

Accepted: March 10, 2004

STATEMENT OF STANDARDS FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
For The Faculty In The
DEPARTMENT OF EXERCISE AND SPORT SCIENCE
THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Chapters V and VI of the Faculty Regulations of the University of Utah (www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/9/9-5-1.html) deal with retention, promotion, and tenure. Faculty members should consult these chapters in addition to the Department of Exercise and Sport Science Statement of Standards for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure and the College of Health Dossier Guidelines (www.health.utah.edu/ess). According to Chapter V "periodic reviews shall be scheduled during a faculty member's probationary period" to consider retention of all non-tenured faculty members in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science. This document is in compliance with that part of Chapter V, Section 2 of faculty regulations which requires that all individuals concerned be provided a written statement of policy which shall contain the following: (a) the criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure; and (b) performance with respect to the criteria.

These standards will guide all reviews and become effective AY 2004-2005. They replace the previous standards and should be used by all faculty being reviewed for retention, promotion, and tenure.

MISSION STATEMENT

The Mission of the Department of Exercise and Sport Science is to enhance health and quality of life through the promotion of participation in regular physical activity. With a focus on movement, the department seeks to improve sport performance of the athlete, and to provide opportunities for all individuals to understand, value, and pursue a physically active lifestyle. This mission is realized through various research and scholarly activities, undergraduate and graduate teaching, and clinical, community, and professional service conducted by the faculty, staff, and students.

TENURE TRACK FACULTY - FORMAL REVIEWS

Faculty performance reviews may be either formal or informal (9.5, C, 1). Faculty must have a third year formal review and at least one other formal review prior to their seventh probationary year. Formal reviews are typically conducted during the third, fifth, and seventh probationary years with the tenure decision being made during the candidate's seventh year. Formal reviews are also required for consideration of promotion and may be initiated at the request of a faculty member.

Formal reviews for tenure-track faculty involve evaluation by the following: external and internal peer reviewers, the Department of Exercise and Sport Science Student Advisory Committees (USAC and GSAC), the Department of Exercise and Sport Science Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (DRPT), the Department Chair, the College of Health Advisory Committee (CAC), the College of Health Dean, and the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences. The composition of the Department RPT

Advisory Committee is outlined in PPM (9.5-1, B, 1). The composition of the committee depends on whether the decision concerns retention, promotion, or tenure.

Materials that each candidate must develop for review should be organized as specified in the College of Health Dossier Guidelines and supplemented as stipulated in the departmental Candidate's Statement Guidelines (www.health.utah.edu/ess). These materials shall be designated as the Candidate's File and must be submitted on or before the date prescribed in the College of Health Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Calendar.

For each formal review the Departmental Chair will ask the faculty member to submit a list of five (5) professional peers who can evaluate the candidate's scholarship. Other members of the Exercise and Sport Science faculty, who share the same research emphasis or expertise as the faculty member being reviewed, will be appointed to an ad hoc committee by the Department chair. This committee will develop a list of five (5) professionals knowledgeable of the candidate's scholarship area. During the candidate's first formal review, two names will be selected by the Department Chair from the candidate's list and two names from the faculty derived list. During the second formal review, three names will be selected from each list. During the third formal review, four names will be selected from each list. The qualifications of the letter writers, their relationship to the candidate, and how they were selected must be included in the candidate's file. The Department Chair will solicit external letters of evaluation and include them in the Candidate's File along with the signed waiver indicating whether the requested letters are confidential or non-confidential. In addition to confidentiality information, the external letter writers will be provided with the candidate's vita, the departmental RPT guidelines, and a brief description of the candidate's workload to provide a context for the evaluating the candidate's scholarship.

TENURE TRACK FACULTY - INFORMAL REVIEWS

Informal reviews are conducted during candidates' second, fourth, and sixth probationary years. Informal reviews involve evaluation of candidates' contributions by internal peer reviewers, the USAC, the GSAC, the DRPT, the Department Chair, and the Dean of the College of Health.

Materials that each candidate must develop for informal reviews shall consist of a current curriculum vita, the current year's annual report (see www.health.utah.edu/ess), and current course/teaching evaluations. These materials shall be designated as the Candidate's File and must be submitted on or before the date prescribed by the Departmental Chair.

