Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Scoring System Overview

2020

Department of Recreation Management & Physical Education

BEAVER COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES
APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Contents

RTPM Scoring System Overview

Overview

This document outlines a scoring system used for quantifying professional activities and making administrative decisions based on varying levels of professional engagement and productivity.

Three major performance areas are identified:
1. **Teaching**
2. **Scholarship**
3. **Service**

Each performance area has been weighted according to predetermined departmental standards for full-time tenure track and special faculty appointments (i.e. lecturer, practitioners-in-residence, etc.):

Performance Area	Weight	
	Tenure Track Faculty	**Special Faculty Appointment**
1. Teaching	40 %	80 %
2. Scholarship	30 %	------
3. Service	30 %	20 %

A minimum yearly point criterion for each performance area has been established at 70% of the weighted values from above. The minimum yearly point criteria are as follows:

Performance Area	Points	
	Tenure Track Faculty	**Special Faculty Appointment**
1. Teaching	28	56
2. Scholarship	21	------
3. Service*	21	14

* The minimum yearly point criterion for service is **14** for 1st-year assistant professors

Activities and corresponding point values and criteria have been established and are categorized by the three major performance areas:
1. **Teaching: see Tables 1-3**
2. **Scholarship: see Tables 4-19**
3. **Service: see Tables 20-25**

Tenure Protocol

The teaching, scholarship, and service criteria outlined below are intended to serve as guidelines for the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee in the tenure process. Meeting these minimum expectations does not guarantee attainment of tenure and promotion, as numerous other variables, such as collegiality and institutional need, factor into the decision. It is important to note that the Promotion and Tenure Committee acts as a recommending body, and final decisions are made in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

The following minimum criteria must be met for each of the three performance areas:

1. **Teaching**
   - From the IDEA, an adjusted summary evaluation score in the middle 40% (45-55) during both the 4th and 5th years of tenure track employment.
   - Participation in, on average, at least 1 teaching enhancement activity per year.

2. **Scholarship**
   - Five refereed publications (with at least 3 at the Beta level as sole, first, or co-author).
   - At least one of the lead author, Alpha/Beta level publications results from an original data-driven research project that was conceived, planned, implemented and completed by this individual while at ASU.

3. **Service**
   - Demonstrate regular and on-going service to the university, department, and/or profession
   - At least one service leadership role in an institutional or professional matter.

Promotion Protocol

<u>**Promotion to Associate Professor**</u>
The criteria for promotion to associate professor are identical to the criteria outlined for tenure (see Tenure Protocol section).

<u>**Promotion to Full Professor**</u>
For promotion to professor, faculty within the Department of Recreation Management and Physical Education should have *significant accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service beyond what is expected at the Associate Professor level*. The faculty member should demonstrate a consistent and sustained record of accomplishments since the last promotion and/or tenure decision. The faculty member should be able to demonstrate the following:

1) *outstanding teaching* that is current in the discipline and is informed by the faculty member's scholarship. Components of outstanding teaching include a clearly articulated philosophy of teaching, excellent evaluations of teaching by students and peers, excellence in student mentorship, and leadership in curriculum, course and/or content area development;

2) an *outstanding record of scholarly activity* that is disseminated in quality professional publications and conference presentations, and clearly demonstrates significant independent contributions to the academic field nationally and/or internationally;

3) *outstanding service at the department, college, and university level* in the form of committee leadership and mentorship of junior faculty (if applicable) and students; and *service to the designated profession* in the form of significant leadership positions in national or state professional organizations, journal or grant editorships, and other service activities within appropriate professional organizations; and,

4) evidence of commitment to the *BCHS Mission, Vision and **Core Values**** and professional behaviors consistent with the **Attributes of Successful Faculty****. Additionally, faculty aspiring to promotion to full professor should demonstrate the qualities of senior leadership and mentoring of others (i.e., junior faculty, students).

***BCHS Core Values**
The Beaver College of Health Sciences embraces the following core values that guide us in achieving our vision and fulfilling our mission. We are committed to:
- ⬚PROFESSIONALISM - Modeling honesty, integrity, ethics & professional behaviors for our students.
- INNOVATION - Embracing change that promotes excellence and reflects best practice.
- ACCOUNTABILITY - Honoring our commitments in all that we say and do.
- TRANSPARENCY - Making decisions in an open and honest manner that support shared governance.

- CIVILITY - Encouraging open dialog and debate, free from bullying behaviors.
- RESPECT - Treating each other with dignity and respect.
- DIVERSITY - Promoting diversity and expanding inclusion in our programs.
- EQUITY - Striving to reduce health disparities and promote health equity for all.
- STEWARDSHIP - Managing our resources efficiently and effectively.
- WELLNESS - Living and promoting healthy lifestyles.

**BCHS Attributes of Successful Faculty
The Beaver College of Health Sciences believes that all academic faculty should model professional skills and attributes, and these characteristics should be considered when recruiting new academic faculty. In addition to discipline-specific requirements, successful BCHS faculty exhibit the following attributes:
- ⬚Terminal degree earned in the discipline (for tenure track faculty only).
- Collegiality that contributes to a positive work environment in the college.
- Commitment to the strategic goals of the department, college, and university.
- Promoting excellence in teaching, including learning opportunities for students through research, study abroad, service learning, and interprofessional experiences, etc.
- Conducting productive scholarship consistent with the teacher-scholar model, to include peer reviewed publications and grant proposal writing (for tenure track faculty only).
- Engagement in professional service within the University and beyond.
- Technological literacy and a commitment to using technology in teaching and scholarship.
- Willingness to engage in diverse academic and professional communities.
- Student engagement through recruiting, advising, retaining, and mentoring qualified students.

Additionally, all faculty are expected and obligated to perform the following services, demonstrating engagement in departmental and university affairs:
- active participation on standing and/or ad hoc departmental committees
- regular participation in university graduation and convocation events
- regular attendance at faculty meetings (unless scheduling conflict with other university commitments prohibits attendance)

Performance Indicators
The performance indicators below provide *minimum* criteria for attaining the rank of Professor. It is possible that a candidate may have accomplishments in all of the required categories, but not attain an overall level of performance and quality to earn the rank of Professor. Additionally, the following is not necessarily an exhaustive list, and it is possible there are other accomplishments not indicated here that could positively impact a candidate's overall evaluation. Ultimately, the impetus for making the case that the body of accomplishments is worthy of the rank of Professor falls on the faculty member seeking promotion.
 A candidate's full body of academic accomplishments are taken into consideration when being evaluated for promotion to Professor, with primary emphasis placed on work completed while employed at Appalachian State, and an expectation to demonstrate a consistent and sustained record of accomplishments since the last promotion and/or tenure decision.

