

Illinois State University

School of Kinesiology and Recreation

School Faculty Status Committee Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies and Procedures (Effective January 1, 2015)

The School Faculty Status Committee (SFSC) in the School of Kinesiology and Recreation (KNR) has developed this document to further interpret University ASPT policies outlined in the *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies, Effective January 1, 2015*. This School of KNR document should be considered as a supplement to the current University ASPT Policies and the CAST College Faculty Status Committee (CFSC) Standards for Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure. The SFSC shall comply with the University ASPT Calendar for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Performance-Evaluation, and Cumulative Post-Tenure Review, Reporting Requirements, and ASPT Elections as described in the Illinois State University Faculty ASPT policies document.

I. SELECTION, ORGANIZATION, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SFSC

The School shall have a School Faculty Status Committee (SFSC) consisting of five members. The SFSC shall consist of four (4) elected probationary tenure or tenured faculty and the Director of the School. The terminal degree required for appointment to a tenure track position is the doctorate. The majority of the elected committee members must be tenured. It is required that the members of the SFSC have locus of tenure in the School of KNR. The SFSC shall act in accordance with the current Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies of the University as well as the College of Applied Science and Technology CFSC Standards.

The School of KNR Director shall chair the SFSC and will be an ex-officio voting member of the committee. The remaining four members will be elected and serve two-year staggered terms beginning in the Fall semester of the year they are elected. Members may serve two consecutive terms of two years but are not eligible for SFSC membership for one year following a double term. Members on leave for a semester or longer shall relinquish their positions, and their vacancy will be filled by election within one month of the vacancy. The individual elected will serve the remainder of the term. This replacement term will count as a full two-year term in regards to eligibility for election to further consecutive terms.

All full-time probationary tenure or tenured faculty members are eligible to vote for members of the SFSC. Election of SFSC representatives shall be completed by secret ballot by May 1 of each academic year. Faculty members on leave shall have voting privileges, provided that they submit a ballot for the election. Faculty members may return ballots by fax, .pdf files, or email. Each year the Director of KNR shall determine in

advance of the election the required qualifications of the candidates for election to the SFSC, taking into account the University requirement that the majority of the members be tenured.

The SFSC shall be responsible for:

- Developing School of KNR policies and procedures for the allocation of monies devoted to performance-evaluated salary increments and salary equity adjustments in accordance with University ASPT and CFSC guidelines. These policies and procedures must be approved by the majority vote of the School of KNR faculty prior to January 1 of the year in which the policies and procedures take effect.
- Conducting the annual performance evaluations of the tenured and probationary tenure faculty. Annual formative performance evaluations shall be provided to all tenured and probationary tenure faculty in writing in accordance with University policies. In situations in which faculty have reassigned activities (i.e. administrative) but are still under the SFSC review process, the SFSC will provide evaluative feedback concerning performance in these reassigned activities. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide goal statements and outcome verifications pertinent to these reassigned activities. These annual reviews also serve as post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty. If desired, tenured faculty may voluntarily submit dossiers for a 3-5 year cumulative post tenure review. A faculty member who receives an overall unsatisfactory rating during the annual review process for any two years out of a three year period is required to undergo cumulative post tenure review as mandated by University ASPT policy. These written communications will be retained as SFSC records in the School Office. The faculty member can access their personal SFSC file, as well as Human Resource files, upon request during normal business hours.
- Conducting pre-tenure reappointment reviews. Interim appraisal letters shall be sent to probationary faculty on an annual basis to provide feedback on progress toward tenure and promotion in accordance with University ASPT and CFSC guidelines. These written communications will be retained as SFSC records in the School of KNR office. The faculty member can access their personal SFSC file, as well as Human Resource files, upon request during normal business hours.
- Conducting the summative reviews of performance evaluations of faculty members applying for tenure and/or promotion in accordance with University ASPT and CFSC guidelines.
- Conducting voluntary 3-5 cumulative post-tenure reviews or mandated cumulative post tenure reviews in cases of faculty who receive an overall unsatisfactory performance rating on an annual review for any two years of a three-year period in accordance with University ASPT and CFSC guidelines.

