found on the evaluations.

When reviewing course evaluations and reflections, criteria considered include annual reflections on the evaluation results and detailed implementation of course adjustments based on the evaluations.

Awards and Recognitions Related to Teaching

The recognition of a teaching award is a significant recognition of an educator's effectiveness in teaching. It signifies that their teaching practices have had a positive impact on students, peers, and the broader teaching community, and it often reflects their commitment to excellence in education.

Awards related to teaching can come from a variety of sources. Awards may be distributed via a simple nomination where some may be decided upon a full committee review of possible

candidates. When looking at awards and recognitions related to teaching, the criterion considered is the type of award obtained and whether or not the award was obtained from an outside organization or from the university.

Creation or Redesign of New Courses / Programs

Creating a new course in a degree program can serve as evidence of teaching effectiveness by showcasing your expertise in determining knowledge gaps in the current curriculum and developing solutions to address the identified gaps. Even in cases where the administration may request a new degree program or expansion of a current program, it is still up to the faculty member to determine the knowledge gaps that must be covered within individual courses. Coverage of these gaps will have a positive impact on student's education and development and better prepare them for success after graduation.

New courses and programs are defined as those that have gone through the curriculum committee process and are approved for delivery in the course catalog. A new program is considered upon final approval from ACHE and the Board of Trustees and thus can officially be offered at the university. New courses are considered complete on the last day of final exams during the first semester they are offered.

Official course and program redesigns are changes to the course and program that are significant enough to require curriculum committee approval. Tallying of official redesigns follows the same process as that of new courses and programs. Unofficial redesigns of courses and programs are changes that are significant to the core structure of a program or course but do not require curriculum committee approval. These changes more than likely will impact the objectives, assessment, and content of a course. Changes should be significant enough to warrant clear change throughout multiple areas of the course syllabus. Thus, a syllabus before and after the adjustment should be provided along with clear documentation of the changes made and the purpose of the changes.

Changes to a course due to a change in the textbook are considered course maintenance and do not constitute a course redesign.

When reviewing the creation or adjustments of courses and programs, the criteria considered include whether the adjustments are for a course or program, whether it is a new catalog entry or a redesign, an individual's role in the project, and how many colleagues contributed to the work.

Student Advisement (Preparation for Post-Graduation Success)

Student job placement and graduate school acceptance is an outcome that can be attributed to effective teaching as it demonstrates the relevance of coursework, practical skills, and knowledge. It underscores the value of the educational experience in preparing students for successful post-graduate advancement in their chosen fields.

When looking at student advisement related to post-graduation success, the criterion considered is the recommendation letters assisting students on future career paths and communication from students demonstrating they have successfully taken the next step in their career paths.

Student Advisement (Dissertation / Thesis / Research Guidance)

Serving on a research team with students demonstrates teaching effectiveness by providing mentorship, facilitating practical application of knowledge, encouraging collaboration and teamwork, and instilling confidence in students. This collaboration reflects the effective teaching practices that prepare students for successful academic and professional pursuits.

Student capstones, thesis projects, and dissertations are meant to display a student's overall understanding of academic content and ability to practically implement the concepts learned. Having multiple faculty members with diverse experience help guide and mentor students through these larger projects provides a stronger overall experience. For these projects to be tallied, the project must have a public presentation or demonstration produced to display the findings of the project.

When reviewing student advisement in terms of research guidance, criteria considered include level of the student project being completed, an individual's role on the guidance team, whether or not the student successfully completed the final project, and whether or not the individual served on a team with colleagues from outside the university.

Professional Effectiveness Activities (For Librarians Only)

Liaison Responsibilities

All librarians serve as liaisons to specific colleges and departments across campus. As liaisons, librarians engage with students and faculty through information literacy instruction, reference consultations, and collection management.

Information Literacy Instruction
REQUIRED SECTION

Librarians teach in a variety of settings and situations, with the goal of ensuring that students graduate with the ability to successfully find and evaluate needed information. Information literacy "is the set of integrated abilities encompassing the reflective discovery of information, the understanding of how information is produced and valued, and the use of information in creating new knowledge and participating ethically in communities of learning."

Examples of modes of information literacy include but are not limited to reference interviews, individual or small group research consultations, in-person class instruction, digital or print instruction resources, web tutorials or web-based instruction, and asynchronous or synchronous instruction.

When reviewing information literacy instruction, criteria considered include the faculty member's reflection on their information literacy instruction efforts. The reflection will include the various modes of instruction used, how the instruction benefits the students, and future plans to improve and expand library instruction based on feedback from students, faculty, and library colleagues.

Reference
REQUIRED SECTION

Within the field of librarianship, "reference" means providing assistance by using expertise to respond to an information need. Reference work includes meeting students at their point-of-need, recommending and interpreting sources, promoting services, and managing service points. Librarians show mastery of the reference interview process, demonstrate search and retrieval techniques, identify authoritative, high-quality information, and empower users to navigate future information needs. During reference interactions, librarians will demonstrate values such as inclusion, approachability, engagement, searching, evaluation and closure.
Examples of reference work may include but are not limited to conducting reference interviews, keeping reference interaction statistics, providing information expertise, recommending and evaluating resources, promoting services, creating and updating asynchronous aids such as FAQs, and planning for future services.

When reviewing reference activities, criteria considered include the faculty member's reflection on their reference-related efforts. The reflection will include the various modes of reference, how the work benefits the academic community, and future plans to expand and implement reference services based on feedback from students, faculty, and library colleagues.

Collection Management
REQUIRED SECTION

Collection Management refers to the work involved in managing the library collection. Librarians strive to maintain an up-to-date and diverse collection of materials that align with the university's curriculum and information needs. In their role as collection managers, librarians must stay abreast of new publications and resources, manage funds, communicate with faculty about resource needs, right-size the collection when appropriate, determine the most appropriate format to purchase (i.e., online or print), evaluate the quality of resources, and intentionally work to build a collection of diverse voices and ideas.

Examples of collection management activities include assessing (and weeding) the collection for currency, accuracy, and relevancy, selecting discipline-specific materials, keeping track of the budget, and communicating with faculty to ensure the library collection supports the curriculum and research needs of the academic community.

When reviewing collection management activities, criteria considered include the faculty member's reflection on their collection management efforts. The reflection will include various tasks involved with collection management, how the work benefits the academic community and future plans for managing the collection.

Unique Job Responsibilities

In addition to the shared responsibilities, all faculty librarians have distinct job duties that differ librarian to librarian (e.g., cataloging librarian, user experience librarian, acquisition librarian). These additional responsibilities usually require as much time and effort as primary responsibilities. Because librarianship evolves with changes in technology and culture, these librarian roles, responsibilities, and titles can also change every few years.

Examples of distinct job duties include but are not limited to cataloging and metadata, circulation, systems administration, acquisitions, public services, and archives. Librarian faculty often take the lead for one or more of these areas and may also provide support to other areas.