Teaching
Faculty seeking the rank of Professor are expected to demonstrate outstanding teaching performance. There are numerous avenues through which a faculty might excel at teaching, and as such, the RMPE Department has identified the following areas of evidence for outstanding teaching:
- Student-centered teaching
- Commitment to program and curricular development
- Mentorship

- Evidence of growth [since last promotion decision]

Performance indicators for the Teaching category may include, but are not limited to, the following.
- Peer evaluations demonstrating effective teaching behaviors
- Demonstration of quality curriculum and/or course development
  - As evidenced by course syllabi, course websites, samples of student work, videos, assignments, exams, or other teaching artifacts
- Clearly articulated philosophy of teaching
- Evidence of student mentorship
- Evidence of mentorship of junior faculty
- Evidence of mentorship within the profession
- Student evaluations of teaching
  - Report distribution of scores, number of responders, and response rate
- Awards
- Thesis/honors committees
- Study abroad
- Instructional institutes/workshops

Scholarly Activity

Faculty seeking the rank of Professor must demonstrate outstanding scholarly productivity. Although the quality of scholarly/creative work will be judged more critically than the quantity, faculty are expected to show both sustained productivity and an overall level of productivity that clearly demonstrates significant independent contributions to the academic field nationally and/or internationally. The RMPE Department values varied forms of scholarship and creative work in the following areas:

- The **scholarship of discovery** that includes original research that advances knowledge;
- The **scholarship of integration** that involves synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics within a discipline, or across time;
- The **scholarship of application/engagement** that goes beyond the service duties of a faculty member to those within or outside the University and involves the rigor and application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers; and
- The **scholarship of teaching and learning** that includes the systematic study of teaching and learning processes. It differs from scholarly teaching in that it requires a format that will allow public sharing and the opportunity for application and evaluation by others.

Performance indicators for the Scholarly Activity category include, but are not limited to, the following.
- Publication, with evidence of peer review or jury process, of original research or creative work that has scholarly significance in academic journals, books, chapters, or technical reports.
- Publication, or other documented dissemination, of a textbook or curricular materials that show documented input from external reviewers and/or editors.
- Delivery of an invited, keynote address at a professional conference.
- Substantial external funding for research, development, or innovative creative projects whose scope or stature positively advances the field and with evidence of dissemination of the work to an audience of peers.
- Serving as an editor of a scholarly journal.
- Letters of support from independent external reviews of the faculty's scholarship.
- Delivery of presentations, with a documented peer review processes, at professional conferences.
- Recognition from peers in the field of specialization (e.g., recipient of publication awards, awards for research or creative work).

- Publication of a community-based research or technical report that results in substantive policy changes at national, regional, or local level.

Service
Faculty are expected to demonstrate *outstanding service in the following areas:*

- Service to the department, college, and university
- Service to the designated profession
- Service to the broader community outside of academia (whether local, regional, or national), when directly related to one's professional expertise

The Department of Recreation Management and Physical Education considers these activities vital to all the institutions of academia and thus includes them in our list of factors to be considered in promotion/tenure decisions.

Performance indicators for the Service category include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Significant roles at the University and/or college level, such as faculty Senator, chair of University or College committee, participation on a system-wide committee or board, or director of a university-wide program.
- Significant leadership roles in professional organizations, such as president or other senior officer, serving on a national or international convention planning committee, or serving on a committee or board for a national/international organization.
- Administrative roles, such as department chair, program area director, or associate dean.
- Accreditation activities, such as leading a program accreditation or serving on a national accreditation team.
- Significant service, directly related to one's professional expertise, to community- or school-based organizations, such as serving on a steering committee or civic board, or establishing a long-term program for schools.
- Long-term leadership in professional development activities, such as curriculum development and education for practitioners.
- Other notable service activities.

Once promoted to full professor, the faculty member would have the opportunity to negotiate a percentage reallocation in each of the performance areas (teaching, scholarship, and service). The range for reallocating percentages for each performance area is as follows:
1. **Teaching: 40-60%**
2. **Scholarship: 10-40%**
3. **Service: 10-40%**

- The minimum percentage for each performance area cannot be less than the minimum value of each range.
- The percentage values for each performance area must be in intervals of 10.
- When added, the percentages for each of the 3 performance areas must be 100.
- To determine a minimal point criterion once the percentages for each performance area are established, the percentage for each performance area would be multiplied by 70% (i.e., teaching 50% x 70% = 35 points).
- The established percentages would be in effect for a period of 3 academic years.
- Near the conclusion of each 3-year period, a full professor would have the opportunity to renegotiate the percentage allocation to each of the 3 performance areas.

Raise & Merit System Overview

The raise and merit system is used to reward professional productivity. To objectively determine an appropriate raise a performance score must be calculated. The performance score represents a faculty member's contribution to the area, department, university, profession at-large, and so forth. Accordingly, the greater one's contribution, the higher the performance score. The raise and merit system consists of three categories as indicated below:

1. **Basic Raise**
2. **Merit**
3. **RMPE Departmental Discretionary Merit**

Allocation of Money to the Raise & Merit Pool

The chair will divide the total amount of money that is allocated for raises and merit among the 3 categories as follows:

1. **Basic Raise: 50%**
2. **Merit: 45%**
3. **RMPE Departmental Discretionary Merit: 5%**

For example, if the total allocated for raises and merit is $50,000, then the dollar value for each category is as follows:

1. **Basic Raise: $25,000**
2. **Merit: $22,500**
3. **RMPE Departmental Discretionary Merit: $2,500**

1. **Basic Raise**

All faculty members are expected to make a basic contribution to their area, department, etc. by engaging in professionally relevant activities in each of the three major performance areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. To earn an area basic raise it is expected that the faculty member demonstrate effective teaching, productive participation in scholarship, and active engagement in service by accumulating 70 points during the **academic/fiscal/calendar** year. To earn a basic raise an individual must meet minimum point criteria in each of the three performance areas. The minimum criteria for each performance area are as follows:

Performance Area	Points	
	Tenure Track Faculty	**Special Faculty Appointment**
1. Teaching	28	56
2. Scholarship	21	------
3. Service*	21	14

* The minimum yearly point criterion for service is 14 for 1st year assistant professors

- **50%** of the money allocated to raises and merit is reserved for basic raises
- The money allocated to the basic raise pool will be divided equally among all individuals who meet the minimum point criteria in each of the three performance areas.
- For example, if there were 25 faculty members who meet the basic raise criteria and the money allocated to the basic raise pool is $25,000, then each faculty member would receive a $1,000 raise.

