PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

Department of Counseling, Leadership, and Research Methods

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & HEALTH PROFESSIONS
University of Arkansas

Approved by the Faculty: May 11, 2020

Revised April 19, 2023 to reflect a re-configuration of the
Department of Rehabilitation, Human Resources and Communication Disorders
to the
Department of Counseling, Leadership, and Research Methods
(effective July 1, 2023)

Personnel Document
On Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for
Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments,
Annual and Post-tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure

University of Arkansas
College of Education & Health Professions
Department of Counseling, Leadership, and Research Methods

This document governs the Department of Counseling, Leadership, and Research Methods (CLRM) in the selection, retention, promotion, granting of tenure to, and evaluation of faculty and in the selection and evaluation of non-classified staff, effective as of the date of the president's approval. It has been approved by the faculty of the College of Education & Health Professions, the Dean, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President of the University of Arkansas, as indicated by the signatures below.

These policies are required to be consistent with the policies of the university as set forth in Board of Trustees policy 405.1 and in two campus policy statements: (1) Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual and Post-tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure, and (2) Guidelines for University and Distinguished Professor Appointments. In case of conflict, the board policy, the campus policy, the school, college, or library policy, and the department policy shall have authority in that order. Copies of these documents are available online, as referenced in the *Faculty Handbook*, at the UA web site https://provost.uark.edu/faculty-handbook.

It is the policy of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville to provide equal employment opportunity to all qualified persons; to prohibit discrimination against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, sexual orientation, marital or parental status, veteran's status, or disability, and to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive, continuing program of affirmative action.

APPROVALS

_____   4/24/2023
Department Head   Date

_____   **4/24/2023**
Dean   Date

_____   _____
Provost   Date

_____   _____
Chancellor   Date

_____   _____
President   Date

I. Committees: Responsibilities and Service

The department adopts I.A-E. of APS 1405.11 and the COEHP Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee will serve as the Peer Review Committee and facilitate the peer review process.

II. Initial Appointment

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment at the Rank of Assistant Professor

In addition to II.A. of APS 1405.11, the department has additional criteria:

Assistant Professor
Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
Evidence and/or promise of exemplary performance in research/scholarship/creative activity.
Evidence and/or promise of effective teaching and advising.
Evidence and/or promise of productive service to the program, department, institution, and profession.
Potential to meet Associate Professor expectations.

B. Criteria for Initial Appointment at or Above the Rank of Associate Professor

In addition to criteria and processes stipulated in II.B. of APS 1405.11 and the COEHP Personnel Document, the department has additional criteria:

Associate Professor

Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
Record of sustained exemplary performance in research/scholarship/creative activity consistent with high national standards.
Record of highly effective teaching and advising.
Record of sustained productive service to the program, department, institution, and profession.
Potential to meet Professor expectations.

Professor

Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
A substantial and sustained record of distinguished accomplishments resulting in international and/or national recognition in research/scholarship/creative activity consistent with high inter/national standards.
Record of continuous highly effective teaching and advising.
Record of significant and continuous productive service to the program,

department, institution, and profession.

C. Criteria for Initial Appointment with Tenure

   The department adopts II.C. of APS 1405.11 and the COEHP Personnel Document.

D. Initial and Successive Appointments of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

   Non-tenure track faculty are generally on appointments not to exceed one academic year. In some instances, multi-year appointments may be extended to instructors or non-tenure track faculty in professor ranks. Such appointments are generally intended for faculty hired in competitive searches or who have established a notable and consistently strong record of effective performance during their period of service to the University.

   Multi-year appointments, to the extent they are utilized, must have satisfied a merit-based review process employing evaluative criteria and procedures established in this personnel document as supplemented in departmental personnel documents. These appointments require the review and recommendation of the departmental personnel committee and the department chair/head, and the approval of the Dean and the Provost. The first such merit-based appointment would usually be up to three years. If successfully completed, in accordance with the evaluation procedure set out herein, an initial merit-based term appointment may be considered for renewal for an additional appointment of up to three years. After successful completion of a second three-year term (or after a total of six years of appointment), appointments may be considered for renewal for faculty in professor ranks for periods of up to five years.