- Evaluating and making recommendations regarding sabbatical leaves and conduct post sabbatical evaluations.
- Making recommendations regarding faculty contracts and appointments.

II. APPOINTMENTS OF NEW FACULTY

School search committees are responsible for the recruitment of potential faculty members. Search committee members will be selected pursuant to the School of KNR Bylaws and Operating Codes. A full description of procedures for appointment to School search committees can be found in that document. Recommendations for appointments originate with the school search committee.

III. FACULTY PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, MERIT, AND TENURE DECISIONS

The performance criteria stated in this document are to be used by the School Faculty Status Committee (SFSC) of the School of KNR in considering and making reappointment, tenure, promotion, merit recommendations, and other personnel decisions. It is understood that the attainment of these criteria does not, in itself, guarantee granting of the personnel decision sought. Further, it should be clearly understood that high standards of professionalism and collegiality are prerequisite to all facets of successful faculty performance.

Each faculty member will be evaluated in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. The candidate will have the responsibility of documenting accomplishments. Documentation should clearly differentiate activities and accomplishments both prior to and since the last reappointment, promotion, and/or merit decision at Illinois State University. All documentation must include dates and be organized in reverse chronological order (see Appendix A). Anonymous communications (aside from student evaluations) shall not be considered in annual performance review and in promotion and tenure evaluative activities.

The SFSC will have the responsibility for informing the candidate of 1) Existing strengths and weaknesses in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, and: 2) Existing strengths and weaknesses of *documentation*. This information will be communicated in annual evaluation letters and interim appraisal letters.

The performance criteria listed for the Teaching, Scholarship, and Service categories may be included by the candidate in support of reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit consideration. While satisfactory performance in the Teaching, Scholarship and Service categories is an expectation of all faculty members, attainment of all criteria listed for these categories is not necessary for positive personnel decisions.

The lists of suggested documentation are not meant to be all-inclusive. Rather, they are intended to provide guidance to faculty about ways to document professional activities common to the School of KNR. This type of documentation should be included by candidates in support of reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit consideration. Merit and reappointment documentation should include professional achievements accomplished at Illinois State University.

Performance in Teaching

Teaching activities are a critical part of faculty life. To simply perform those tasks is not the same as offering evidence of high quality or excellence in their performance. Faculty that seek high performance appraisals in teaching should offer evidence of excellence in their teaching activities. Beyond traditional classroom and laboratory teaching assignments, teaching activities can also include distance education efforts, curricular development, supervision of professional practice, supervision of student teachers, mentoring of students, independent studies, and participation on thesis committees.

Performance Criteria of Teaching

Content Expertise

- Demonstrates appropriate content expertise in preparing and delivering courses
- Updates course materials to stay abreast of current information

Instructional Design

- Prepares syllabi that clearly communicate course objectives, high but reasonable student expectations, and grading procedures
- Administers exams that possess content validity in relation to course objectives
- Plans and delivers course activities that relate to course objectives
- Designs learning environments that encourage time on task

Instructional Delivery

- Provides regular, helpful evaluations of learning
- Uses an appropriate array of pedagogical methods
- Engages students in actively utilizing knowledge
- Shows respect for students and their individual differences

- Deals fairly and impartially with students

Course Management

- Grades and returns student assignments in a timely manner
- Completes administrative tasks associated with teaching in a timely manner
- Is available to students outside of class (includes keeping regular office hours)

Examples of documentation used to evaluate teaching can be found in the appendices of the current *Faculty ASPT Policies Booklet*. Additional information concerning School requirements for documentation and organization of dossiers is included in Appendix A. Submissions of documentation should be made electronically. The exception to this would be the previous fall semester IDEA reports included in the annual evaluation in January. Other requests to deviate from complete electronic submission can be made to the SFSC, but such requests should be based on exceptional circumstances.