When reviewing librarians' unique responsibilities, criteria considered include the faculty member's role in the particular department and annual reflections on the tasks they have performed. The reflection will include detailed descriptions of the tasks and technology used, how the work benefits the academic community, and any future plans to enhance the aforementioned work.

Interdepartmental Collaboration

Librarians from different departments often collaborate on group projects, events, and committee work. Interdepartmental collaboration gives librarians the opportunity to share information, knowledge, and resources. These types of collaboration lead to new ideas and solutions, improve performance, increase efficiency and productivity, and, ultimately, benefit the university as a whole.

When reviewing interdepartmental collaboration for librarians, criteria considered include the faculty member's role in the collaboration and a reflection of their involvement in it. The reflection will include detailed descriptions of the work involved, how the work benefits the academic community and any future plans to enhance the aforementioned work.

Professional Development

Professional development is crucial for librarians to stay current, relevant, and effective in their roles. As the information landscape evolves, librarians need to continually enhance their skills and knowledge regarding technology, information literacy, collection development, and other areas of librarianship.

Continuing education includes a wide variety of learning opportunities such as classes, training, conferences, workshops, and webinars and allows librarians to stay abreast of new technologies and trends to better meet the needs of students, faculty, and staff.

When reviewing professional development for librarians, criteria considered include the type of activity (or repeat professional development), the duration of the activity, a detailed description of how the knowledge or techniques were or will be implemented, and a reflection of how the information or techniques benefits the academic community.

Scholarly Works Activities

Publications

It is important for faculty members to publish scholarly work for both individual professional development and the advancement of academic knowledge. Publishing a book or book chapter is viewed as a strong accomplishment for faculty members. Additionally, producing journal publications is integral to the academic profession as it plays a crucial role in the continuous development and dissemination of knowledge in various fields within the broader academic community. These are some of the many ways to demonstrate in-depth scholarship, expertise, and authority, and contribute to the field in which the faculty member resides. Although publishing is viewed as a significant accomplishment, it is important to recognize that different academic disciplines may have varied expectations for scholarly output and may place more emphasis on items other than publications.

For an item to be considered a publication, it must be a written document officially published in a scholarly format in which the academic community can access it (book, journal, or conference proceeding). This can be in a traditionally printed format or an online format, but it must be published through a recognized academic authority. If the publication is intended for a more general audience or an audience other than professionals in the field, then the publication should be placed in Service Related Activities as a community service activity.

When reviewing publications, criteria considered include the type of publication, whether or not a peer-review of the publication was completed, the level of audience/viewership, the level of author contribution by the faculty member, and whether or not the faculty member collaborated with individuals outside of the university on the publication.

> **NOTE:** Publications that have been accepted with proof that no further edits are required, but have not yet been officially published, ARE PERMITTED to be included in "completed projects" for both promotion and tenure purposes.

Presentations

Delivering conference presentations is important for faculty for several reasons, and it serves a different but complementary role to publications. Conference presentations provide a dynamic forum for sharing research, obtaining feedback, and fostering collaboration, while publications offer a more in-depth and enduring platform for presenting scholarly work. Both avenues are valuable for faculty members, and their relative importance may vary based on academic discipline.

For an item to be considered a presentation, it must be officially presented at a scholarly forum in which the academic community was able to attend (conference, webinar, etc.). This can be in a traditional presentation with onsite travel or in an online format, but it must be presented through a recognized academic authority. If the presentation is intended for a more general audience or an audience other than professionals in the field, then the presentation should be placed in Service Related Activities as a community service activity.

When reviewing presentations, criteria considered include the type of presentation, whether or not a peer review of the presentation was completed, the level of audience/viewership, the level of presenter contribution by the faculty member, and whether or not the faculty member collaborated with individuals outside of the university on the presentation.

Creative Works (Fine Arts and Graphic Design)

Creative works serve as a form of scholarly work for fine art faculty, offering a unique and essential mode of academic inquiry within the field. These works contribute to the academic discourse by pushing the boundaries of artistic expression, challenging established norms, and offering innovative perspectives. Creative works by fine art faculty not only contribute to the broader academic community but also demonstrate the profound scholarly value inherent in the visual and sensory dimensions of artistic practice.

When looking at creative works for fine arts, acceptance into juried shows serves as a primary method of critique for art pieces – similar to that of peer-reviewed written work. Additionally, commissioned work often shows a high demand for the work being produced by an artist. When reviewing creative works from the fine arts and graphic design fields, criteria considered include acceptance into an art show, the audience level of the show, whether or not multiple pieces were accepted to the show, or if a prize was one at the show. For commissioned works, the type and amount of compensation are taken into account along with the general viewership of where the art will be displayed.

Creative Works (Theatre and Drama)

Creative works in the realm of drama hold paramount importance as scholarly endeavors for drama faculty, constituting a distinctive form of academic exploration. Unlike conventional scholarly activities that predominantly rely on written discourse, theatrical productions, scriptwriting, and

performance art provide a dynamic avenue for investigating and advancing the understanding of dramatic arts. Drama faculty engage in scholarly creativity to not only contribute to the academic discourse but also to enhance pedagogy, fostering a deeper comprehension of theatrical techniques, storytelling, and the socio-cultural implications of dramatic expression.

When looking at creative works for theatre and drama, number of tickets sold is one metric demonstrating the popularity and success of a performance. Additionally, the incorporation of new styles and acting techniques helps increase the quality of the performance. When reviewing creative works from theatre and drama fields, criteria considered include number of seats/tickets sold, role in the production, and implementation of new techniques and strategies.

Grants

Applying for grants is essential for faculty members as it not only provides financial support for research but also contributes to professional development, institutional reputation, and the advancement of knowledge. The ability to secure research grants is often seen as a key indicator of an academic's research prowess and impact in their field.

Although the process for applying for a grant is rigorous, only projects in which the grant was awarded should be inserted in this section. For individuals applying for a grant for which an award was not given, it is recommended that the information used to apply for the grant be used for work on a publication or presentation so that the work could be applied to those areas. Grants will be recognized during the term(s) of the actual project – not the submission or the award notification. As the management and work on an awarded grant can take multiple years, an awarded grant can be counted throughout the lifespan of the project. Thus, if a grant overlaps multiple reporting years, points can be tallied on both years. Additionally, if a grant overlaps multiple promotion periods – while assistant professor then while associate professor roles, then the grant can be counted on both portfolio submissions.

When reviewing grants, criteria considered include grant award and funding level, level of impact for the awarded grant, an individual's role on a grant, and whether or not the individual collaborated with a member of an institution other than the university.