2. **Merit**
- Merit is used to reward those individuals who exceed a basic contribution to their area, department, etc. and earn more than the minimum point criteria in each of the three major performance areas.
- **45%** of the money allocated to raises and merit is reserved for merit. For example, $22,500.
- This 45% is sub-divided into the following categories: teaching (40%), scholarship (30%), and

service (30%).   For, example: teaching = $9,000, scholarship = $6,750, and service = $6,750
- Any points exceeding the minimum yearly point criteria are applied toward merit within the category in   which the points are earned. For example, the minimum yearly point criterion for teaching is 28 points. If an individual earned 38 points for teaching, then 10 points are applied to teaching merit.
- To calculate merit in each of the three performance areas, merit points for the department are totaled within each category. Then each individual earns a share of the money in each performance area equal to the corresponding percentage of points they earned in each category. For example, if an individual earned 10   points in the teaching merit pool, and the total number of points in that category is 200, and the total amount   of money allocated to that pool is $9,000, then the individual earns a $450 teaching merit raise.
- A three-year moving average is used to determine merit scores for any given **academic/fiscal/calendar** year. For example, each year's merit scores would be calculated by using the current scores and the two previous year's scores.

3. **Departmental Discretionary Merit**
   - **5%** of the money allocated for raises and merit is reserved for discretionary purposes. For example, $2,500
   - Individuals are eligible to receive area discretionary merit raises only if they exceed the area basic raise criteria.
   - The area discretionary merit money is distributed to individuals within the area at the discretion of the chair.
   - Possible uses include, but are not limited to
     1. Exceptional performance by faculty
     2. Activities not yet assigned a point value

How Points for Activities are Determined
- Points for activities are based on a number of factors including:
  o Professional judgment,
  o Impact of activity on profession,
  o Quality of activity,
  o Rigor necessary to complete activity,
  o Value of activity as a percentage of overall points required for basic contribution in the performance area, and
  o Norm-referenced comparison of activity to other activities within the same performance area.

- If an individual engages in an activity that is not yet identified, a point value will be assigned to the activity by the Chair based on:
  o Professional judgment,
  o Impact of product on profession,
  o Quality of product,
  o Rigor necessary to develop product,
  o Percentage of overall points required for basic contribution in the performance area,
  o Norm-referenced comparison of product to other activities within the same performance area,
  o Written justification from the individual who developed the product suggesting a point value.

Raise Example
The following example assumes:

- A 5% annual raise
- That the average annual salary in the department is $50,000
- That there are 30 full time tenure track and special appointment faculty members in the department
- That the total dollar amount allocated for raises in the department is $75,0000 ($50,000 x 30 x 0.05)
    1. **Basic Raise** pool = $37,500 (50% of total merit pool)
    2. **Merit** pool = $33,750 (45% of total merit pool)
        a. Teaching = $13,500 (40% of merit pool)
        b. Scholarship = $10,125 (30% of merit pool)
        c. Service = $10,125 (30% of merit pool)
    3. **Discretionary** merit pool = $3,750 (5% of total merit pool)

- Each of the 30 faculty members in the department scored at least 70 total points each (≥28 [teaching], ≥21 [scholarship], and ≥21 [service]) and earned a basic raise; therefore all of the funds in the basic raise pool will be distributed equally to each of the 30 faculty members as a $1,250 raise ($37,500/30)

Example:
- Dr. Jane Doe earned 100 merit points during this past **academic/fiscal/calendar** year with a teaching score of 35, a scholarship score of 33, and a service score of 32.
- To receive a basic raise she needed to earn at least 70 points, with a minimum teaching score of 28, a minimum scholarship score of 21, and a minimum service score of 21. Dr. Doe will receive a basic raise of **$1250** ($37,500/30).
- A three-year moving average is used to determine her merit points for this **academic/fiscal/calendar** year. Dr. Doe earned 30 merit points during this academic/ fiscal/ calendar year, which is the difference between her total merit score and the 70-point minimum basic raise criterion.
- For this year, merit point totals in each performance area for Dr. Doe are as follows: Teaching = 7 (35-28), Scholarship = 12 (33-21) and Service = 11 (32-21)
- Assuming that in each of the past two **academic/fiscal/calendar**, Dr. Doe earned the following merit points in teaching 10 and 7, in scholarship 10 and 8, and in service 7 and 9 respectively.
- Her merit score, which will be used to determine her merit raise, for teaching is 8 ([7 + 10 + 7] / 3), for scholarship is 10 ([12+10+8] / 3), and for service is 9 ([11 + 7 + 9] / 3).
- Assume that the total number of merit points for the department in teaching is 250, in scholarship is 200, and in service is 300. In teaching each merit point is worth $53 ($13,500/250). In scholarship each merit point is worth $50.60 ($10,125/200). In service each merit point is worth $33.75 ($10,125/300).
- Dr. Doe's merit raise is as follows: Teaching = $424 ($53 X 8 points), Scholarship = $506 ($50.60 X 10 points), Service = $303.75 ($33.75 X 9 points).
- Dr. Doe had an exceptional **academic/fiscal/calendar** year and engaged in an activity that brought great prestige to the department. However, the activity was not yet identified on the list of professional activities. Since she met the criteria for a basic raise she was eligible for a discretionary merit raise. Therefore, at the discretion of the chair, Dr. Doe received an additional discretionary merit raise of $200.
- In summary, Dr. Doe earned a total raise of $2,683.75. Her raise is itemized below:
    1. **Basic Raise: $1,250**
    2. **Merit: $1,233.75**
    3. **Area Discretionary Merit: $200**

Teaching Overview

RTPM scores for teaching are based on:
- Teaching Enhancement Activities (Table 1)
- Teaching Effectiveness (Table 2)
- Teaching Honors & Awards (Table 3)

Table 1a. Teaching Enhancement Activities

Points	Activity
4	National/Regional/State Coursework for Credit – on site
4	National/Regional/State/University Coursework for Credit – distance learning
3	University Sponsored Coursework for Credit – on site
3	National/Regional/State Multi-day Workshop Participation
2	University Sponsored Multi-day Workshop Participation
2	National/Regional/State Full day Workshop Participation
1	University Sponsored Full day Workshop Participation
1	National/Regional/State Partial-day Workshop Participation
0.5	University Sponsored Partial-day Workshop Participation
2	Individual Growth Plan – Based on RMPE Peer Observation & IDEA data
1	Extended invitation to qualified observer
1	Observation of effective teacher
	Other

Criteria:
- All participation in activities must be documented or a written action plan indicating how activity will be used to enhance teaching effectiveness.
- Activity must be directly related to teaching responsibilities (current or immediate future).
- Maximum points available for teaching enhancement activities - 50% of Teaching benchmark during first 3 years / 25% of teaching benchmark in all subsequent years.
  - For example, during the first 3 years of employment, an individual with a teaching benchmark of 28 points could earn a maximum of 14 teaching enhancement points. In all subsequent years, this individual could earn a maximum of 7 teaching enhancement points.