Performance in Scholarship

Scholarly activities are valued and expected from faculty members. While there are many forms of acceptable scholarship, research activities involving the collection and analysis of data resulting in refereed national and international publications are normally the most prestigious and highly valued. Research can be based on quantitative or qualitative methodologies. While faculty can pursue a variety of types of scholarship, successful research activities are expected from faculty. Faculty members are also expected to develop a clear focus in their scholarship that will make significant contributions to their field.

Given that there are many forms of scholarship, it is important to realize that all are valued and acceptable. However, it is also clear that within any specialization in Kinesiology and Recreation, certain journals, funding agencies, conferences, etc. are normally considered more prestigious. Thus, professional judgments are inevitable and desirable in measuring the value and impact of scholarly activities. Faculty can assist peer and administrative judgments by offering evidence of high visibility and prestige for scholarly activity. Finally, "primary" status reflects lead or sole authorship and is highly desirable. When students are listed as an author before their faculty advisor, the School will recognize it as if the faculty member was the primary author.

Performance Criteria for Scholarship

- National/international research publications in refereed journals that are in an appropriate discipline

- Textbooks in an appropriate discipline
- Refereed national/international research presentations to professional groups in the appropriate discipline
- Invited research presentations to professional groups in the appropriate discipline.
- Funded external grant applications with the objective of answering a research question or improving teaching capability or personnel preparation
- Professional articles (application, theoretical, synthesis, etc.) in refereed national publications
- Editor of a textbook in an appropriate discipline
- Chapter in a textbook in an appropriate discipline
- Performances, exhibitions, and other creative activities locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally
- State or regional research publications in refereed journals that are in an appropriate discipline
- Theoretical and/or application oriented presentations to professional groups in the appropriate discipline.
- Funded internal grant applications with the objective of answering a research question or improving teaching capability
- Submission of external grant applications
- Scholarly products from student-faculty collaboration
- Professional articles (application, theoretical, synthesis, etc.) in refereed state or regional publications
- Refereed published abstracts in an appropriate discipline
- State or regional presentations in an appropriate discipline.
- Submission of internal grant applications
- Refereeing or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts

- Non-refereed publications in professional journals in appropriate disciplines
- Works in progress

Examples of documentation used to evaluate scholarship can be in the appendices of the current *Faculty ASPT Policies Booklet*. Additional information concerning School requirements for documentation and organization of dossiers is included in Appendix A. Submissions of documentation should be made electronically. Requests to deviate from complete electronic submission can be made to the SFSC, but such requests should be based on exceptional circumstances.

Performance in Service

The service function encompasses university, professional, and community activities. Faculty have many alternatives in fulfilling this performance function, and evidence of excellence will normally be providing leadership and valuable participation in university assignments, professional associations, and community organizations related to the profession. While service is an important aspect of professional life, it is expected that faculty will normally not expend more effort in service activities than in the teaching and scholarship areas.

Performance Criteria for Service

- Chairing a university, college, school, or program committee (document type of committee and amount of time spent in committee work)
- Serving on a university, college school, or program committee (document type of committee and amount of time spent in committee work)
- Serving as a professional consultant/resource person
- Sponsoring or working with student organizations
- Conducting or assisting with professional workshops, in-services, conferences, professional development for faculty, public and/or private school personnel, etc.
- Holding office, serving on committees etc. for professional organizations
- Delivering presentations to and/or participation with community organizations
- Administering areas or programs within the school, college, or university
- Nomination and/or receipt of an award recognizing service
- Serving on accreditation or evaluation teams

Examples of documentation used to evaluate service can be found in the appendices of the current *Faculty ASPT Policies* Booklet. Additional information concerning School requirements for documentation and organization of dossiers is included in Appendix A. **Submissions of documentation should be made electronically. Requests to deviate from complete electronic submission can be made to the SFSC, but such requests should be based on exceptional circumstances.**

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The primary principle guiding the SFSC's performance evaluation of faculty will be the *quality* of work produced rather than the quantity. There is no substitute for sound professional judgment in the evaluative process. Performance evaluations for tenured and tenure-track faculty will be based on a rating scale as follows:

- | | |
|---|------------------------|
| 5 | Far Above Expectations |
| 4 | Above Expectations |
| 3 | Meets Expectations |
| 2 | Below Expectations |
| 1 | Far Below Expectations |

The following rubrics are meant to provide general, but not all-inclusive, descriptors of the five-level rating scale within the three faculty performance areas. Being rated at any level on the rating scale is contingent upon exceeding the requirements of the lower categories. These descriptors should not be considered a checklist. They are intended to guide faculty in general terms about performance expectations in the school.