Exhibitions and Exhibit Curation

Exhibition and exhibit curation play a crucial role in showcasing faculty scholarly work by providing a platform for disseminating research findings, fostering interdisciplinary dialogue, and engaging with broader communities. Successful exhibitions and exhibits demand significant effort and resources as well as extensive study and contextualization of a wide array of primary source materials. It is a valuable aspect of faculty scholarly work that extends the reach and impact of research, fosters collaboration and engagement, and contributes to the advancement of knowledge and understanding in society.

Exhibitions and exhibits must include in-depth research and various objects on the topic and be displayed at a scholarly forum in which the academic community is able to attend (conference, museum, university library, etc.). Exhibitions are larger in scale, while exhibits may only fill a single display case or lobby panel. Exhibitions and exhibits may be physical, virtual, or a combination of the two. To be considered scholarly, the curation must be supported or sponsored by an academic authority, such as a library, museum, university, or professional organization.

When reviewing exhibition or exhibit curation, criteria considered include type of exhibition or exhibit, whether it is peer-reviewed, juried or invitational, audience level or impact, exhibitor contribution level, and whether or not the faculty member engaged with colleagues outside of the university on the exhibit.

Workshops / Training Sessions

Hosting training series and workshops for academic organizations is important for knowledge dissemination, community building, professional development, and contributing to the overall growth and vibrancy of the academic community. It serves as a means to share expertise, foster collaboration, and address educational needs within and beyond the institution.

Workshops and trainings in this section must be geared towards the academic community. General workshops delivered to the public should be considered under Service Related Activities as community service. Once the audience is established, a workshop is viewed as a multi-hour event in which a presenter or facilitator teaches and trains individuals on various topics. For an event to be considered a workshop, the individual or team must be scheduled to engage with the same audience over four hours within a four-week period. If a workshop is scheduled for less than this specified timeframe, it is considered training. When reviewing academic workshops and training, the criteria considered include the type of workshop and training, the duration of the workshop, the audience level, the individual's contribution to running the workshop, and whether or not they collaborated with an individual outside of the university.

Multimedia

Creating in-field digital media is a multifaceted approach to research that extends beyond traditional academic publishing. This emerging form of scholarship aligns with the changing landscape of communication, enhances the impact and accessibility of research, and facilitates meaningful engagement with the academic community and beyond. This evolution in scholarly communication reflects a commitment to effective knowledge dissemination and societal impact and are valuable tools for faculty members to contribute to their fields and engage with diverse audiences.

In order for a form of multimedia or digital publishing to be applicable for review, the item created must be in existence for at least one calendar year and the content must be related to the teaching

field or the faculty member's content area. Additionally, metrics must be able to be gathered demonstrating number of views or other activity the media receives.

When reviewing management of various multimedia platforms, criteria considered include the annual viewership of the platform and the number of subscribers on the platform. Multimedia channels are only counted once in the tally, so the highest value during a reporting period should be highlighted. However, when reporting for a different academic rank (currently assistant professor to currently associate professor), the multimedia tally can be repeated as long as the numbers used fall within the new reporting years.

Awards and Recognitions Related to Research

The recognition of research is important because it recognizes excellence in regard to a faculty member's research acumen, enhances the reputation of the faculty member and university, opens doors to funding opportunities, inspires students, and facilitates the dissemination of knowledge, ultimately contributing to the advancement of scholarship and the mission of the institution.

Awards related to research can come from a variety of sources. When looking at awards and recognitions related to research, the criterion considered is the type of award obtained and whether or not the award was obtained from an outside organization or from the university.

Service Related Activities

Service to the Institution

Participation in University Committees

Faculty participation in governance through university committees is essential for ensuring that the university operates effectively and fulfills its academic mission. Active committee participation allows faculty members to contribute to decision-making, policy development, and the overall well-being of the institution. It provides additional insight into how the university can ultimately serve the best interests of students, the academic community, and society at large.

University committees are considered official committees that continually run over multiple academic years. If the committee runs for more than one year, it is to be placed in this category. Points for this category will only be awarded if the individual served at least 6 months on the committee in a given academic year. Multiple years of service on the committee should be counted as individual items as long as the individual served at least 6 months on the committee in the year being reported. For points to be awarded in this section, an individual must have been in the appointment for a minimum duration of six months in a recorded academic year. This ensures a sustained and impactful contribution to the specified roles.

When reviewing service on university committees, the criteria considered include the impact level of the committee, an individual's role on a committee, and demonstration of active participation on the committee.

Participation in Temporary Committees

It is important for faculty members to actively serve on task forces and committees at the university to help ensure academic perspectives are considered as various decisions are made. It is also important for faculty members to add additional viewpoints to assist in ensuring the university's mission, values, and its commitment to academic excellence and student success are upheld.

Temporary committees and task forces are university bodies intended to solve a temporary problem or create a solution for quick implementation or further thought. Generally speaking, these bodies complete their work within one year of being established. If the committee runs for less than one year, it is to be placed in this category. For points to be awarded in this section, an individual must have been in the appointment for a minimum duration of six months, unless the activity is explicitly defined as a limited-term appointment of less than one year (e.g. a 60-day task force), in which case points are awarded regardless of duration. If multiple reporting years are attributed to a temporary committee, the committee should be reported in the University Committees section.

When reviewing service on temporary committees, criteria considered include the impact level of the committee, an individual's role on a committee, and demonstration of active participation on the committee.

Appointment of Administrator Level Positions of a University Department or Initiative

In certain situations, it is in the best interest of the university to appoint a faculty member in an administrative role at the university. During this period, the faculty member may serve dual roles as an administrator and a faculty member at the institution.

Administrative appointments are considered positions in which the individual has at least one employee or student worker directly reporting to the position. For points to be awarded in this section, an individual must have been in the appointment for a minimum duration of six months in the year being reported. Additionally, if the individual serves in the appointment for more than two reporting years, then each year should be counted towards the total tally as long as the individual served at least six months in the year being reported.

When reviewing administrative appointments, the criterion considered is based on the level of administrative appointment.

Producing Institutional Reports and Accreditation Documentation

Faculty involvement in accreditation writing is essential for demonstrating the institution's commitment to academic quality, alignment with accreditation standards, and continuous

improvement. Their expertise and engagement contribute to the credibility and effectiveness of the accreditation process, leading to a stronger and more accountable institution.

When looking at institutional report writing and accreditation documentation, items are tallied on a project basis – not a time basis. Completion of the final report, not individual sections of a report, is required for point allotment.   When reviewing service writing institutional reports and accreditation documentation, the criteria considered include the level of the report (institutional, college, dept, etc.), the individual's role on the reporting team, and the level of participation in writing the report.

Supporting University Initiatives

Faculty involvement in university initiatives helps advance the university's academic and strategic goals, foster a collaborative and inclusive culture, and ensure that the institution continues to excel and evolve in the ever-changing landscape of higher education.

Supporting university initiatives can take the form of officially being assigned to help with an initiative or assisting a colleague with a project related to a university initiative. In either case, tallying for support of a university initiative is based on a per-project basis – not a time basis. Thus, serving at an event such as Fiddler's Convention would count as a single event, even if you served two shifts at the convention as the event itself is considered the initiative.