Table 1b. Auxiliary Teaching

Points	Activity
3	Design & Development of a New Course via AP&P
4	Chair, Thesis Committee
2	Member, Thesis Committee
2	Reader, University Honors Program
2	Director, Student Project
2	Receiving /maintaining official designation as a Service Learning Course
	Other

Criteria: All participation in activities must be documented.

Table 1c. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*

Points	Activity
2	Construction of an annotated bibliography for course reference
2	Implementation of a novel teaching method or activity (including use of technology)
2	Implementation of a novel examination or testing practice
2	Development of ungraded assessments to enhance students' learning
2	Implementation of a novel strategy for dealing with class management problems
	Other

Criteria: All participation in activities must be documented, a written action plan indicating how activity will be used to enhance teaching effectiveness, and a written summary of outcome measurement techniques (i.e. student survey, test scores) and of effectiveness.
*A maximum of 6 points in this area per year.

Table 2. Teaching Honors & Awards

Points	Activity
15	National
10	Regional
8	State
5	University
2	Community
	National

Criteria: Honor or awards must be documented.

Table 3. Teaching Effectiveness Scoring Table

Evaluation Category	Points				Criteria
	Average Score	Tenure Track	Special Appt	Full Professor	
Exceeds Expectation	5.0	43	71		* CourseEval administered in every class that you teach.
	4.9	42	70		
	4.8	41	69		* Administration adheres to the protocol outlined by the RMPE Teaching Enhancement Committee.
	4.7	40	68		
	4.6	39	67		
	4.5	38	66		
	4.4	37	65		* Scores below the lowest scores illustrated on the table earn 1 less point pre 0.1 point increment.
	4.3	36	64		
	4.2	35	63		
	4.1	34	62		**For example**:
Meets Expectation	4.0	33	61		A tenure track faculty with an average CourseEval Score:
	3.9	32	60		- **2.4 = 17 pts**
	3.8	31	59		
	3.7	30	58		
	3.6	29	57		
	3.5	28	56		
Does Not Meet Expectation	3.4	27	55		
	3.3	26	54		
	3.2	25	53		
	3.1	24	52		
	3.0	23	51		
	2.9	22	50		
	2.8	21	49		
	2.7	20	48		
	2.6	19	47		
	2.5	18	46		

To calculate your RTPM Teaching Effectiveness Points:
- From CourseEval, average your scores for each course you teach on:
  - Course Q1 - Overall, this course was a valuable learning experience for me
  - Course Q2 - The course contributed to my knowledge of/skills in the subject matter
  - Instructor Q1 - Overall, I consider this individual to be an effective instructor
- Refer to table above to determine points that correspond to your Average Score

Scholarship Overview

RTPM scores for scholarship are based on the following major activities:
- Publications (Tables 4-6)
- Presentations (Tables 7-10)
- Professional Editor/Reviewer (Tables 11-16)
- Grantsmanship (Tables 17-18)
- Other (Table 19)
- Scholarship Honors & Awards (Table 20)

Scores

In most cases within a single category, points are allocated based on progressive levels of responsibility. The allocation of points are based on the following percentages:
- 100% - highest level of responsibility (ex. 1st author – 30 points)
- 70%- 2nd highest level of responsibility (ex. 2nd author – 21 points)
- 40%- 3rd highest level of responsibility (ex. 3rd author – 12 points)
- 15%- 4th highest level of responsibility (ex. 4th author – 4.5 points)

Faculty who co-author publications and/or co-present may choose to divide credit equally.

First-Year Assistant Professor Scholarship Matriculation:

In order to aid **first-year** assistant professors in initiating a cycle of scholarship, a percentage of the total points allocated to the activity will be credited for submissions in each of the following major scholarship activities: publications, presentations, and grantsmanship. The criteria for giving credit for submissions in any of the identified scholarship activities is as follows:
- The individual is a first year assistant professor
- 33% of the points allocated to a scholarship activity will be awarded for submission of the activity
- If the scholarship activity is published, presented, or funded, then the individual will receive the remaining points (66%) allocated to the scholarship activity.

Publications

Classification of journal levels is based upon the judgment of leading professionals in discipline. Points shall be awarded upon final publication of the article. Evidence of the publication must be provided.

Research-based Refereed Journal Articles

This classification is for peer-reviewed publication of original, data-driven research projects. Literature review articles published in research journals fall under this classification.

Table 4. Criteria and Points for Research-based Refereed Journal Articles:

Author	Points		
	Alpha • Higher rejection rate, • Higher circulation, and • Higher impact on profession.	**Beta** • Moderate rejection rate, • Moderate circulation, and • Moderate impact on profession.	**Delta** • Lower rejection rate, • Lower circulation, and • Lower impact on profession.
1st	30	20	10
2nd	21	14	7
3rd	12	8	4
≥4th h	4.5	3	2

Profession-based Refereed Journal Articles

This classification is for peer-reviewed non-research based articles published in professional journals. Examples include application, dissemination, teaching methods, and/or position statements.

Table 5a. Criteria and Points for Profession-based Refereed Journal Articles:

Author	Points		
	Alpha • Higher rejection rate, • Higher circulation, and • Higher impact on profession. • Feature/main section articles only	**Beta** • Moderate rejection rate, • Moderate circulation, and • Moderate impact on profession.	**Delta** • Lower rejection rate, • Lower circulation, and • Lower impact on profession. • All sub-section articles/briefs
1st	15	10	5
2nd	10.5	7	3.5
3rd	6	4	2
≥4th h	3	2	1

Non-refereed Articles

This classification is for non-refereed articles published in professional journals or magazines. Examples include articles published in professional journals or popular magazines that did not undergo peer review, published reviews of books or research articles, as well as published conference proceedings.