Teaching Descriptors

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| Far Above Expectations | Outstanding teaching ratings*; extraordinary projects or accomplishments (e.g., development of exceptional pedagogical materials, acquisition or implementation of a teaching grant, teaching awards). |
| Above Expectations | Strong teaching ratings*; very active in improving teaching effectiveness (e.g., attendance at on campus and/or off campus teaching workshops; submission of a teaching grant); extensive teaching and/or mentoring efforts outside of class time; extensive contribution in curriculum review/revision as necessary. |

Meets Expectations	Satisfactory teaching ratings*; active efforts to improve teaching effectiveness; appropriate design and delivery of course materials; appropriate course content; upgrades individual courses as necessary; appropriate teaching and/or mentoring efforts outside of class time (e.g., electronic portfolio maintenance, independent study, honors project, thesis committee, professional practice supervision); appropriate work in necessary curriculum review/revision.
Below Expectations	Less than satisfactory teaching ratings*; substandard design and delivery of course materials; course content needs review; course materials outdated; minimal teaching efforts outside of class; very little contribution to necessary curricular review/revision (curricular change, monitoring maintenance of program requirements, program review, program assessment).
Far Below Expectations	Poor teaching ratings*; unacceptable design and delivery of course materials; course materials outdated.

*According to University ASPT policies, two or more types of factors must be used to evaluate teaching performance, one of which shall be student reactions to teaching performance. However, student ratings of instruction shall not constitute more than a 40% weighting of the overall rating of teaching.

Scholarship Descriptors

Far Above Expectations	Publications in rigorously refereed national/international journals; textbook authorship(s); publication of invited review papers in prestigious peer reviewed journals; recipient of faculty research award; extensive refereed and/or invited presentations at the national/international level; award of substantial external grant.
Above Expectations	National/international refereed publications or a refereed publication in a rigorous national/international journal; textbook authorship; book chapter; award of external grant or active external grant. Presentations at the national level. Editor or editorial board member of peer-reviewed journal.
Meets Expectations	A national/international refereed publication plus one or more state/regional refereed publications or refereed research presentations; award of an internal research grant, submission of an external research grant which was not awarded.

Refereeing or editing peer-reviewed journal articles, grant proposals, or book manuscripts.

Below Expectations	One or more state/regional refereed publications; refereed research presentation(s); submission of an internal research grant which was not awarded.
Far Below Expectations	Not actively engaged in research/scholarly activity, publications, or professional presentations.

Service Descriptors

Far Above Expectations	Extensive service contributions through substantial committee work or significant leadership at multiple levels including professional, university, college, school, program, and/or community service. Additional service productivity such as acquisition of a service grant, service award recipient.
Above Expectations	Strong service contributions through substantial committee work or leadership in professional, university, college, school, program, and/or community service. Additional efforts such as productive contributions on multiple committees at various levels. Submission of a service grant.
Meets Expectations	Productive contributor in program committee work and in professional, university, college, school, program service. Active in community service.
Below Expectations	Program committee work with minimal service contributions in other areas of service.
Far Below Expectations	Not actively engaged in service activities; fails to meet minimal service standards. Absent from program committee work and no service contributions at other levels.

Steps for Using the Rating Scale

1. All faculty will provide the requested documentation to the SFSC for the purpose of annual performance evaluation (See Appendix A) by the announced due date.