When reviewing support for university initiatives, the criterion considered is based on the level of initiative being supported.

Faculty Mentorship

Faculty mentorship by senior faculty members is a cornerstone of academic life and plays a crucial role in the overall functioning and success of a university. Mentorship promotes professional development, retention, and satisfaction among faculty members, fosters collaboration and networking, and ensures the continuity and success of academic departments and disciplines.

Mentorship can take the form of formally being assigned a mentor and engaging with them in activities throughout the year or informal mentorship of new faculty. Additionally, participation in mentoring events such as the First Year Faculty program may be applied to this area.

When reviewing faculty mentorship activities, the criterion considered is based on the type of mentorship activity being conducted.

Representing the University in Public Media

Appearances in public media play a significant role in shaping the public perception of the university and in sharing its contributions to society and academia. These types of activities are generally designed to inform, engage, and connect with various stakeholders, including current and prospective students, faculty, alumni, the local community, researchers, and the general public. Examples of such media include newspapers, local news media, newsletters, and popular magazines.

Representation on public media should be considered when you serve as a guest on a media forum. Hosting of your own media forum would be considered the creation of multimedia research dissemination and located under Scholarly Works activities. When reviewing the representation of the university in public media, the criterion considered is based on the level of audience in which the media is being viewed.

Participation in Student Organizations

Faculty participation in student organizations enriches the student experience while fostering a sense of community and connection within the university. It is an important aspect of holistic education that goes beyond the classroom and empowers students to excel academically and professionally.

For allotment of points related to student organizations, the student organization must be officially registered with the university to be considered. Additionally, faculty members are expected to take a guiding and leadership role within these organizations. For points to be awarded in this section, the student organization must have existed for at least six months and the individual must have been in the role being reported for a minimum duration of six months in the year being reported. Additionally, if the individual serves in the appointment for multiple reporting years, then each year should be counted towards the total tally as long as the individual served at least six months in the year being reported.

An additional type of participation is in supporting events hosted by student clubs and organizations. Attendance and engagement in student-hosted activities are encouraged among faculty members.

When reviewing participation in student organizations, the criteria considered include the individual's role in the student organization, the activity level of the organization, and participation in student-led events (up to a certain amount).

Faculty – Student Advising and Mentorship

Faculty engagement in student advising and mentoring is of paramount importance, particularly for at-risk students, as it serves as a pivotal support system that can profoundly influence the student's persistence each semester through graduation. Through constant, proactive, and clear communication, a faculty member can provide students with the support, knowledgeable guidance, empowerment, encouragement, feedback, and assessment they need to succeed academically and

thrive personally. This process extends beyond mere course registration and requires the faculty member to establish strong connections with students by sharing their knowledge and insight from their various programs and professions.

When reviewing faculty advising and mentoring, the criteria considered include a demonstration of proactive communication, the ability to review and understand student advisees and their challenges, differentiate at-risk advisees, and demonstrable collaboration with support staff involved with student advising.

Participation in Student Affairs and Recruiting Initiatives

Faculty involvement in student affairs initiatives fosters a sense of community, provides leadership and mentorship opportunities for students, and enriches the overall student experience, making it more engaging and rewarding. Faculty involvement in student recruiting is valuable for prospective students, the university, and the faculty members themselves; it ensures that students receive personalized academic information and guidance while beginning to develop a student-to-faculty relationship which increases the likelihood of them attending the institution to pursue their academic goals.

Due to the nature of recruiting events, activity in these events is based on time served per recruiting event. Additionally, events located further away from campus tend to have less faculty participation and thus are weighted slightly heavier. When reviewing participation in recruiting activities, the criteria considered include the time served at an event and the distance from campus for the event.

Service to the Community

Service to Private or Public Entities

By providing time and expertise to public or private entities, faculty are promoting the well-being of communities, supporting innovation, and fostering collaboration between the university and organizations, ultimately contributing to a more prosperous and equitable society.

For tallying purposes, service on a board or similar managerial team for an organization is considered if an individual has been in the appointment for a minimum duration of six months in the year being reported. Additionally, if the individual serves in the appointment for more than two reporting years, then each year should be counted towards the total tally as long as the individual served at least six months in the year being reported.

For individual projects such as a consulting report, each individual project counts as an activity. These projects should take a significant amount of research and work to produce a final product. Otherwise, general volunteerism and service on service days should be reported in the Informal / Non-Academic Community Service activities.

When reviewing service to private or public entities, the criteria considered include the type of service, the level of the organization being served, and whether or not any compensation was involved.

Awards and Recognitions Related to Community Service

Awards for community service are prestigious because they celebrate and honor the positive impact of selfless service on society, inspire others to get involved, and encourage a culture of giving and social responsibility. They highlight the significance of faculty member's community engagement and effort put forward to improve the lives of others and create stronger, more compassionate communities.

When reviewing awards for service, the criterion considered is based on the level of organization presenting the award.

Informal and Non-Academic Community Service

Volunteering for community service is essential because it creates a stronger, more engaged, and compassionate society. Volunteering for a community service event allows additional avenues to enhance the name and reputation of the University. Examples of this type of service may include coaching youth sports, volunteering with outreach organizations, or volunteering time at other local institutions supporting various causes.

Volunteering time and effort to local organizations can take many forms. Individual service projects being reported must be of a duration of at least one hour to be tallied. Additionally, drives to collect money or materials for organizations may be tallied regardless of the duration of the drive. These activities are counted as one item (maximum of five per academic year). Individual projects occurring more than three times in a reporting year should be counted as recurring community service activities. Recurring service activities (i.e. serving with Habitat for Humanity every Saturday for two months) count as one item in a reporting period regardless of the number of times an individual has served the activity (maximum of three per reporting year). A recurring service activity can be counted in multiple reporting years as long as the event meets the definition of a recurring service activity in each year reported.

Coaching sports is a unique service activity. When reporting a coaching activity, tallying for the activity is based on the duration of an entire season with one team (maximum of three per reporting year).

When reviewing informal and non-academic community service, the criteria considered include the type of event and whether or not it is a coaching activity.

Service to the Profession

Active Participation in Professional Organizations

Faculty members benefit from being involved with professional organizations by gaining access to valuable resources, opportunities for collaboration, recognition, and personal and professional development. Additionally, active participation allows faculty to assist in creating and enriching an environment that contributes to the growth of other professionals as educators, researchers, and experts in their fields.

For a faculty member to grow through a professional organization, they need to be active in the organization. This could include items such as attending professional events, communicating with members of the organization, taking trainings via the organization, etc. Simply paying for membership in an organization does not constitute active status for tallying purposes. When reviewing active participation in professional organizations, the criteria considered include the level of the organization and the level of activity in the organization.