Table 5b. Criteria and Points for Non-refereed Journal Articles:

Author	Points	
	Alpha • Publication in a national, regional, or state professional journal.	**Beta** • Publication in a local or university-based professional journal • Publication in a non-professional outlet (magazine, newspaper, newsletter, etc.).
1st	7.5	5
2nd	5	3.5
3rd	3	2
≥4th $_h$	1.5	1

Books

Table 6a. Alpha Level Books

Points	Authorship	Criteria
40	1st	Higher tiered book in discipline as evidenced by:
28	2nd	• Publisher status in discipline,
16	3rd	• Higher impact on profession, and

6	≤4th	• Judgment of leading professionals in discipline.
		• 1st Edition
		• Subsequent editions earn 33% of the points allocated to authorship of a book
		• Examples include:
		  - Professional text
		  - Participation in activity can be documented

Table 6b. Beta Level Books

Points	Authorship	Criteria
25	1st	Intermediate tiered book in discipline as evidenced by:
17.5	2nd	• Publisher status in discipline,
10	3rd	• Moderate impact on profession, and

4	≤4th	• Judgment of leading professionals in discipline.
		• 1st Edition
		• Examples include:
		  - Chapters in a professional text, or
		  - Non-professional, discipline related text
		  - Participation in activity can be documented
		  - Points awarded upon validated/proof of acceptance

Table 6c. Delta Level Books

Points	Authorship	Criteria
25	1st	Lower tiered book in discipline as evidenced by:
17.5	2nd	• Publisher status in discipline,
10	3rd	• Lower impact on profession, and
4	≤4th	• Judgment of leading professionals in discipline.
		• 1st Edition
		• Examples include:
		- Chapters in a non-professional, discipline related text, or
		- University-based publications (i.e. Hubbard Center Texts).
		- Participation in activity can be documented
		- Points awarded upon validated/proof of acceptance

Table 6d. Other

Points	Authorship	Criteria
		Any activities not yet identified will be assigned a point value by the Chair based on:
		• Effort required to develop product,
		• Quality of product,
		• Impact of product on profession,
		• Norm-referenced comparison of product to other activities within the same performance area,
		• Professional judgment, and
		• A written justification from the individual who developed the product suggesting a point value.

Presentations

Table 7a. International/National Alpha Level Presentation

Points	Presenter	Criteria
15	1st	Higher tiered national presentation in discipline as evidenced by:
11	2nd	• Peer reviewed, research-based, discipline oriented.
6	3rd	• Invited speaker, research-based, discipline oriented.
4	≤4th	• Activity can be documented

Table 7b. International/National Beta Level Presentation

Points	Presenter	Criteria
10	1st	Intermediate tiered national presentation in discipline as evidenced by:
7	2nd	• Peer reviewed, non-research-based, discipline oriented.
4	3rd	• Invited speaker, non-research-based, discipline oriented.
2	≤4th	• Activity can be documented

Table 7c. International/National Delta Level Presentation

Points	Presenter	Criteria
3	1st	Lower tiered national presentation in discipline as evidenced by:
2	2nd	• Non-peer reviewed, non-research-based.
1	3rd	• Invited speaker, non-research-based, non-discipline oriented.
.5	≤4th	• Activity can be documented

Table 8a. Regional/State Alpha Level Presentation

Points	Presenter	Criteria
12	1st	Higher tiered regional presentation in discipline as evidenced by:
8.5	2nd	• Peer reviewed, research-based, discipline oriented.
5	3rd	• Invited speaker, research-based, discipline oriented.
2	≤4th	• Activity can be documented

Table 8b. Regional/State Beta Level Presentation

Points	Presenter	Criteria
8	1st	Intermediate tiered regional presentation in discipline as evidenced by:
5.5	2nd	• Peer reviewed, non-research-based, discipline oriented.
3	3rd	• Invited speaker, non-research-based, discipline oriented.
1	≤4th	• Activity can be documented

Table 8c. Regional/State Delta Level Presentation

Points	Presenter	Criteria
3	1st	Lower tiered regional presentation in discipline as evidenced by:
2	2nd	• Non-peer reviewed, non-research-based.
1	3rd	• Invited speaker, non-research-based, non-discipline oriented.
.5	≤4th	• Activity can be documented

Table 9. Professional Conference Attendance

Points	Level	Criteria
3	International/National	Attendance can be documented:
2	Regional (multi-state)	Up to 3 points per year may be earned for attending professional conferences
1	State & Local	Professional moderator = 1 point per conference
		*May not count a given professional conference for both scholarship and teaching enhancement, even if both aspects were present. If counted as teaching enhancement, must be directly related to teaching responsibilities.

Table 10. Other Presentation

Any activities not yet identified will be assigned a point value by the Chair based on:
• Effort required to develop product,
• Quality of product,
• Impact of product on profession,
• Norm-referenced comparison of product to other activities within the same performance area,
• Professional judgment, and
• A written justification from the individual who developed the product suggesting a point value.

Professional Editor and/or Reviewer

Table 11a. Editorship – Alpha Journal

Points	Level	Criteria
40	Editor-in-chief	• Alpha level, refereed publication (see Table 4 for Alpha level criteria)
28	Assoc./Section	• Participation in activity can be documented.
16	Guest, theme	• Points for this activity are awarded only once per academic/fiscal/calendar year per journal.
6	Guest, section	

Table 11b. Editorship – Beta Journal

Points	Level	Criteria
20	Editor-in-chief	• Beta level, refereed publication (see Table 4 for Beta level criteria)
14	Assoc./Section	• Participation in activity can be documented.
8	Guest, theme	• Points for this activity are awarded only once per academic/fiscal/calendar year per journal.
3	Guest, section	

Table 11c. Editorship – Delta Journal

Points	Level	Criteria
5	Editor-in-chief	• Delta level, refereed publication (see Table 4 for Delta level criteria)
3.5	Assoc./Section	• Participation in activity can be documented.
2	Guest, theme	• Points for this activity are awarded only once per academic/fiscal/calendar year per journal
1	Guest, section	

Table 12a. Editorship – Alpha Book

Points	Level	Criteria
30	Whole Book	• Alpha level book (see Table 6 for Alpha level criteria)
14	Chapter	• Name on document as editor.
6	Section	• Participation in activity can be documented.
		• Points for this activity are awarded only once per academic/fiscal/calendar year per book.
		• Subsequent editions earn 33% of the points allocated to editorship of a book

Table 12b. Editorship – Beta Book

Points	Level	Criteria
20	Whole Book	• Beta level book (see Table 6 for Beta level criteria)
10	Chapter	• Name on document as editor.
4	Section	• Participation in activity can be documented.
		• Points for this activity are awarded only once per academic/fiscal/calendar year per book.
		• Subsequent editions earn 33% of the points allocated to editorship of a book

Table 12c. Editorship – Delta Book

Points	Level	Criteria
10	Whole Book	• Delta level book (see Table 6 for Delta level criteria)
4	Chapter	• Name on document as editor.
2	Section	• Participation in activity can be documented.
		• Points for this activity are awarded only once per academic/fiscal/calendar year per book.
		• Subsequent editions earn 33% of the points allocated to editorship of a book

Table 13a. External Funded Grantsmanship Alpha

Points	Authorship	Criteria
30	1st	Alpha level grants are evidenced by *(one or more of the following)*:
21	2nd	• Highly competitive nature,
12	3rd	• Granting agency is highly esteemed in discipline,
4.5	≤4th	• High dollar value of grant: >$100,000.00
		• Points awarded upon money received
		• Participation in activity can be documented.
		• No more than two non-funded grant per year receives ½ credit.