2. Weighted percentages will be incorporated in the evaluation process to be consistent with College and School expectations. For most probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty members, the weighting will be as follows:

40% - teaching
40% - scholarship
20% - service

In some situations, this weighting could be adjusted for a probationary tenure-track or a tenured faculty member after consultation with the Director and subsequent approval by the majority of the SFSC. Examples of these situations include but are not limited to when a faculty member has been on sabbatical, accepts an administrative assignment in the school, or has a grant that buys out instructional time.

3. Using the documentation provided by each faculty member, the School performance criteria, and the rating scale above, each SFSC member would independently rate each faculty member (excluding him/herself) in each of the three areas.
4. After all SFSC members have turned in their ratings to the SFSC chair, the mean value for each of the three areas of performance will be calculated for each faculty member. In the case of SFSC members or spouse/partners of SFSC members, the mean will be based on four ratings.
5. Upon determining the mean value for each of the three areas of performance, each value will be multiplied by the percentage weighting. These resultant values will then be added to result in a single overall score for each faculty member. For example, the rating of a faculty member receiving the following ratings from the five SFSC members would be calculated as follows:

<u>Teaching</u>	<u>Scholarship</u>	<u>Service</u>
3	3	4
4	3	3
3	3	3
4	3	3
3	2	4
<hr style="width: 20%; margin: 0 auto;"/> 17/5 = 3.4	<hr style="width: 20%; margin: 0 auto;"/> 14/5 = 2.8	<hr style="width: 20%; margin: 0 auto;"/> 17/5 = 3.4
<u>X .40</u>	<u>X .40</u>	<u>X .20</u>
1.36	1.12	.68

$$1.36 + 1.12 + .68 = 3.16 \text{ overall rating}$$

It is mandated by the current University ASPT policies that faculty members receive an overall evaluation as either “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory”. The SFSC will use the overall ratings as illustrated above to make this determination. As shown in the example, taking the average of a rating scale using whole numbers, called discrete data, will produce fractional ratings, called continuous data. The apparent limits are the whole numbers of the rating scale, but the real limits would be based on continuous data as follows:

Far Above Expectations	5	4.5 – 5.0
Above Expectations	4	3.5 – 4.49
Meets Expectations	3	2.5 - 3.49
Below Expectations	2	1.5 – 2.49
Far Below Expectations	1	1.0 – 1.49

The initial determination of “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” overall evaluations will be based on these real limits. By the definitions in this document, “meets expectations” and higher would be considered “satisfactory” and “below expectations” and lower would be considered “unsatisfactory”.

6. These values will not be absolute in determining the rating of each faculty member. Rather, they will provide the starting point for discussion as the SFSC composes annual formative evaluations for each faculty member. This scale will also form the starting basis for other personnel recommendations regarding reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.

V. PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Granting of Tenure

The SFSC conducts summative reviews of faculty members seeking tenure. The probationary tenure-track faculty member must achieve an overall rating for the entire probationary period at the “meets expectations” level in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service over the probationary period to be considered for tenure by the School of KNR. This does not mean that a faculty member must receive “meets expectations” in all three performance areas in each annual evaluation. In fact, it would probably not be unusual for ratings of “unsatisfactory” or “needs improvement” to occur, especially early in the probationary period. As indicated by the descriptors in the previous section, School standards of “meeting expectations” over the probationary period will require high quality work in all three areas. Meeting expectations in the overall probationary period in all three performance areas is a prerequisite for receiving tenure but does not guarantee that the SFSC will make a positive recommendation. As stated in the CFSC Standards, “Faculty must show evidence of developing a focused area of scholarly expertise and demonstrate the ability to function as a contributing colleague within the culture of their School, College, and University.”