Organizing Conferences or Service on Conference Committees

Assisting organizations in conducting and running conferences benefits both individuals and the academic community. It promotes knowledge dissemination, intellectual exchange, networking, professional growth, and the advancement of research. It plays a crucial role in strengthening the academic community and its commitment to excellence.

When considering activities in this category, conference assistance should be related to planning or working on an actual conference. Reviewing proposals should be placed in the "Refereeing Manuscripts, Conference Submissions, and Grant Proposals section rather than here. When reviewing service on conferences and/or conference committees, criteria considered include the role of the individual related to the event, the level of the conference being organized, and the level of participation in organizing the event.

Refereeing Manuscripts, Conference Submissions, or Grant Proposals for Outside Organizations

Refereeing journal and conference submissions through peer review is essential for maintaining the integrity and credibility of academic research as it ensures that content is of high quality, adheres to best practices and standards, and contributes to the advancement of knowledge in various disciplines.

When reviewing services related to referring peers' work, the criteria considered include the individual's role on the review team and the level of the event for which items are being reviewed.

Serving as a Reviewer for an Organization or Part of an Accreditation Team

Peer reviewing other academic institutions through the quality control processes or accreditation processes is crucial for maintaining the quality, accountability, and reputation of higher education

and higher education institutions. It ensures that institutions provide a high standard of education, adhere to ethical principles, and meet the needs of faculty, students and society.

When reviewing service related to reviewing items for accreditation or another institution / organization, criteria considered include the individual's role on the review team, the level of the reviewing organization, and whether or not it is an accreditation review or different review project.

Promotion and Tenure Activity Values and Formulas

Green Highlight - These items are variable range for the committee to determine.

Teaching Effectiveness Activities

Implementation of New Knowledge and Teaching Techniques

- **Formula**
  - **Method + Implementation + Reflection + Future Adjustments**
- Method of Knowledge Acquisition (Baseline)
  - 5 pts - Training / CE Attendance (3 annual cap)
  - 5 pts - Conference Attendance (3 annual cap)
  - 0 pts – Informal
- Implementation of Technique / Knowledge
  - 10 pts – Based on Written Summary
- Reflection of Implementation Results
  - 10 pts – Based on Written Summary
- Future Adjustments from Implementation Reflection
  - 10 pts – Based on Written Summary

Additional Credentials Outside of Promotion Requirements

- **Formula**
  - **Exam Based Certification**
- Exam Based Certification (Baseline)
  - 50 pts - Exam Based Certificate (one-time inclusion max of 3 total)

Peer Review of Courses

- **Formula**
  - **(Type of Review * (Average Score / 100)) + Reflection + Growth Plan**
- Type of Review (Baseline)

- o 100 pts – Course Design Review
- o 100 pts – Teaching Review
- o Average Reviewer Score Adjustment
    - ▪ Varies – Percentage of Whole Applied to Baseline
- <mark>Reflection of Review</mark>
    - o 20 pts – Based on Written Summary
- <mark>Growth Plan Based on Reflection</mark>
    - o 30 pts – Based on Written Plan

Course Evaluation and Reflection

- **Formula**
    - o **Reflection of Annual Scores + Growth Plan**
- <mark>Reflection of Annual Scores</mark>
    - o 20 pts – Based on Written Summary
- <mark>Growth Plan Based on Reflection</mark>
    - o 30 pts – Based on Written Plan

Awards and Recognition Related to Teaching

- **Formula**
    - o **Type of Award**
- Type of Award (Baseline)
    - o 100 pts – Outside Entity
    - o 50 pts – University
    - o 5 pts – Student Based

Creation or Redesign of Courses or Programs

- **Formula**
    - o **(Type of Project * New or Redesign * Role) / Num. of Contributors**
- Type of Project (Baseline)
    - o 50 pts - Program
    - o 100 pts - Course
- New Project or Redesign
    - o 100% of Points Allotted – New Project
    - o 75% of Points Allotted – Official Redesign Process
    - o 50% of Points Allotted – Unofficial Redesign Process Based on Written Summary
- Role in Project

- o   100 % of Points Allotted– Program Lead, Course Lead, or Course Anchor
- o   50 % of Points Allotted - Contributor
- Number of Contributors (up to 4 on Program, up to 2 on Course)
    - o   Varies – Divide Total Point Allotted by Number of Contributors

Student Advisement (Preparation for Post-Graduation Success)

- **Formula**
    - o   **Type of Communication**
- Type of Letter for / From Student (Baseline) – Max 1 Occurrence Per Academic Year
    - o   10 pts – Recommendation Letter for Student
    - o   30 pts – Communication Displaying Successful Student Placement

Student Advisement (Dissertation / Thesis / Research Guidance)

- **Formula**
    - o   **(Level of Project * Role on Project * Project Success) + Outside Collaboration**
- Level of Student Project (Baseline)
    - o   10 pts – Capstone Project
    - o   50 pts – Master's Thesis
    - o   100 pts – Dissertation
- Role on Project
    - o   100% of Allotted Points - Chair / Sole Committee Member
    - o   50% of Allotted Points - Committee / Team Member
- Project Success
    - o   100% of Allotted Points – Yes
    - o   25% of Allotted Points – No
- Outside Collaboration Bonus
    - o   + 50 pts

Professional Effectiveness Activities

Liaison Responsibilities

Information Literacy Instruction

- **Formula**
    - o   **Reflection + Growth Plan**
- **Reflection**
    - o   Based on Written Summary (100)
- **Growth Plan Based on Reflection**
    - o   Based on Written Plan (+ 50)

Reference
- **Formula**
  - **Reflection + Growth Plan**
- **Reflection**
  - Based on Written Summary (100)
- **Growth Plan Based on Reflection**
  - Based on Written Plan (+ 50)

Collection Management
- **Formula**
  - **Reflection + Growth Plan**
- **Reflection**
  - Based on Written Summary (100)
- **Growth Plan Based on Reflection**
  - Based on Written Plan (+ 50)

Unique Job Responsibilities
- **Formula**
  - **Reflection + Growth Plan**
- **Reflection**
  - Based on Written Summary (300)
- **Growth Plan Based on Reflection**
  - Based on Written Plan (+ 50)

Interdepartmental Collaboration
- **Formula**
  - **Role + Reflection + Growth Plan**
- **Role**
  - Primary/Lead – 50 points
  - Supporting – 25 points
- **Reflection**
  - Based on Written Summary (50)
- **Growth Plan Based on Reflection**
  - Based on Written Plan (+ 25)

Professional Development

- **Formula**
  - **Type + Reflection**
- Type of Professional Development (Baseline)
  - 50 pts – Classes/training (3 annual cap)
  - 5 pts - Conference Attendance (3 annual cap)
  - 5 pts – Workshops (3 annual cap)
  - 1 pt - Webinars (10 annual cap)
- Reflection of how education benefitted students and patrons
  - 10 pts – Based on Written Summary