   Any merit-based term appointment of more than one year shall only be recommended when the candidate has consistently demonstrated (or, for initial appointment, shown clear potential for) highly effective teaching and/or, as appropriate to the appointment, a record of highly effective research or service/administration, as well as the ability and willingness to work productively with colleagues.

   See APS 1405.111 for detailed procedures.

   In addition to criteria and processes stipulated in II.D. of APS 1405.11, APS 1405.111, and the COEHP Personnel Document, the department has additional criteria:

   Clinical Instructor or Teaching Instructor

   Master's degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
   Evidence and/or promise of effective teaching and/or clinical/professional practice.

Evidence and/or promise of productive service to the program, department, institution, and profession.

<u>Clinical Assistant Professor, Teaching Assistant Professor, or Assistant Professor of Practice</u>

Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
Evidence and/or promise of highly effective teaching and/or clinical/professional practice.
Evidence and/or promise of productive service to the program, department, institution, and profession.
Potential to earn recognition from peers through professional practice, service to professional organizations, outreach, curriculum development, and/or program leadership.

<u>Research Assistant Professor</u>
Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
Evidence of high-quality performance and promise of excellence in research/scholarship/creative activity.
Evidence and/or promise of productive service to the program, department, institution, and profession.
Potential to earn recognition from peers as demonstrated through scholarship, publications, and/or grants.

<u>Clinical Associate Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, or Associate Professor of Practice</u>
Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
Record of highly effective teaching and/or clinical/professional practice.
Record of high-quality scholarship in the field of study (e.g., presenting and writing about the scholarship of teaching and learning in the field).
Record of sustained productive service to the program, department, institution, and/or profession.
Evidence of recognition by peers as demonstrated through professional practice, service to professional organizations, outreach, curriculum development, and/or program leadership.

<u>Research Associate Professor</u>
Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
Record of excellence in research/scholarship/grant activity consistent with high national standards.
Record of sustained productive service to the program, department, institution, and profession
Evidence of recognition from peers as demonstrated through scholarship, publications, and/or grants.

<u>Clinical/Teaching Professor, or Professor of Practice</u>
Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
Record of continuous highly effective teaching and/or clinical/professional practice.
Record of sustained high-quality scholarship in the field of study (e.g., presenting and writing about the scholarship of teaching and learning in the field).
Record of significant and continuous productive service to the program, department, institution, and/or profession.
Evidence of national and/or significant regional recognition by peers as demonstrated through professional practice, service to professional organizations, outreach, curriculum development, and/or program leadership.

<u>Research Professor</u>
Doctoral degree from an accredited university in area of specialization or related field
A substantial and sustained record of excellence resulting in international and/or national recognition in research/scholarship/creative activity consistent with high inter/national standards.
Record of significant and sustained productive service to the program, department, institution, and profession.
Evidence of national and/or significant regional recognition from peers as demonstrated through scholarship, publications, and/or grants.

E. Required Notification

   The department adopts II.E. of APS 1405.11.

III. Successive Appointments, Annual Review, Peer Review, Third-Year Review, and Post-Tenure Review

A. Successive Appointments for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

   The department adopts III.A. of APS 1405.11.

B. Annual Review for All Faculty

   In addition to III.B. of APS 1405.11 and the COEHP Personnel Document, the department has additional processes:

   The typical faculty workload for tenured and tenure-track faculty will be 50% teaching and advising, 40% research, and 10% service. The typical faculty workload for teaching and clinical faculty will be 90% teaching and advising and 10% service. This is subject to revision and change by the Department Head in consultation with the affected faculty. Most workload deviations will be as a result of externally-funded research or major service obligations. As stipulated in Academic Policy Series 1405.11, to fulfill the educational mission of the University and in the best interest of each unit, the Department Head may modify a faculty member's workload assignment and evaluation criteria, if necessary

The annual review of all full-time faculty will begin in January and conclude in March. Faculty will submit the Annual Faculty Report and any supporting materials on a date to be determined each year, typically around January 15. The Personnel Committee will serve as the Peer Review Committee and facilitate the peer review process. Peer reviews of submitted materials will be made by peer-review subcommittees and guided by the criteria set forth in the CLRM and COEHP Personnel Documents. The Department Head independently assesses each faculty member based on information submitted in the Annual Faculty Report and any other information relevant to faculty annual performance. Peer-reviews are used in an advisory capacity.