The candidate will receive reports/letters from each of the following review levels: the USAC, the GSAC, the DRPT, the Department Chair, and the Dean of the College of Health. The candidate shall have the opportunity, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her informal review file in response to the review documents received. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the Chair's evaluation and the DRPT summary report which is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the Chair within seven

days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the Chair's evaluation and the DRPT summary report are delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the Chair within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the Chair. The last level of review for informal reviews for track faculty is the Dean of the College of Health. Following review by the Dean of the College of Health, copies of all review reports/letters and any statement submitted by the candidate will be archived and made available for future reviews.

NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY - INFORMAL REVIEWS

Informal reviews, for non-tenure track faculty will be conducted yearly. The exception to this pattern will be the scheduling of a formal review for the purpose of promotion for non-tenure track faculty. Informal reviews, for non-tenure-track faculty concerned primarily with the department's teaching mission (lecturer appointments), involve evaluation by the following: internal peer reviewers, the USAC, the GSAC, the DRPT, and the Department Chair. Informal reviews, for non-tenure-track faculty focusing primarily upon the department's research mission (research appointments), involve evaluation by the following: internal peer reviewers, DRPT, and the Department Chair. The composition of the Department RPT Advisory Committee is outlined in PPM (9.5-1, B, 1). The composition of the committee depends on whether the decision concerns retention or promotion.

Materials that each candidate must develop for informal reviews shall consist of a current curriculum vita, the current year's annual report (see www.health.utah.edu/ess), and current course/teaching evaluations. These materials shall be designated as the Candidate's File and must be submitted on or before the date prescribed by the Departmental Chair.

The candidate will receive reports/letters from each of the following review levels: the USAC, the GSAC, the DRPT, the Department Chair, and the Dean of the College of Health. The candidate shall have the opportunity, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her review file in response to the summary report of the DRPT and/or the evaluation of the Chair. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the Chair's evaluation and the DRPT summary report which is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the Chair within seven days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the Chair's evaluation and the DRPT summary report are delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the Chair within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the Chair. The last level of review for formal reviews for non-tenure track faculty formal reviews is the Dean of the College of Health. Following review by the Dean of the College of Health, copies of all review reports/letters and any statement submitted by the candidate will be archived and made available for future reviews.

NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY - FORMAL REVIEWS

For the purposes of promotion, non-tenure track faculty will undergo formal reviews. Formal reviews, for non-tenure-track faculty concerned primarily with the department's teaching mission (lecturer appointments), involve evaluation by the following: internal peer reviewers, the USAC, the GSAC, the DRPT, the Department Chair, and the Dean of the College of Health. Formal reviews, for non-tenure-track faculty focusing primarily upon the department's research mission (research appointments), involve evaluation by the following: internal and external peer reviewers, DRPT, the Department Chair, and the Dean of the College of Health.

Materials that each candidate must develop for formal review should be organized as specified in the College of Health Dossier Guidelines and supplemented as stipulated in the departmental Candidate's Statement Guidelines. These materials shall be designated as the Candidate's File and must be submitted on or before the date prescribed by the Department Chair.

After the DRPT has conducted its review and forwarded the resultant document to the Chair, the Chair will complete his/her review. Prior to forwarding the file to the Dean, the Chair shall send an exact copy of the his/her evaluation and the original DRPT summary report to the candidate. The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her formal review file in response to the summary report of the DRPT and/or the evaluation of the Chair. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the Chair's evaluation and the DRPT summary report which is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the Chair within seven days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the Chair's evaluation and the DRPT summary report are delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the Chair within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the Chair. The last level of review for formal reviews for non-tenure track faculty formal reviews is the Dean of the College of Health. Following review by the Dean of the College of Health, copies of the review reports/letters and any statement submitted by the candidate will be archived and made available for future reviews.

CRITERIA

The purpose of this document is to provide a set of standards upon which decisions concerning retention, promotion, and tenure will be based. These standards cover three areas in which faculty will be evaluated: (a) Teaching, (b) Research and Scholarship, and (c) Service. Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated in all three areas. Lecturers will be evaluated on their teaching and service. Research faculty will be evaluated on their scholarship and service.

I. TEACHING

Teaching involves creating environments where student learning is encouraged to take place. A variety of teacher behaviors may be employed to create learning environments. These behaviors include, but are not limited to: classroom

instruction; off-campus instruction; designing distance learning and or experiential learning opportunities; involvement with graduate student supervisory committees; student advising; curriculum development and leadership; teaching-related administrative functions; professional development relative to the enhancement of teaching

Criteria for Teaching

Unsatisfactory Performance (Level 1)

Unacceptable in-class evaluation by students and peers. Evaluation of syllabi, examinations, student projects, and other teaching materials suggests that improvement is necessary to provide students with quality learning environments. Little evidence of efforts to keep abreast of new knowledge and implementation of the material into learning environments. Only sporadic efforts are being made to enhance teaching. Little involvement with theses and dissertations.