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Summative reviews of faculty members seeking promotion to Associate Professor will be conducted by the SFSC. The consideration for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will normally occur simultaneously with the consideration of the granting of tenure. Only in exceptional circumstances will it be possible for an entry-level faculty member to be able to achieve a record appropriate for promotion in less than six years. The successful candidate should show sustained high quality performance in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. It is normally expected that a faculty member receiving a positive tenure recommendation would also receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor. Thus, the standards for receiving promotion to Associate Professor are very much the same as for receiving tenure.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Summative reviews of faculty members seeking promotion to Professor will be conducted by the SFSC. To be recommended for Professor, an individual minimally must exceed expectations in one performance category and continue to meet expectations in the other two categories. This type of performance should be sustained and continuous over a significant period of time. It is expected that a candidate for Professor should be recognized by students and colleagues as a highly effective teacher, should have established a productive line of scholarly inquiry, and should have provided significant service contributions to the School, College, University, and professional organizations. While not required to do so, a candidate submitting materials for promotion to Professor has the option to include written evaluations from peer evaluators external to ISU who are qualified to comment on contributions to the discipline. If a candidate chooses this option, the candidate must provide to the external evaluator(s) the School, College, and University mission statements and a written description of the candidate's assignment of efforts and activities for the entire time span being evaluated. These materials should be approved by the SFSC prior to submission to the external evaluator(s). No more than three external evaluators should be chosen by a candidate. The written evaluations of external evaluator(s) shall become part of the candidate's promotion application. External evaluations are not available to the candidate without prior written permission of the same evaluator.

VI. SALARY INCREMENTATION POLICIES

The Provost shall allocate a minimum of 90 percent of the salary funds directly to the schools/departments for salary increments. The equivalent allocation to each school/department shall be proportional as a percentage of base salary for each raise-eligible faculty member in the school/department.

These salary increments shall take the form of (1) standard increments payable to all raise-eligible faculty members who receive a minimum overall rating of meets

expectations and (2) performance-evaluated increments that recognize equity and short-term and long-term contributions made by particular faculty members.

Faculty members with overall ratings of “unsatisfactory” shall receive non-incremental raise. Twenty percent of the School’s allocation shall be distributed as a standard increment. The standard increment shall be payable as an equal percentage of base salary to all raise-eligible faculty who receive a minimum overall rating of meets expectations. The remaining 80 percent of the School’s allocation shall be distributed as performance-evaluated increments that recognize annual performance, long-term contributions, and equity.

Determining the Annual Salary Increment

The Director will use annual performance ratings done previously by the SFSC, consider long term contributions and equity issues, and make initial recommendations to the SFSC about salary increments for each raise-eligible faculty who received an overall rating of meets expectations. This recommendation would indicate the amount of the 20% standard increment. The Director will further recommend what part of the remaining 80% should be allocated for long-term contributions and equity adjustments accompanied by a rationale for these recommendations. The remaining percentage of the pool would be recommended for salary increment for each raise-eligible faculty member as well. This salary compensation review will be in addition to the review that occurs annually. The Director will present these recommendations to the other four members of the SFSC who will then have opportunity to consider and discuss these recommendations and offer suggestions for revisions. The Director and the SFSC will consider and modify these recommendations as needed until a majority of the SFSC supports the final recommendations. Every effort will be made to reach a consensus on these recommendations.

VII. Appeals and Termination Procedures

The SFSC shall comply with appeals and termination procedures as described in the Illinois State University Faculty ASPT policies document.

Right of Access to Personnel Documents

The SFSC shall comply with right of access to personnel documents policy as described in the Illinois State University Faculty ASPT policies document.

Post-tenure Review

The SFSC shall comply with Post-Tenure Review, including Cumulative Post-Tenure Reviews as described in the Illinois State University Faculty ASPT policies document.

Termination of Appointment of Probationary and Tenured Faculty

The SFSC shall comply with Termination of Appointment of Probationary and Tenured Faculty as described in the Illinois State University Faculty ASPT policies document.