The procedures are as follows:

Faculty member submits the Annual Faculty Report, typically around January 15.

The Personnel Committee coordinates the peer review process. The Personnel Committee selects a peer-review subcommittee comprised of three faculty members for each faculty member. Whenever feasible, the peer-review subcommittee will include at least one member from the faculty member's academic program and one member external to the academic program. The Personnel Committee will provide specific instructions to the peer-review subcommittees.

The Department Head independently evaluates each faculty member based on the Annual Faculty Report and Department Criteria Document, using peer-reviews in an advisory capacity.

The Department Head provides each faculty member with the Evaluation Form, which includes a merit rating and narrative feedback. Peer-reviews are also distributed to faculty.

Each faculty member will be rated according to a 0.0 to 3.0 scale.

A weighted composite score will be calculated based on the following formulas:

A score for each area is derived by first obtaining the weighted average of the ratings in each area (teaching and advising, research, and service) by multiplying the rating score by the percent workload.

Next, a composite score is calculated by adding the calculated products of each of the three areas.

Ratings are based on the criteria set forth in Appendix A. The Criteria Document provides the foundation and guidance on the rating for each section—teaching and advising, research, and service—but ratings are also open to the professional judgement of the Department Head. The Criteria Document assumes that each faculty member has made meaningful contributions to all aspects of their workload

without performance concerns. In instances of performance concerns, faculty members may receive lower ratings than otherwise suggested by the Criteria Document. These concerns will be included in the evaluation narrative. Examples of performance that could result in "does not meet expectations" (0.0) are highlighted in Appendix A (pp. 13-14, 16, 19).

In addition to the evaluative ratings, the Department Head will also provide a written synopsis of the rating to each faculty member, inclusive of strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for the next year. All faculty will then have an opportunity to review their evaluation and schedule a meeting to discuss the rating with the Department Head. Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty are required to meet with the Department Head. Faculty members whose appointment is being renewed and who receive a 1.0 rating or below in any one aspect of their workload (teaching and advising, research, or service) will work with the Department Head to identify and implement strategies to improve the score for the next year.

The process of awarding merit pay will be determined by the Department Head and communicated to the faculty at the beginning of the annual evaluation process (around January 15). The final rating of the annual review shall be used to guide merit pay increases; the Department Head may make adjustments based on exceptional contributions or to address equity issues.

The Department Head assesses whether each faculty member's performance for the year has been satisfactory. Consistent with APS 1405.11, overall unsatisfactory performance means that the faculty member's performance as a whole is unsatisfactory, taking into consideration the faculty member's assigned workload (teaching/professional practice, scholarship, service) and overall contributions to the academic unit. Before making a determination of overall unsatisfactory performance, the department head considers evidence of relevant, documented efforts and outcomes within the context of the faculty member's assigned workload, including the faculty member's assigned annual evaluation score. At a minimum, any overall score of less than 1.0 or a 0.0 in any substantial area of faculty responsibility would constitute overall unsatisfactory performance, and makes the faculty member ineligible for a merit salary increase.

Unsatisfactory performance for a non-tenure track faculty member is addressed in APS 1405.111. Post-tenure review based on overall unsatisfactory performance for tenured faculty is outlined in III.E. of APS 1405.11.

C. Peer Review for All Faculty

In addition to III.C. of APS 1405.11 and the COEHP Personnel Document, the department shall use the following process.

The Personnel Committee will provide leadership and oversight to the peer review process. Given the number of Comm faculty and the diversity of CLRM academic programs, the Personnel Committee will establish 3-member blinded peer review subcommittees for each full-time faculty member (i.e., faculty member will not know

the members of the subcommittee). In instances when there are more than 3 faculty members in the academic program, 2 members of the subcommittee will come from the faculty member's academic program and 1 member will be external to the faculty member's academic program. In instances where there are 3 or fewer faculty members in an academic program, the CLRM Personnel Committee will take steps to ensure the confidentiality of the subcommittee members and assign peer reviewers from the faculty member's academic program and a closely related program. Each member of subcommittee will provide the Personnel Committee with narrative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance. The Personnel Committee will ensure to the best extent possible the consistency of application of standards and processes of all peer review subcommittees and report the results to the Department Head.

D. Third Year Review for Tenure Track Faculty

The Department adopts III.D. of APS 1405.11 and the COEHP Personnel Document.