Table 13b. External Funded Grantsmanship Beta

Points	Authorship	Criteria
20	1st	Beta level grants are evidenced by *(one or more of the following)*:
14	2nd	• Moderately competitive nature,
8	3rd	• Granting agency is moderately esteemed in discipline,
3	≤4th	• Modest dollar value of grant: >$5,000.00

		• Points awarded upon money received
		• Participation in activity can be documented.
		• No more than two non-funded grant per year receives ½ credit.

Table 13c. External Funded Grantsmanship Delta

Points	Authorship	Criteria
10	1st	Delta level grants are evidenced by *(one or more of the following)*:
7	2nd	• Low competitive nature,
4	3rd	• Granting agency is esteemed in discipline,
2	≤4th	• Low dollar value of grant: >$500.00
		• Points awarded upon money received
		• Participation in activity can be documented.
		• No more than two non-funded grant per year receives ½ credit.

Table 14a. Internal Funded Grantsmanship Alpha

Points	Authorship	Criteria
10	1st	Alpha level grants are evidenced by *(one or more of the following)*:
7	2nd	• Highly competitive nature,
4	3rd	• High dollar value of grant: >$3,000.00
2	≤4th	• Points awarded upon money received
		• Participation in activity can be documented.
		• No more than two non-funded grant per year receives ½ credit.

Table 14b. Internal Funded Grantsmanship Beta

Points	Authorship	Criteria
5	1st	Beta level grants are evidenced by *(one or more of the following)*:
3.5	2nd	• Moderately competitive nature,
2	3rd	• Modest dollar value of grant: >$1,000.00
1	≤4th	• Points awarded upon money received
		• Participation in activity can be documented.
		• No more than one non-funded grant per year receives ½ credit.

Table 14c. Internal Funded Grantsmanship Delta

Points	Authorship	Criteria
3	1st	Delta level grants are evidenced by *(one or more of the following)*:
2	2nd	• Low competitive nature,
1	3rd	• Low dollar value of grant: >$100.00
0.5	≤4th	• Points awarded upon money received
		• Participation in activity can be documented.
		• No more than one non-funded grant per year receives ½ credit.

Table 15. Other Grantsmanship

Any activities not yet identified will be assigned a point value by the Chair based on:
• Effort required to develop product,
• Quality of product,

- Impact of product on profession,
- Norm-referenced comparison of product to other activities within the same performance area,
- Professional judgment, and
- A written justification from the individual who developed the product suggesting a point value.

Table 16. Scholarship Enhancement Activities

Points	Activity
4	National/Regional/State Coursework for Credit – on site
4	National/Regional/State/University Coursework for Credit – distance learning
3	University Sponsored Coursework for Credit – on site
3	National/Regional/State Multi-day Workshop Participation
2	University Sponsored Multi-day Workshop Participation
2	National/Regional/State Full day Workshop Participation
1	University Sponsored Full day Workshop Participation
1	National/Regional/State Partial-day Workshop Participation
0.5	University Sponsored Partial-day Workshop Participation

Table 17. Scholarship Honors & Awards

Points	Level	Criteria
	National	Points negotiated with chair
	Regional	Honor or award can be documented
	State	
	University	
	Community	

Service Overview

RTPM scores for service are based on service activities at the following levels:

- International/National (Table 21),
- Multi-State (Table 22),
- State (Table 23),
- University/Department/Area (Table 24),
- Community/District(Table 25), and
- Service Honors & Awards (Table 26).

First-Year Assistant Professor Service Matriculation: In order to aid first-year assistant professors in providing service to the department, university, etc., the basic

Table 18a. International/National Service Activities

Points	Activity	Criteria
20	Member of Executive Board, Discipline-oriented Committee	Participation in activity can be documented
15	Chair, Discipline-oriented Committee	
8	Member, Discipline-oriented Committee	
2	Member, National Level Discipline-oriented Organization (dues paid) *Up to 6 points per year may be earned for membership in national, regional, state, and/or, community/district organizations.*	
	Officers of committees receive a negotiated value between the point values for member and chair	
	Other	

Table 18b. International/National Service Workshop, Symposium, Event

Points	Workshop, Symposium, Event	Criteria
	Leadership Role	Participation in activity can be documented
15	• Multi-day	
10	• Full-day	
7	• Partial-day (Lecture/Presentation)	
	Other	

Table 19a. Multi-state Service Activities

Points	Activity	Criteria
15	Member of Executive Board, Discipline-oriented Committee	Participation in activity can be documented
10	Chair, Discipline-oriented Committee	
6	Member, Discipline-oriented Committee	
2	Member, Regional Level Discipline-oriented Organization (dues paid) *Up to 6 points per year may be earned for membership in national, regional, state, and/or, community/district organizations.*	
	Officers of committees receive a negotiated value between the point values for member and chair	
	Other	

Table 19b. Multi-state Service Workshop, Symposium, Event

Points	Workshop, Symposium, Event	Criteria
	Leadership Role	Participation in activity can be documented
12	• Multi-day	
8	• Full-day	
5	• Partial-day (Lecture/Presentation	
	Other	

Table 20a. State Service Activities

Points	Activity	Criteria
10	Member of Executive Board, Discipline-oriented Committee	Participation in activity can be documented
8	Chair, Discipline-oriented Committee	
3	Member, Discipline-oriented Committee	
1	Member, State Level Discipline-oriented Organization (dues paid) *Up to 6 points per year may be earned for membership in national, regional, state, and/or, community/district organizations.*	
	Officers of committees receive a negotiated value between the point values for member and chair	
	Other	

Table 20b. State Service Workshop, Symposium, Event

Points	Workshop, Symposium, Event	Criteria
	Leadership Role	Participation in activity can be documented
10	• Multi-day	
7	• Full-day	
4	• Partial-day (Lecture/Presentation	
	Other	