Scholarly Activities

Publications

- **Formula**
  - **(Type of Publication * Peer Review * Audience * Author Level) + Outside Collaboration**
- Type of Publication (Baseline)
  - 600 pts – Book
  - 300 pts – Journal Article
  - 250 pts – Book Chapter
  - 200 pts – Book Review
  - 150 pts – Book– Supplemental Contributor (No bonus for outside collaboration)
  - 100 pts – Conference Proceedings
- Peer Review Status
  - 100 % of Allocated Points – Peer Reviewed
  - 65 % of Allocated Points – Editorial Board Review
  - 50 % of Allocated Points – Invited / Solicited / No Peer Review
- Level of Audience / Viewership
  - 100 % of Allocated Points – International / National
  - 75 % of Allocated Points – Regional / State
  - 25 % of Allocated Points - Local
- Author Contribution Level
  - 100 % of Allocated Points – 1st Author
  - 50 % of Allocated Points – 2nd Author
  - 35 % of Allocated Points – 3rd through 5th Author
  - 0 % of Allocated Points – 6th Author or Lower
- Outside Collaboration Bonus
  - + 50 pts

Presentation

- **Formula**
  - **(Type of Presentation * Peer Review * Audience * Author Level) + Outside Collaboration + Student Inclusion**
- Type of Presentation (Baseline)
  - 100 pts - Presentation
  - 75 pts – Poster Presentation
  - 50 pts – Panel Facilitator / Panel Moderator
  - 25 pts – Panel Speaker
- Peer Review Status
  - 100 % of Allocated Points – Peer Reviewed
  - 50 % of Allocated Points – Invited / Solicited
  - 25 % of Allocated Points – Editorial / No Peer Review
- Level of Audience / Viewership
  - 100 % of Allocated Points – International / National
  - 75 % of Allocated Points – Regional / State
  - 25 % of Allocated Points - Local
- Author Contribution Level
  - 100 % of Allocated Points – 1st Author
    - *Panel Facilitators / Panel Moderators are always considered 1st Author*
  - 50 % of Allocated Points – 2nd Author
  - 35 % of Allocated Points – 3rd through 5th Author
  - 0 % of Allocated Points – 6th Author or Lower
- Outside Collaboration Bonus
  - + 50 pts
- Student Inclusion Bonus
  - + 50 pts

Creative Works (Theatre)

- **Formula**
  - **(Number of Seats Sold * Role) + New Technique Bonus**
- Number of Seats Sold (Baseline)
  - Varies – 1 pt per Seat Sold
- Role in Production
  - 100 % of Allocated Points – Director / Technical Director
  - 75 % of Allocated Points – Producer

- o 50 % of Allocated Points – Other Contributor
- Implementation of New Technique into Production
    - o + 25 pts

Creative Works (Visual Arts)

- **Formula**
    - o **(Type of Display * Audience) + Multiple Piece Bonus + Award Bonus + Commission Bonus**
- Type of Display (Baseline)
    - o 300 pts – Juried Show
    - o 150 pts – Non-Juried Show
    - o 100 pts – Commission (Paid)
    - o 50 pts – Commission (Invited)
    - o 10 pts – Commission (Donated) – Max 3 Per Academic Year
- Level of Audience / Viewership
    - o 100 % of Allocated Points – International / National
    - o 50 % of Allocated Points – Regional / State
    - o 25 % of Allocated Points – Local
    - o 5 % of Allocated Points – University
- Multiple Pieces in Show Bonus
    - o + 50 pts
- Award in Show Bonus
    - o + 50 pts
- Commission Bonus
    - o + 5 pts per $1000 in commission

Grants

- **Formula**
    - o **((Grant Awarded + Amount Bonus) * Impact * Role) + Outside Bonus**
- Grant Awarded (Baseline)
    - o 150 pts – Award Received
- Grant Amount Bonus
    - o 1 pt per $1000 of Grant Award
- Level of Impact
    - o 100 % of Allocated Points of Grant + Amount – University
    - o 85 % of Allocated Points of Grant + Amount – College / Dept
    - o 25 % of Allocated Points of Grant + Amount – Non-University

- Role on Grant
    - 100 % of Allocated Points of Grant + Amount – Principle Investigator
    - 75 % of Allocated Points of Grant + Amount – Leadership Team
    - 25 % of Allocated Points of Grant + Amount – Participant
- Include Outside Collaboration
    - + 50 pts

Exhibitions and Exhibit Curation

- **Formula**
    - **(Type of Curation * Size of Curation * Audience Level * Contribution) + Outside Bonus**
- Type of Curation:
    - 150 pts – Commission (Paid)
    - 100 pts – Commission (Invited / Assigned)
    - 50 pts – Commission (Donated / Volunteered) – Max 3 Per Academic Year
- Size of Curation
    - Three or More Display Cases on Same Topic – 100%
    - One or Two Display Cases on Same Topic – 50%
- Audience Level (Local, State, Regional, National, International)
    - International / National – 100%
    - Regional/State/Local – 75%
- Exhibitor Contribution Level
    - 1st or solo – 100%
    - 2nd – 75%
    - 3rd -5th -25%
    - Other – 0%
- Collaboration with Colleagues Outside of Athens State
    - +50 pts

Hosting Workshop / Training for the Field or Academic Professionals

- **Formula**
    - **((Workshop Type + Duration) * Audience * Host) + Outside Bonus**
- Type of Workshop / Training (Baseline)
    - 100 pts – Paid / Contracted
    - 50 pts – Volunteer
- Duration in # of Hours Bonus
    - 10 pts per 4 hours over the initial 4 hours of workshop or training
- Level of Audience

- o 100 % of Allocated Points of Type + Duration – National
- o 75 % of Allocated Points of Type + Duration – Regional / State
- o 50 % of Allocated Points of Type + Duration – Local
- Host Level
  - o 100 % of Allocated Points of Type + Duration – Sole Presenter / 1st Presenter
  - o 75 % of Allocated Points of Type + Duration – 2nd or 3rd Presenter
  - o 25 % of Allocated Points of Type + Duration – 4th or 5th Presenter
  - o 0 % of Allocated Points of Type + Duration – 6th Presenter or Lower
- Include Outside Collaboration
  - o + 50 pts

Multimedia Distribution

- **Formula**
  - o **Interactions + Subscribers**
- Annual Hits / Views (Baseline)
  - o + 5 pts per 5000 interactions annually
- Subscribers
  - o 10 pts per 1000 subscribers annually

Awards and Recognition Related to Research

- **Formula**
  - o **Type of Award**
- Type of Award (Baseline)
  - o 100 pts – Outside Entity
  - o 50 pts – University

Service Activities

Service to the Institution

Participation in University Committees

- **Formula**
  - o **(Committee Level * Role) + Role Bonus**
- Committee Level (Baseline)
  - o 100 pts - University
  - o 100 pts – Faculty Senate
  - o 75 pts – Faculty Senate Sub-Committee
  - o 50 pts – College / Kares Library / Dept. Level Committee