E. Post-Tenure Review

The Department adopts III.E. of APS 1405.11 and the COEHP Personnel Document for post-tenure review of tenured faculty.

F. Criteria for Assessing Faculty Performance

In addition to III.F. of APS 1405.11 and the COEHP Personnel Document, the department has additional criteria:

All CLRM faculty members are evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas of teaching and advising, research, and service. Each faculty member should be actively engaged in all areas as appropriate for their rank and workload. Each category is rated 0.0 to 3.0. The categories are:

> *Exceeds Expectations (3.0)*
> *Meets Expectations (2.0)*
> *Partially Meets Expectations (1.0)*
> *Does Not Meet Expectations (0.0)*

Specific definitions and evaluative criteria for each rating in the areas of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service are described in the Appendix.

IV. Promotion

A. Criteria for Promotion

In addition to IV.A. of APS 1405.11, the department has additional criteria:

Clinical Associate Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, or Associate Professor

of Practice

A faculty member applying for promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, or Associate Professor of Practice must provide evidence of sufficient achievement of the criteria for initial appointment:

Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.

Record of highly effective teaching and/or clinical/professional practice.

Record of high-quality scholarship in the field of study (e.g., presenting and writing about the scholarship of teaching and learning in the field).

Record of sustained productive service to the program, department, institution, and/or profession.

Evidence of recognition by peers as demonstrated through professional practice, service to professional organizations, outreach, curriculum development, and/or program leadership.

The faculty member's overall achievement should be congruent with the accomplishments of beginning non-tenure track associate professors focused on teaching in the candidate's field of study at benchmark institutions. Beyond the degree requirement, the faculty member should provide evidence of the achievements at the University of Arkansas.

Research Associate Professor

A faculty member applying for promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor must provide evidence of sufficient achievement of the criteria for initial appointment:

Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.

Record of excellence in research/scholarship/grant activity consistent with high national standards.

Record of sustained productive service to the program, department, institution, and profession.

Evidence of recognition from peers as demonstrated through scholarship, publications, and/or grants.

The faculty member's overall achievement should be congruent with the accomplishments of beginning non-tenure track associate professors focused on research in the candidate's field of study at benchmark institutions. Beyond the degree requirement, the faculty member should provide evidence of the achievements at the University of Arkansas.

Clinical Professor, Teaching Professor, or Professor of Practice

A faculty member applying for promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor, Teaching Professor, and/or Professor of Practice must provide evidence of sufficient achievement of the criteria for initial appointment:

Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.

Record of continuous highly effective teaching and/or clinical/professional practice.

Record of sustained high-quality scholarship in the field of study (e.g., presenting and writing about the scholarship of teaching and learning in the field).

Record of significant and continuous productive service to the program, department, institution, and/or profession.

Evidence of national and/or significant regional recognition by peers as demonstrated through professional practice, service to professional organizations, outreach, curriculum development, and/or program leadership.

The faculty member's overall achievement should be congruent with the accomplishments of beginning non-tenure track professors focused on teaching in the candidate's field of study at benchmark institutions. Beyond the degree requirement, the faculty member should provide evidence of the achievements at the University of Arkansas.

Research Professor

A faculty member applying for promotion to the rank of Research Professor must provide evidence of sufficient achievement of the criteria for initial appointment:

Doctoral degree from an accredited university in area of specialization or related field

A substantial and sustained record of excellence resulting in international and/or national recognition in research/scholarship/creative activity consistent with high inter/national standards.

Record of significant and sustained productive service to the program, department, institution, and profession

Evidence of national and/or significant regional recognition from peers as demonstrated through scholarship, publications, and/or grants.

The faculty member's overall achievement should be congruent with the accomplishments of beginning non-tenure track professors focused on research in the candidate's field of study at benchmark institutions. Beyond the degree requirement, the faculty member should provide evidence of the achievements at the University of Arkansas.

Associate Professor

A faculty member applying for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure must provide evidence of sufficient achievement of the criteria for initial appointment:

Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.

Record of sustained exemplary performance in research/scholarship/creative activity consistent with high national standards.

Record of highly effective teaching and advising.

Record of sustained productive service to the program, department, institution,

9

and profession.
Potential to meet Professor expectations.