Table 21a. Univ/Dept/Area Service Activities

Points	Activity	Criteria
10	Advisor, Professional Student Club/Organization	Individual receives points for *either* being a member of a committee or chair of that committee -- *not both.*
5	Advisor, Extra-Curricular Student Club/Organization	
10	Member, Faculty Senate	
12	Chair, University Committee	
10	Chair, Department Committee	
6	Member, Committee	
4	Lead Observer, RMPE Peer Review of Teaching Process	
2	Secondary Observer, RMPE Peer Review of Teaching Process	
2	Attending Graduation, Open House, or Convocation ** Faculty may earn two (2) points per event with a maximum of 6 points per year for attending graduation, open house, &/or convocation.*	
2	Mentorship, assisting with individual growth plan, teaching enhancement or advisement (meeting with mentee at least 3 times in year, documentation letter required from mentee)	
1	Per 10 advisees per semester	
	Other	

Table 21b. Univ/Dept/Area Service Workshop, Symposium, Event

Points	Workshop, Symposium, Event	Criteria
	Leadership Role	Participation in activity can be documented
5	• Multi-day	
3	• Full-day	
2	• Partial-day (Lecture/Presentation)	
	Other	

Table 22a. Community/District Service

Points	Activity	Criteria
7	Member of Executive Board, Discipline-oriented Committee	Participation in activity can be documented
5	Chair, Discipline-oriented Committee	
3	Member, Discipline-oriented Committee	
1	Member, Community/District Discipline-oriented Org (dues paid) *Up to 3 points per year may be earned for membership in national, regional, state, and/or, community/district organizations.*	
	Officers of committees receive a negotiated value between the point values for member and chair	
	Other	

Table 22b. Community/District Service Workshop, Symposium, Event

Points	Workshop, Symposium, Event	Criteria
	Leadership Role	Participation in activity can be documented
5	• Multi-day	
3	• Full-day	
2	• Partial-day (lecture/Presentation	
	Other	

Table 23. Service Grantsmanship

Points	Award Amount	Criteria
10	>100,000.00	Service grants are evidenced by:
7	>50,000.00	• Granting agency is non-profit in discipline
4	>5,000.00	• Activity resulting from grant money has an impact potential on
2	>500.00	profession
		• Student clubs are excluded from point awarding.
		• Points awarded upon money received.
		• Participation in activity can be documented.

Table 24. Service Enhancement Activities

Points	Activity
4	National/Regional/State Coursework for Credit – on site
4	National/Regional/State/University Coursework for Credit – distance learning
3	University Sponsored Coursework for Credit – on site
3	National/Regional/State Multi-day Workshop Participation
2	University Sponsored Multi-day Workshop Participation
2	National/Regional/State Full day Workshop Participation

1	University Sponsored Full day Workshop Participation
1	National/Regional/State Partial-day Workshop Participation
0.5	University Sponsored Partial-day Workshop Participation

Table 25. Professional Reviewer

Points	Level	Review Type	Criteria
1	Alpha, Beta, Delta	Journal Article	Name on document as reviewer.
3	Alpha, Beta, Delta	Book	
1	Alpha, Beta, Delta	Book Chapter or Section	
1	Alpha, Beta, Delta	Book Proposal	
1	Alpha, Beta, Delta	Convention Presentation Proposals	
3	Alpha	Grant Proposal	Letter of request to review, letter/email indicating service was performed, or copy of completed review
2	Beta		
1	Delta		

Table 26. Service Honors & Awards

Points	Level	Criteria
	National	• Points negotiated with chair
	Regional	• Honor or award can be documented
	State	
	University	
	Community	

Appendix A: Journal Rankings by Program

Overview

RTPM scores for publications by program for alpha, beta and delta level are noted below.

Publication stratification information:
- Journal rankings are determined by individual program areas based on the journal's impact within the profession, circulation, rejection rate, and the judgment of leading professionals in the discipline. These factors are evaluated within the context of an undergraduate-only program at a regional comprehensive university, and as they relate to the RMPE departmental mission and vision.
- Journals may be added to the listing. First, a ranking must be agreed upon by members of the program area, and then approval must be granted through the RTPM committee and the department chair.
- It should be noted that some journals publish different types of articles (i.e., research-based reports vs. commentaries or applied practice pieces), and therefore the rankings of various scholarly products within a given journal may vary.

Table 27a. HPE Journal Rankings

	Level	
Refereed	Alpha	• American Journal of Health Education • American Journal of Health Research • American Journal of Sexuality Education • College Student Journal • Health Education Journal • Health Education and Behavior • International Journal of Health Education and Promotion • International Journal of Physical Education • Journal of Adolescent Health • Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine • Journal of American College Health • Journal of Applied Social Psychology • Journal of Drug Education • Journal of Motor Behavior • Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance* • Journal of School Health • Journal of Southwest University (China) • Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology • Journal of Sport Pedagogy • Journal of Sport Sciences • Medicine and Science in Sport and Exercise • Pediatric Exercise Science • Perceptual and Motor Skills • Physical Educator • Quest • Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport • Sports Medicine: Training and Rehabilitation • Youth and Society
	Beta	• Academic Exchange Quarterly • Creative Education • Effective Teaching [Online @ http://uncw.edu/cte/et/] • Journal of Health Education Teaching Techniques • Psychological Reports • Teaching Elementary Physical Education • The Chronicle of Kinesiology and PE in Higher Education
	Delta	• Headwaters: Appalachian Journal of Expressive Arts Therapy • North Carolina Institute of Medicine Publications • North Carolina Journal • Strategies
Non-refereed	Alpha	• The Lesson Plans Page, Learn NC
	Beta	• HotChalk Lesson Plans: Lesson Plans by Teachers for Teachers • Re-Visioner, ASU Writing Center Newsletter

Table 27b. RM Journal Rankings

	Level	
Refereed	Alpha	• American Journal of Recreation Therapy • Annals of Leisure Research • Annals of Tourism Research • Annual in Therapeutic Recreation • Australian Journal of Outdoor Education • Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly • Environment & Behavior • International Journal of Hospitality Management • Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education • Journal of Aging & Physical Activity • Journal of Environmental Education • Journal of Experiential Education (JEE) • Journal of Environmental Psychology • Journal of Experimental Education • Journal of Forestry • Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research • Journal of Leisure Research • Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Education* • Journal of Outdoor Recreation, Education, and Leadership (JOREL) • Journal of Park & Recreation Administration • Journal of Sport Management • Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing • Journal of Travel Research • Leisure Science • Leisure Studies • New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education • Public Personnel Management • Schole* • Society & Natural Resources • Therapeutic Recreation Journal • Tourism Analysis • Tourism Management
	Beta	• Anatolia • AORE Online • Backpacker • Camping Magazine • Canoe • Current Issues in Tourism • Environmental Management • Hospitality and Tourism Management • International Journal of Heritage Studies • International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Systems • International Journal of Tourism Research • International Journal of Wilderness • Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing • Journal of Adventure Education & Outdoor Learning • Journal of Ecotourism • Journal of Interpretation Research • Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance • Journal of Sport Tourism