- o   50 pts – Board of Trustees Committee
- **Role on Committee**
  - o   + 50 pts bonus – Committee Chair / Presiding Officer
  - o   + 20 pts bonus – Other Leadership Role
  - o   100 % of Allocated Points – Active Participation
  - o   25 % of Allocated Points – Inactive

Participation in Temporary Committees
- **Formula**
  - o   **(Committee Level * Role) + Role Bonus**
- Committee Level (Baseline)
  - o   50 pts - University
  - o   30 pts – College / Kares Library / Dept. Level Committee
  - o   20 pts – Search Committee
- **Role on Committee**
  - o   + 15 pts bonus – Committee Chair / Presiding Officer
  - o   + 5   pts bonus – Other Leadership Role
  - o   100 % of Allocated Points – Active Participation
  - o   25 % of Allocated Points – Inactive

Appointment of Administrator Level Position of a University Department or Initiative
- **Formula**
  - o   **Type of Appointment**
- Type of Appointment (Baseline)
  - o   200 pts – Dean / VP
  - o   100 pts – Department Chair / Director
  - o   100 pts – Program / Special Project Lead
  - o   50 pts – Lead a Student Support Lab or Tutoring Center

Producing Institutional Reports and Accreditation Documentation
- **Formula**
  - o   **(Level of Report * Role) + Role Bonus**
- Level of Report (Baseline)
  - o   150 pts – University
  - o   150 pts – College
  - o   100 pts – Program Specific

- ==Role on Committee==
    - + 50 pts bonus – Chair / Compiler of Overall Report
    - + 20 pts bonus – Chair / Compiler of Individual Portion of Report
    - 100 % of Allocated Points – Active Participation
    - 25 % of Allocated Points – Inactive

Supporting University Initiatives
- **Formula**
    - **Level of Initiative**
- Level of Initiative (Baseline)
    - 50 pts – University
    - 30 pts – College / Kares Library / Dept. Level
    - 15 pts – Program Specific

Faculty Mentorship
- **Formula**
    - **Type of Communication**
- Type of Mentorship (Baseline)
    - 10 pts – Leading a Recognized Mentoring Event
    - 20 pts – Letter of Support from Mentee Demonstrating Long Term Mentorship (max 2 Per Reporting Year)

Representing the University in Public Media
- **Formula**
    - **Level of Audience**
- Level of Audience (Baseline)
    - 50 pts – National
    - 15 pts – Local

Participation in Student Organizations
- **Formula**
    - **Role In Organization + Total Activity Bonuses + Participation**
- Role in Student Organization (Baseline)
    - 25 pts – Faculty Lead / Advisor

- o   15 pts – Faculty Co-Leader / Co-Advisor
- o   5 pts – Active Participant / Non-Lead
- Level of Organization Activity
  - o   + 5 pts bonus - Demonstration of Meeting Throughout the Year
  - o   + 5 pts bonus – Service Project / Fundraiser Other than Fiddler's
  - o   + 5 pts bonus – Host a Public Symposium or Workshop
- Participation in Student Activity / Event
  - o   + 1 pt   bonus (Maximum 10 Events Per Reporting Year)

Faculty – Student Advising and Mentorship

- **Formula**
  - o   **Engagement and Communication + Support of At-Risk Advisees + Collaborative Advising Efforts**
- Engagement and Communication Reflection and Growth Plan
  - o   10 pts –Reflection of new communication methods from the reporting period
  - o   10 pts – Anticipated enhancements to make over the next reporting period
- Supporting At-Risk Advisees Reflection and Growth Plan
  - o   10 pts –Reflection on work with at-risk advisees from the reporting period
  - o   10 pts – Anticipated enhancements to working with at-risk advisees over the next reporting period
- Supporting Collaborative Advising Efforts
  - o   + 5 pts bonus (Maximum 2 Per Reporting Period)

Participation in Student Affairs and Recruiting Initiatives

- **Formula**
  - o   **(Time at Event * 10 per hour served) + Required Travel Bonus**
- Time at Event (Baseline)
  - o   10 pts per Hour Served
- Required Travel
  - o   + 25 pts bonus – If event was greater than 25 miles away from campus

Service to the Community

Service to Private or Public Entities

- **Formula**
  - o   **Role in Organization * Level of Organization * Level of Compensation**

- Role in Organization (Baseline)
  - o 100 pts – Board Member or Leadership Role
  - o 75 pts – One Time Project
- Level of Organization
  - o 100 % of Allocated Points – National Organization
  - o 50 % of Allocated Points – Local / Regional Chapter
- Level of Compensation
  - o 100 % of Allocated Points – Paid Project / Voted in Appointment
  - o 85 % of Allocated Points – Volunteer Project / Volunteer Appointment

Awards and Recognitions Related to Community Service

- **Formula**
  - o **Level of Organization**
- Level of Organization Presenting Award (Baseline)
  - o 150 pts – National
  - o 125 pts – State
  - o 50 pts – Local

Informal and Non-Academic Community Service

- **Formula**
  - o **Role In Organization + Total Activity Bonuses + Participation**
- Type of Event (Baseline)
  - o 2 pts per event – Single Event (Maximum 5 per academic year)
  - o 10 pts per event – Recurring Event (Maximum 3 per academic year)
  - o 15 pts per season – Coaching Local Teams (Maximum 3 per academic year)
- Role at Event
  - o 100 % of Allocated Points – Volunteer
  - o 100 % of Allocated Points – Head Coach
  - o 75 % of Allocated Points – Assistant Coach

Service to the Profession and Academic Community

Active Participation in Professional Organizations

- **Formula**
  - o **(Level of Organization * Role) + Role Bonus**
- Level of Organization (Baseline)
  - o 25 pts - National

- o 15 pts – Regional / State
- o 5 pts – Local
- <mark>Role on Committee</mark>
  - o + 30 pts bonus – Leadership Role
  - o 100 % of Allocated Points – Active Participation
  - o 25 % of Allocated Points – Inactive

Organizing Conferences or Service at Conferences

- **Formula**
  - o **Role * Level of Conference * Activity**
- Role in Conference Organization (Baseline)
  - o 100 pts – Leadership / Planning Team
  - o 50 pts – Working Event
- Level of Conference
  - o 100 % of Allocated Points – National
  - o 50 % of Allocated Points – State / Regional
  - o 25 % of Allocated Points – Local
- <mark>Level of Activity</mark>
  - o 100 % of Allocated Points – Active Participation
  - o 25 % of Allocated Points - Inactive

Refereeing Manuscripts, Conference Submissions, or Grant Proposals

- **Formula**
  - o **Role * Level of Reviewing Organization**
- Role in Review (Baseline)
  - o 100 pts – Chair / Organizer
  - o 75 pts – Reviewer
- Level of Reviewing Organization
  - o 100 % of Allocated Points – International / National
  - o 75 % of Allocated Points – State / Regional
  - o 25 % of Allocated Points – Local