The faculty member's overall achievement should be congruent with the accomplishments of beginning associate professors with tenure in the candidate's field of study at benchmark institutions. Beyond the degree requirement, the faculty member should provide evidence of the achievements at the University of Arkansas.

<u>Professor</u>

A faculty member applying for promotion to the rank of Professor must provide evidence of sufficient achievement of the criteria for initial appointment:

Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
A substantial and sustained record of distinguished accomplishments resulting in international and/or national recognition in research/scholarship/creative activity consistent with high inter/national standards.
Record of continuous highly-effective teaching and advising.
Record of significant and continuous productive service to the program, department, institution, and profession.

The faculty member's overall achievement should be congruent with the accomplishments of beginning professors in the candidate's field of study at benchmark institutions. Beyond the degree requirement, the faculty member should provide evidence of the achievements at the University of Arkansas.

B. Procedures for Promotion

The department adopts IV.B. of APS 1405.11 and the COEHP Personnel Document.

V. Tenure

A. Criteria for Awarding Tenure

The department adopts V.A. of APS 1405.11. Additionally, in the Department of Counseling, Leadership, and Research Methods, criteria for tenure include excellence in teaching and research resulting in high-quality impact in the field.

B. Procedures for Awarding Tenure

The department adopts V.B. of APS 1405.11.

C. Procedures for Suspending Probationary Period

The department adopts V.C. of APS 1405.11.

D. Mandatory Sixth Year Review – Terminal Appointment

The department adopts procedure specified under V.D. of APS 1405.11.

VI. Dismissal of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

The department adopts procedures specified under VI. of APS 1405.11.

VII. Dismissal of Multi-Year Appointed Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The Department adopts procedures specified under VII. of APS 1405.11.

APPENDIX: Evaluative Criteria

The assessment rubrics are based on the standard workload assignment for tenured or tenure-track faculty of 50% teaching and advising, 40% research, and 10% service. The Department Head will make appropriate adjustments for varying workload assignments.

Evaluative criteria for teaching and advising, research/scholarship, and service are categorized into three categories and include examples of applicable activities for each category. The category definitions will guide the Department Head and the faculty peer reviewers to assess the record and evidence provided by the faculty member. CLRM faculty may receive credit for activities beyond the listed examples below, though the overall goal of the evaluative criteria is to assist the Department Head in determining a faculty member's ratings in an equitable and consistent manner throughout the department. In instances where an activity is eligible to receive credit in multiple workload areas (e.g., a journal article related to the scholarship of teaching and learning), CLRM faculty should include the activity in the area in which they desire to receive credit on the Annual Faculty Report. In addition, CLRM faculty should provide relevant information (e.g., acceptance rates, impact factors) on the Annual Faculty Report for to access any quality distinctions (e.g., inter/nationally prominent peer-reviewed journal vs. a peer-reviewed journal).

CLRM faculty agree with III.F. of APS 1405.11, "Each faculty should actively contribute to the life of the academic unit … and should exhibit respect and cooperation in shared academic and administrative tasks."

Teaching and Advising

CLRM faculty members are committed to teaching and advising and engage in ongoing reflective teaching practices to advance student learning. CLRM faculty members are also committed to helping students achieve their academic and professional goals through providing high-quality advising, including chairing and serving on dissertations and honors theses as appropriate for rank. The evaluation of CLRM faculty in teaching and advising is guided by the criteria under III.F.1. of APS 1405.11. Teaching and advising activities have been categorized into three categories where:

- Category III identifies **exemplary teaching and advising practices that maximize student success** that can lead to inter/national visibility in the area of teaching and advising;

  Receives an externally funded teaching/training/personnel preparation grant
  Receives a national, university, or college award in teaching
  Appointed as co-director of Teaching and Faculty Support Center (TFSC) or President of the Teaching Academy
  Receives a national, university, or college award in advising or mentoring
  Chairs a dissertation/thesis that receives a national, regional, state, university, or college award
  Publishes in an inter/nationally prominent (e.g., acceptance rates, impact factors, journal rankings) outlet (e.g., peer-reviewed journal article, book, textbook, edited book) related to the scholarship of teaching and learning
  Delivers a keynote at a major inter/national conference related to the scholarship of

teaching and learning

- Category II identifies **meaningful teaching and advising practices that advance student success** in the area of teaching and advising;