Initial Draft: Approved 4/27/2000 by HPER Faculty by a vote of 19-0-1
Modified Draft: Approved 11/14/2000 by CFSC by a vote of 7-0-0
Modified Draft: Approved 2/13/06 by KNR Faculty unanimously
Modified Draft: Approved 11/7/06 by CFSC unanimously
Modified Draft: Approved 9/20/07 by KNR Faculty unanimously
Modified Draft: Approved 3/08 by KNR Faculty unanimously
Modified Draft: Approved 9/22/11 by KNR Faculty by a vote of 19-0-0
Approved by CFSC 10/21/2011
Modified Draft: Approved 9/27/12 by KNR Faculty by a vote of 13-0-0
Modified Draft: Approved 4/30/14 by KNR Faculty by a vote of 17-0-1

APPENDIX A

School of Kinesiology and Recreation Dossier Organizational Format

The following is the required dossier organizational format for the School of Kinesiology and Recreation. This dossier format is designed to be consistent with expectations of the College of Applied Science and Technology. Please adhere to this format as consistently as possible in submitting your materials for annual performance evaluations, reappointment reviews (progress toward tenure), tenure reviews, promotion reviews, and post-tenure reviews.

As much as possible, the dossier organizational format for these materials follows the categories included in the School of Kinesiology and Recreation vita requirements (see Appendix B). There is no need to include an electronic folder if there is no supporting material in this area. It is unlikely that a faculty member would have materials in every category listed in the vita format.

Your electronic dossier materials should be separated into seven major areas as follows:

I. Current Curriculum Vitae

Please use the "Annual Review CV" report created in Activity Insight and highlight by shading the items in each category that are applicable to the particular type of review (annual, reappointment, tenure, etc.)

II. Statement of Self-Analysis and Future Professional Goals

Your statement of self-analysis should address your work in the Teaching, Scholarship, and Service areas over the time period applicable to the type of review. This is an opportunity for you to highlight your professional efforts and provide insights into your work for the colleagues who are reviewing your dossier. You should also include a statement of your future professional goals in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service for the next applicable time period. This is also dependent on the type of review. If it were the annual performance review, then your goals would apply to the upcoming calendar year. If it were a reappointment review, your goals should address the time remaining prior to your tenure decision year. If it a tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review, your goals will likely be more long-term in nature.

III. Teaching

Materials submitted to document your accomplishments in teaching should be organized in electronic folders arranged in the order of the categories included in the vita format. Additionally, you must include electronic folders for representative classes you have taught that would include the course syllabus, final exam, and samples of assignments. All student course evaluation materials including individual student forms must be submitted electronically.

IV. Scholarship and Creative Activity

Materials submitted to document your accomplishments in scholarship and creative

activity should be organized in electronic folders consistent with categories included in the School of Kinesiology and Recreation vita format.

V. Service

Materials submitted to document your accomplishments in service should be organized in electronic folders consistent with categories included in the School of Kinesiology and Recreation vita requirements.

VI. Professional Development

Materials submitted to document your professional development should be organized in folders consistent with categories included in the School of Kinesiology and Recreation vita format.

VII. Honors and Awards

Materials submitted to document your honors and rewards should be organized in electronic folders consistent with categories included in the School of Kinesiology and Recreation vita requirements.

An electronic faculty folder, located on the School's network drive, should be used to submit your dossier.

APPENDIX B

School of Kinesiology and Recreation Vita Requirements

Name _____

Present Rank Year Achieved _____

Tenure Status

Tenured? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, year tenured _____

Years at ISU _____

Earned Degrees *(List Institution, Degree, Date of Conferral)*

Professional Experience *(List Institution, Dates, Rank/Responsibilities with the most recent first through the completion of your Baccalaureate degree.)*

Report of Work Activities and Accomplishments *(Use all parts of the outline format presented in the "Annual Review CV" report created by Activity Insight. In sections where there is no activity, leave it blank. If no part of the outline represents your work adequately, add an appropriate subheading at the end of the appropriate section.)*

I. TEACHING

- A. Course Information *(List courses taught during the evaluation period and include the number of students enrolled for each course.)*
- B. Teaching Evaluation Data *(Provide summary information and include course evaluation sheets and student comments electronically for period being evaluated.)*
- C. Advisees *(List number of graduate advisees for each year.)*
- D. Independent Studies *(List name of student, semester, title, brief description of the project.)*
- E. Graduate Student Committees *(List name of student, title of project, status - completed during the year or in progress and your role: chair or member.)*
- F. New Courses Developed or Major Course Revisions *(List proposed or actual number and title. Please include copy of course outline in dossier.)*
- G. Instructional Material Developed *(List title of material, associated course number, and course title, and include specific materials in dossier.)*

II. SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE PRODUCTIVITY

- A. Publications *(Provide complete APA citation for each and list in reverse chronological order.)*
1. Abstracts
 - Refereed
 - Non-refereed
 2. Books
 3. Chapters in Books
 4. Monographs
 5. Non-refereed Articles
 6. Proceedings
 7. Refereed Journal Articles
 8. Research Reports
- B. Publication Work in Progress *(Identify status – accepted, in revision, in review, under contract, etc.)*
- C. Research Projects in Progress *(Include title, brief description, status, your role, and if funded, source and amount.)*
- D. Research and/or Scholarly Papers Presented *(List title, name of meeting, place, date.)*
- E. Invited Research and/or Scholarly Presentations *(Include if presentation was part of colloquium, special lecture series, research symposium, and scholarly effort required in the development.)*
- F. Editorial Contributions
1. Editor, Associate Editor, Editorial Board *(Identify publication and your role.)*
 2. Journal Manuscript Reviewer *(Identify publication and your role.)*
 3. Book Reviews *(Identify sponsor requesting reviews.)*

G. Grants and Contracts

1. Internal Grants (*List title, sponsor, amount requested, grant period, and status, i.e., in review, funded, not funded*)
2. External Grants (*List title, sponsor, amount requested, grant period, and status, i.e., in review, funded, not funded*)
3. Contracts (*List title, sponsor, amount requested, contract period*)

III. SERVICE

A. Professional

1. Organizational Leadership
2. Presentations and Workshops Presented

B. University (*List title of committee, role, time commitment, etc.*)

1. University Committees
2. College Committees
3. School Committees
4. Other (*List and describe.*)

C. Community and Civic

1. Organizational Leadership (*List title and role.*)
2. Organizational Membership (*List title.*)
3. Presentations or Other Service Rendered (*Please describe.*)

D. Consulting and Technical Assistance

1. Consulting (*Identify agency, nature of consultation, place, and dates.*)
2. Technical Assistance (*Identify agency, nature of consultation, place, and dates.*)

IV. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- A. Conferences Attended *(List title, sponsoring organization, date, and place.)*
- B. Workshops Attended *(List title, sponsoring organization, date, and place.)*
- C. Courses Taken *(List title, sponsoring organization, date, and place.)*
- D. Memberships in Professional Organizations *(Identify organization.)*
- E. Certifications, Credentials, and Education *(Identify new certification, credentials, or degrees earned.)*

V. AWARDS AND HONORS *(List title, sponsoring organization, type of award.)*

- A. Teaching
- B. Scholarship and/or Creative Activity
- C. Service

APPENDIX C

TEACHING EVALUATION – SCHOOL OF KINESIOLOGY AND RECREATION

Instructor _____ Course _____ # of students _____

Observer _____ Date _____

Please make ratings and anecdotal comments as applicable in the areas listed below.

Rate each area as: exceeds expectations (EE), meets expectations (ME), needs improvement (NI), or unsatisfactory (U).

Performance criteria for Instructional Design and Organization, Content Expertise, Instructional Delivery, and Engagement Strategies can be found in the School of Kinesiology and Recreation Faculty Performance Documents.

Instructional Design and Organization (clarity of syllabus, lesson linked with course objectives, efficient use of time, etc.)

Rating: EE ME NI U

Content Expertise (demonstrates mastery of subject matter, able to answer student questions appropriately, etc.)

Rating: EE ME NI U

Instructional Delivery (appropriate use of instructional aids, use of anticipatory set and closure to class, clear presentation of material appropriate to the level of the students, instructor gauges students comprehension of material, etc.)

Rating: EE ME NI U

Engagement Strategies (provides a productive learning environment, utilizes appropriate questioning strategies and feedback, etc.)

Rating: EE ME NI U

Strong Points of the Lesson

Suggestions for ImprovementOverall Effectiveness of the Instructor

Rating: EE ME NI U