Serving as a Reviewer for an Organization or Part of an Accreditation Team

- **Formula**

- o **(Role * Level of Reviewing Organization) + Accreditation Bonus**
- Role in Review (Baseline)
    - o 100 pts – Chair / Organizer
    - o 75 pts – Reviewer
- Level of Reviewing Organization
    - o 100 % of Allocated Points – National
    - o 75 % of Allocated Points – State / Regional
    - o 25 % of Allocated Points – Local
- Accreditation Team or Single Project
    - o 100 pts bonus – Accreditation Team
    - o   0 pts bonus – Other Project

Recommended Updates

Future Tool Updates

Needed

1. Visiting / Guest Lecturer (Teaching Effectiveness)
    a. Defining and creating a value for Guest Lecturing or Visiting Lectures should be debated.
2. Creative Works (Writing) (Scholarly Activity)
    a. A category for writing that is published and recognized, but not necessarily 100% academic in nature, needs to be discussed. This would also need to include self-published works, but not items like blog postings (those are located in the multimedia section of Scholarly Works). The committee agrees it needs to be placed in its own category, but defining it and assigning a point value needs to be discussed.
3. Creative Works (Music) (Scholarly Activity)
    a. The addition of music into the school's catalog of offerings warrants discussion of adding a creative works section for faculty members teaching in this area. This discussion needs to start by discussing what should be measured with faculty members teaching music.
4. Book Editor
    a. An area for editing books, rather than just contributing chapters, should be looked at being added to the Publications section. Considerations thus far are for 200 pts and always allowing this role first author.

Completed

1. Pending Items should be able to be partially credited towards Completed Items and thus partially tallied for promotion and tenure purposes.

a. After debate, the committee adjusted the "Publications" portion of scholarly works to account for publications that have been "accepted with no further edits necessary" (see definition section of Publications). Many publications are accepted, yet held for special issues or editions that come later. This is out of the control of the faculty member. However, for all other categories, the committee determined that the "Completed Items" definition should stand. The two primarily brought up for debate were Presentations and Grant Awards. For Presentations, the date of the conference in which the presentation will be made is set at the time of submission. Thus, a faculty member could accurately plan when to submit such presentations in order to have them completed by the required date. For Grant Awards, although notification of an award may occur after a published expected date, there is no way to determine whether or not the grant was officially awarded until the notification happens. So although the faculty member cannot plan for when the notification is officially made, successful completion of the project also cannot be determined until the notification is officially made. Thus, for both Presentations and Grant Awards, it was determined that the "Completed Item" status should remain.

2. Definition and Reasoning Behind Points for Outside Collaboration
   a. This information was added and can now be found under the "Value of Categories for Faculty Growth" section of the document.

3. Clarification of Required Activities
   a. A new section titled "Required Categories and Activities" was added under the "Instructions and Guidelines" section of the document. This section was made to try and clarify that although all categories of growth are required, not all activities in those categories are required. Rather the faculty member should pursue and include activities that they feel best display their strengths while meeting the requirements of the tool. A few activities are required and the notation for such categories was also discussed in this section so that faculty members could decipher them throughout the document.

4. Panel Facilitation / Moderator
   a. This option is now included under the "Presentations" activity under Scholarly Works.

5. Research Awards
   a. This activity was added both in the definition section of "Scholarly Activities" and in the coordinating Appendix section. It mirrors that of Teaching Awards in the Teaching Effectiveness category.

6. Exhibitions and Exhibits
   a. This activity was added both in the definition section of "Scholarly Activities" and in the coordinating Appendix section.

7. Participation in Student Organizations

    a.   The point structure of this activity was adjusted in the Appendix section under the Scholarly Activities category.

8.   Faculty – Student Advising and Mentorship

    a.   This activity was added both in the definition section of "Scholarly Activities" and in the coordinating Appendix section.

9.   Administration of Part-Time Employees or Student Labs

    a.   An item for this was added to the "Service to the University – Appointment of Administrative Duties" activity to allow credit for this type of service.

10.   Faculty Mentorship

    a.   This activity was added both in the definition section of "Service to the Institution – Faculty Mentorship" and in the coordinating Appendix section. Wording in the section takes into account formal mentorship programs as well as informal mentoring.

11.   Clarification of an Artifact

    a.   Added definition to the "Candidate Responsibilities" towards the top of the document.

Policy Reviews

1.   University Tenure and Promotion Committee Practices, Expectations, and Procedures (UTPCP) - (Rolling Appointments)

    a.   Explore possibility of having two year service terms on T&P Committee members with half of the members rolling off in a given year. This would ensure approximately half of the committee members in a given year were experienced in the rubric tool and the T&P Policies and could mentor incoming committee members.

2.   UTPCP - (Use of New Tool)

    a.   The current policy states that the old tool is used, so this policy would need to be revised if this new tool is adopted

3.   UTPCP - (Review of New Tool)

    a.   It is recommended that a set period to review the new tool is stated in the policy. It is recommended that the tool be reviewed every year or every other year to ensure that the values of various activities are still accurate and to ensure that new activities that are emerging are captured in the tool.

4.   UTPCP - (Use of Tool in Mid-Tenure Promotion)

    a.   The mid-tenure review process should be strengthened and more formalized. It should also use the rubric tool to try and give a more accurate representation of where the faculty member currently stands in the tenure and promotion process.

5.   UTPCP - (Feedback from Review Process)

a. The way feedback is delivered to candidates up for tenure and promotion should be reviewed. Most candidates would like to see specific comments on areas they could adjust to strengthen their portfolios in the future. The comments should still be anonymous, but the specific raw comments on rubric sections would be more valuable than a general summary and help for further growth of the faculty member.

6. Faculty Evaluation (Use of Tool in Faculty Evaluations)
    a. The annual faculty evaluation process should be reviewed to make it a stronger and more valuable tool. It should also use the rubric tool to try and give a more accurate representation of where the faculty member currently stands in the tenure and promotion process each year.

Implementation

1. Rollout Plan of New Rubric
    a. Additional tools need to be developed to make tracking and reporting of activities easy for faculty members and committee members
2. Defining Artifacts
    a. Listing possible artifacts for activities should be accumulated to help demonstrate items to gather when reporting activities
3. Tactics for Addressing Scholarly Activities
    a. Discuss various ways to boost scholarly activity with current and potential future resources on campus
4. Training for New Rubric (Faculty and Committee)
    a. Discuss a plan to create a training for future faculty members on how to correctly document activities and artifacts and how to properly score items when serving on a review committee
5. Further Define Peer Reviews (Teaching Effectiveness)
    a. Currently, the only "peer review" activity in place is a Quality Matters Review. Discuss, options for internal reviews and for