  Teaches above average class sizes in the program
  Conducts teaching presentations or workshops for TFSC, Teaching Academy, or Office of Faculty Affairs
  Conducts teaching workshops at national conferences
  Receives an internally-funded teaching/training/personnel preparation grant
  Develops new courses or curriculum as applicable for program improvement/student success and/or teaches new course preparations
  Uses additional methods (beyond university required) to evaluate courses (e.g., peer observation, mid-semester evaluations, feedback from instructional designer)
  Serves as peer evaluator of teaching
  Teaches clinical courses with a supervision component
  Demonstrates appropriate assessments to meet students' learning needs (e.g., assignments that prepare students for licensure, comprehensive exams, or capstone courses)
  Demonstrates an appropriate high-level of rigor across courses (e.g., course involves challenging assignments that are properly scaffolded, course involves significant writing projects and extensive feedback is provided)
  Incorporates innovative and effective teaching practices
  Carries above average advising load for program
  Chairs a completed dissertation/thesis committee
  Serves as faculty advisor of an academic student organization or serves as academic/scholarship advisor to a student organization
  Publishes in outlet (e.g., peer-reviewed journal article, book, textbook, edited book) related to the scholarship of teaching and learning
  Delivers a keynote at a conference related to the scholarship of teaching and learning
  Delivers a presentation at an inter/nationally recognized conference related to the scholarship of teaching and learning

- Category I identifies **acceptable teaching and advising practices that facilitate student success** in the area of teaching and advising;

  Participates in teaching workshops/events (e.g., teaching camp) sponsored by TFSC, Teaching Academy, or Office of Faculty Affairs
  Attends regional or national conferences on college teaching
  Receives positive evaluations of teaching from peers
  Regularly updates course materials and syllabi to reflect changing disciplinary trends and new scholarship
  Ensures that syllabi meet accreditation and other applicable program standards
  Participates in advising training/professional development
  Serves as a member on a completed doctoral comprehensive examination committee
  Organizes master's comprehensive examination committees or evaluates multiple master's comprehensive examinations
  Serves as a member of completed dissertation/thesis committees

Assessment Scoring for Performance in Teaching and Advising

3.0 = Exceeds Expectations
> Receives a combined average of 4.5-5.0 on student evaluations from all in-load courses on University and College/Department core items, **AND**
> Demonstrates contributions to advising and mentoring of students appropriate for academic program and rank, **AND**
> Provides evidence of 1 activity from Category III and 3 activities from Category II **OR** 8 activities from Category II

2.0 = Meets Expectations
> Receives a combined average of 3.9-4.4 on student evaluations from all in-load courses on University and College/Department core items, **AND**
> Demonstrates contributions to advising and mentoring of students appropriate for academic program and rank, **AND**
> Provides evidence of teaching activities as follows:
>> 1 activity from Category III and 1 activity from Category II **OR**
>> 5 activities from Category II **OR**
>> 4 activities from Category II and 2 activities from Category I

1.0 = Partially Meets Expectations
> Receives a combined average of 3.0-3.8 on student evaluations from all in-load courses on University and College/Department core items, **AND**
> Provides evidence of teaching activity with at least 4 activities from Category I or II

0.0 = Does Not Meet Expectations
> Indicates unsatisfactory performance in teaching and advising. Evidence of unsatisfactory performance could include: failure to submit an Annual Faculty Report by the deadline; a combined average below 3.0 on student evaluations from all in-load courses on University and College/Department core items; consistent refusal to cover the required contents in a course; consistent failure to treat students with professionalism and respect; failure to fulfill academic advising responsibilities; failure to implement reasonable and fair criteria for grades; repeated course absences without adequate provision for learning; and similar behaviors that detriment student learning and success.