		• Journal of Sustainable Tourism • Journal of Tourism Studies • LARnet (E-Journal) • Leisure / Loisir • Managing Leisure • Natural Resources Journal • Outdoor Education & Recreation Law Quarterly • Recreational Sports & Fitness • Recreational Sports Journal • Sports, Parks, & Recreation Law Reporter • Tourism and Hospitality Research • Tourism Economics • Tourism in Marine Environments • Tourism Recreation Research • Tourism Review International • Tourist Studies • World Leisure Journal	
	Delta	• American Forests • American Whitewater • Arena • Athletic Administration • Athletic Business • Bradford Papers online • Courier (NPS) • Cultural Resource Management • e-Review of Tourism Research (eRTR) • Event Management: An International Journal • Golf Digest • Horizons • Hospitality • Interpretation (NPS) • Journal of Christian Camping • Legacy • National Park Scan • National Parks • North Carolina • Off Belay • Outdoor Commitment • Outdoor Communicator • Outside • Palaestra • Park Science (NPS) • Pathways to Outdoor Communication • Professional Skier • Sierra • Ski Area Management • Ski Magazine • Ski Patrol Magazine • Sports & The Courts • Summit • The American Naturalist Trends (Washington, D.C.) • Tourism: Journal of the Tourism Society • Trilogy: The Magazine of	

		• Trilogy: The Magazine of Outdoor Commitment
		• Wilderness
Non-Refereed	Alpha	• Leisure Management
		• Park Science
		• Parks & Recreation
		• Trends
	Beta	• Activities, Adaptation & Aging
		• Government Recreation & Fitness
	Delta	• Leisure Today
		• NCRPA News
		• Park & Grounds Management
		• Perspective (Publication for YMCA Directors)

*Alpha/Beta designation is dependent upon publication section within the journal or the type of article (i.e., research-based article vs. non-research).

Appendix B: RTPM Record of Changes

Overview

The RTPM system is under continual review and is modified periodically to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the system. The list below provides a record of changes made to the system.

The table identifies the:
- **Section** in which the change was made
- **Date** when the change was made official
- **Type of change** made, including original content for clarity when necessary
- **Rationale** for the change so that future decision makers can ascertain why the change was made.

Table 28. RTPM Changes

Section	Date	Change	Rationale
P & T • Scholarship Criteria	4.25.14	**Original criteria:** • Five refereed publications (with at least 3 at the Beta level as sole, first, or co-author). **Added:** • With at least one (1) of the publications resulting from an original research project that was conceived, planned, implemented and completed by this individual while at ASU.	Add specificity to Scholarship section.
Teaching • Teaching Enhancement Activities	4.25.14	**Separated:** Teaching Enhancement into 2 categories: • Teaching Enhancement • Auxiliary Teaching	Betters define the activities.
Service • Uni/Dept/Area	4.25.14	**Added:** • 1 pt/10 formally assigned advisees.	Acknowledge faculty advising workload.
RTPM Report Form	4.25.14	**Added:** • Verification document column for each performance area sub-section.	Enhance reporting reliability and efficiency.
Appendix A	10.30.14	**Added:** • Appendix A: Journal Rankings by Program.	Enhance reporting reliability and system transparency.
Appendix B	10.30.14	**Added:** • Appendix B: RTPM Record of Changes.	Provide historical record of changes and justification thereof.
P & T	2.19.16	• Clarified that PTC is a recommending body. • Removed points accumulation from criteria. • Changed participation in teaching enhancement activities to 1 per year. • Clarified that one of the three lead author, Alpha/Beta articles should be an original data-driven project. • Changed service criteria to include "regular and on-going service to the university, department, and/or profession".	Cumulative point value criteria were out of line (much lower) with actual expectations for P & T.
Table 1b. Auxiliary Teaching	2.19.16	• Add maintaining/receiving official designation as a Service Learning Course: 2 pts	
Teaching Enhancement Activities	2.19.16	Added following criteria: • Activity must be directly related to teaching responsibilities (current or immediate future). • Maximum points available for teaching enhancement activities - 50% of Teaching benchmark during first 3 years / 25% of teaching benchmark in all subsequent years. o For example, during the first 3 years of employment, an individual with a teaching benchmark of 28 points could earn a maximum of 14 teaching enhancement points. In all subsequent years, this individual could earn a maximum of 7 teaching enhancement points.	Avoid superfluous and/or excessive teaching enhancement points.
Table 21a. International/National Service Activities	2.19.16	Change the point cap on Professional memberships to 6.	Previous cap of 3 was too low, discouraged engagement in service.

Table 24a. Univ/Dept/Area Service Activities	2.19.16	Added: Advisor, Extra-Curricular Student Club/Organization, 5 pts	Reward faculty support for non-professional student clubs.
Non-teaching enhancement activities	2.19.16	Added: Table 16. Scholarship Enhancement Activities & Table 24. Service Enhancement Activities	Allow for appropriate reporting of non-teaching workshops and enhancement activities.
Professional conference attendance	2.19.16	Added to Table 9: May not count a given professional conference for both scholarship and teaching enhancement, even if both aspects were present. If counted as teaching enhancement, must be directly related to teaching responsibilities.	Prevent double dipping for conference attendance.
Professional reviewer	2.19.16	Added all reviewing tasks to new Table 25 in Service section. Deleted Tables 13-16. Renumbered tables throughout document appropriately.	Reviewing is a better fit in Service.
Grantsmanship	2.19.16	Change Tables 13-14 Grantsmanship: No more than **two** non-funded grants per year receives ½ credit.	Encourage grant writing.
Publications	6.14.16	Combined Tables 4a-4c into one condensed table.	Conciseness.
Publications	6.14.16	Combined Tables 5a and 5b into condensed Table 5.b Criteria and Points for Non-refereed Journal Articles, Changed point values for Alpha level non-refereed publications.	Faculty re-evaluation of appropriate point values for these activities.
Publications	6.14.16	Added new Table 5a. Criteria and Points for Profession-based Refereed Journal Articles. Point values set at 50% relative value of research-based publications.	Faculty re-evaluation of appropriate point values for these activities. Specifically need to delineate research from non-research publications.
Teaching	11.26.18	Updated Table 2. Teaching Effectiveness Scoring Table to align with CoursEval online course evaluation system.	No longer using IDEA course evaluation system.