Research and Scholarship

CLRM faculty members are committed to advancing their fields through active scholarship. The evaluation of CLRM faculty in research and scholarship is guided by the criteria under III.F.2. of APS 1405.11. Research and scholarship activities have been categorized into three categories where:

- Category III represents **leadership activities that demonstrate inter/national visibility and recognition** in the area of research and scholarship;

  Publications

Sole or lead author of an article in an inter/nationally prominent (e.g., acceptance rates, impact factors, journal rankings) peer-reviewed journal

Author of a book or a textbook from a prestigious (e.g., evidence of external review, prior titles received awards in the field, rankings) academic or university press

Editor of an edited textbook or a book from a prestigious (e.g., evidence of external review, prior titles received awards in the field, rankings) academic or university press

Presentations

Lead presenter at an inter/nationally recognized conference

Featured/keynote speaker at an inter/national conference

Invited presentation at an inter/nationally recognized conference

Testifying before a federal agency, a congressional, or state legislative committee

Research Funding

PI or co-PI on a nationally competitive external research contract or grant

Awards

Inter/national recognition of research career

Inter/national recognition of published research

Inter/national recognition of conference presentation

Book favorably recognized and/or reviewed and deemed highly significant after publication

- Category II identifies activities that contribute to the **development of an inter/national visibility** in the area of research and scholarship;

Publications

Leading author (1st or 2nd) of an article in a peer-reviewed journal

Contributing author of an article in an inter/nationally prominent peer-reviewed journal

Author of a book or a textbook from an academic or university press

Editor of an edited textbook or a book from an academic or university press

Chapter in an edited book

Award of a book contract from a reputable academic or university press

Revised textbook from a reputable academic or university press

Presentations

Presentation at an inter/nationally recognized conference

Featured/keynote speaker at a state or regional conference

Invited presentation at a state or regional conference

Research Funding

PI or Co-PI on externally funded contract or grant

PI or Co-PI on competitive internal funding

Applies as PI or Co-PI for nationally competitive external funding

Administers a multi-year, large externally funded project

Awards

Regional, state, or college recognition of research career

Regional, state, or college recognition of published research

Regional, state, or college recognition of conference presentation

Book favorably reviewed after publication

- Category I consists of **building-block activities that can facilitate the development** of an area of research and scholarship;

Publications
- Trailing author of an article in a peer-reviewed journal
- Author of a non-peer-reviewed article
- Publication in volume edited by the author
- Received a revise and resubmit of a manuscript to a peer-reviewed journal
- Encyclopedia entry
- Book review
- Technical report
- Refereed conference proceeding
- Submission of a manuscript to a peer-reviewed journal*

Presentations
- Presentation at a local, state, or regional conference
- Featured/keynote speaker at a local conference
- Invited presentation at a local organization, agency, school, conference, etc.
- Submission of a paper to a peer-reviewed conference*

Research Funding
- Applies as PI or Co-PI for externally funded contract or grant
- Applies as PI or Co-PI for competitive internal funding
- PI or Co-PI on non-competitive funding
- Participates in professional development activities related to research, such as grant writing workshops, research camp, etc.
- Administers a multi-year externally funded project

* Activity that counts toward "Minimally Meets Expectations" but not toward "Meets Expectations" category.

Assessment Rubric of Faculty Annual Performance in Research and Scholarship

3.0 = Exceeds Expectations
Receives as PI a large, nationally competitive external grant with evidence of peer-reviewed publication(s), **OR**
Provides evidence of authorship of 1 published textbook, book or edited book from a prestigious academic or university press, **OR**
Provides evidence of 3 or more published peer-reviewed journal articles, 2 of which the faculty member is the first or sole author in double-blind (e.g., faculty member is not the editor) inter/nationally recognized journals, **AND**
Provides evidence of additional research activities as follows:
- 1 activity from Category III **OR**
- 2 activities from Category II

2.0 = Meets Expectations
Receives as PI a nationally competitive external grant or large external grant/contract with evidence of peer-reviewed publication(s), **OR**

Provides evidence of authorship of 1 published textbook, book, or edited book from an academic or university press, **OR**
Provides evidence of 1 published peer-reviewed journal article of which the faculty member is the first or sole author in an inter/nationally recognized journal, **OR**
Provides evidence of 2 published peer-reviewed journal articles, **AND**
Provides evidence of additional research activities as follows:
  1 activity from Category III or Category II **OR**
  1 activity from Category II and 2 activities from Category I **OR**
  3 activities from Category I

1.0 = Partially Meets Expectations
  Provides evidence of research activity with at least 5 activities from Category I or II

0.0 = Does Not Meet Expectations
  Indicates unsatisfactory performance in research. Evidence of unsatisfactory performance could include: failure to submit an Annual Faculty Report by the deadline; evidence of 4 or fewer research and scholarship activities from Category I or II; breaches of professional research ethics, such as plagiarism or falsifying research; grant mismanagement; and similar behaviors detrimental to the research and scholarship reputation of the Department, College, and University.

Service

CLRM faculty members are committed to providing service to their institution, academic units, community, and profession. The evaluation of CLRM faculty in service is guided by the criteria under III.F.3. of APS 1405.11. Examples of service activities have been categorized into three categories where:

- Category III represents **major leadership activities that significantly impact** their institution, academic units, community, and/or profession;

  Professional Societies
    Serves as president of a national, regional, or state society or special interest group
    Receives a national, regional, or state award for service
  Professional Conference Participation
    Organizes a national, regional, or state conference
    Serves as a section/division program committee chair for an inter/national conference
  UA Committee Activity
    Chairs a high impact university or college committee
    Receives an award for university, college, or department service
  Editorial work
    Editor of inter/nationally recognized peer-reviewed journal
  Funding Agency Activity
    Chairs a funding board
  Public Service through Consultation
    Receives an award for academic or professional consultation
    Provides academic or professional consultation with high impact on institution
  Professionally Related Community Service

Receives an award for professionally-related community service
Administrative Activities
    Serves as program coordinator
Collaboration
    Leads a high-impact collaboration with school, health agency, industry or business

- Category II represents other activities that **provide contributions** to their institution, academic units, community, and/or their profession;

Professional Societies
    Holds office other than president in national or state society
Professional Conference Participation
    Serves as a discussant for a conference session
    Serves as a section/division program committee chair for a regional, or state conference
    Serves as a member of a conference planning or review committee
    Organizes a local conference
UA Committee Activity
    Chairs a departmental committee
    Chairs a high-impact program committee
Editorial work
    Editor of a peer-reviewed journal
    Editor of a special topics issue of a journal
    Editorial board member of an inter/nationally recognized peer-reviewed journal
Funding Agency Activity
    Serves as a member of a funding board
Public Service through Consultation
    Consults for 2 or more academic or professional groups/agencies
    Consults on multiple occasions or a consistent basis for academic or professional groups/agencies
Professionally Related Community Service
    Provides professional services resulting in benefit to UA and/or students
Administrative Activities
    Chairs a search committee
    Chairs a reaccreditation or program review committee
Collaboration
    Collaborates with school, health agency, industry, or business that benefits UA/students

- Category I represents **participation** in the functioning of their institution, academic units, community, and/or profession;

Professional Societies
    Attends a conference
Professional Conference Participation
    Chairs a session at inter/national, state, or regional conference
    Reviews conference proposals
UA Committee Activity
    Serves as a member of university, college, or department committee
    Serves as a member of program committee with high impact

Editorial work
    Reviewer for a journal
Funding Agency Activity
    Serves as a grant reviewer
Public Service through Consultation
    Consults on at least 1 occasion for academic or professional groups/agencies
Administrative Activities
    Serves as a member of search committee
    Serves as a member of reaccreditation or program review committee
    Participates in program level service activities (e.g., admissions, curriculum review, comprehensive exams, website updates, recruitment, etc.)
    Serves as an advisor to a student organization

Assessment Rubric of Faculty Annual Performance in Service

3.0 = Exceeds Expectations
    Provides service to academic program appropriate for rank, **AND**
    Provides service to the department, college, university, and field (at least two of four), **AND**
    Provides evidence of active participation in at least
        1 Category III activity and 2 Category II or III activities

2.0 = Meets Expectations
    Provides service to academic program appropriate for rank, **AND**
    Provides service to the department, college, university, or field (at least one of four), **AND**
    Provides evidence of active participation in
        1 Category II activity and 2 Category I activities **OR**
        2 Category II activities

1.0 = Partially Meets Expectations
    Provides service to academic program appropriate for rank, **AND**
    Provides evidence of participation in
        2 Category I activities

0.0 = Does Not Meet Expectations
    Indicates unsatisfactory performance in service. Evidence of unsatisfactory performance could include: failure to submit an Annual Faculty Report by the deadline; no evidence of participation in service activities; failure to carry out duties of service roles; refusal to accept reasonable service assignments; and similar behaviors detrimental to the equitable distribution of service responsibilities appropriate for academic program and faculty rank.