Satisfactory Performance (Level 2)

Satisfactory in-class evaluation by students and peers. Evaluation of syllabi, examinations, student projects, and other teaching materials suggests that progress is being made toward the development of quality learning environments. Efforts to keep abreast of new knowledge and the incorporation of that knowledge into student learning experiences are evident. Regular participation on theses and dissertations and an increasing contribution as a **chair of supervisory committees**.

Good Performance (Level 3)

Good in-class evaluation by students and peers. Evaluation of syllabi, examinations, student projects, and other teaching materials document that quality learning environments have been created. Systematic efforts to keep abreast of new knowledge and the incorporation of that knowledge into student learning experiences has been well documented. Evidence of an increasing ability to and interest in utilizing a variety of teaching strategies. Is serving as chair on a **substantial** number of theses and dissertations.

Excellent Performance (Level 4)

Exceptional in-class evaluation by students and peers. Recognized by the College, University, and/or professional associations for her or his excellence or innovation in teaching. Maintains an exemplary level of involvement in efforts to keep abreast of new knowledge and implement that material into curriculum and instruction. Attracts graduate students to study in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science. Maintains exemplary level of involvement in development of teaching skills. Recognition of student publications related to theses and dissertations.

Sources* of Evidence for Teaching

More Important

- Colleague reviews of teaching (including course material, samples of graded student papers, sample exams, etc.).
- Results of student evaluations:
 - Mandatory student course and instructor evaluation reports.
 - Departmental Student Advisory Committee reviews.
 - Unsolicited alumni evaluations or letters of support
- Leadership in curriculum development.
- Chairing and serving on graduate student supervisory committees.
- Mentoring undergraduate research projects.

Important

- Departmental, College, University, or professional awards for teaching excellence.
- Participation in teaching-related professional development activities.
- Statements of teaching philosophy.

*This list of criteria is illustrative and not exhaustive. Also for those faculty members who have fewer opportunities to mentor graduate students, these criteria should be adjusted accordingly.

II. SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship, research, or other creative work reflects a professional and academic commitment to learning through various intellectual activities in order to advance the body of knowledge related to the discipline of Exercise and Sport Science. Recognizing that faculty members have varying interests and aptitudes for scholarship and research, the department expects each tenure-track faculty and research faculty member to demonstrate an active, substantive, and sustained commitment to a planned program of scholarly work resulting in peer-reviewed publications. Quality and a sustained record are more important than quantity at all levels. Included among the criteria that the Department of Exercise and Sport Science will consider in its assessment of the quality of scholarly activity are the breadth, depth, originality, recognition, and acceptance of the published works.

In its consideration of scholarship, research, or other creative work, the Department of Exercise and Sport Science will take into account as many different types of related material as possible. Some of these are articles, textbooks, chapters in textbooks, monographs, book reviews, presentations at scholarly meetings, invited lectures, scripts, films, video tapes, recordings, software, grants and contracts, and abstracts. While grants, contracts, abstracts, and presentations at professional meetings enhance the overall record of scholarship, they cannot substitute for the dissemination of information through publication in scholarly journals.

Criteria for Scholarship

Unsatisfactory Performance (Level 1)

Minimal publication although the candidate may have been engaged in the process of planning and executing research projects. A focused line of research and acknowledgement as an authority is not evident. There is no evidence of mentoring students through the research process.

Satisfactory Performance (Level 2)

Evidence of on-going scholarship agenda is present. The candidate has made high-quality contribution through activities associated with the indices of research competence. Manuscripts are being consistently published in refereed journals. One or more areas of emphasis in the candidate's research activities are recognizable as a focused line of inquiry and recognition as an authority is emerging. Shows some evidence of mentoring students in the research process.

Good Performance (Level 3)

Evidence of a record of continuing on-going scholarship agenda is present. The candidate has a substantial record of publication in quality journals. Scholarship is considered to be significant. The candidate is generally recognized as being an authority in a particular area or areas of special emphasis. Shows some success (e.g., awards, publications, and grants) in mentoring student through the research process.

Excellent Performance (Level 4)

The candidate has made outstanding contribution to the body of knowledge through published works and other sources of evidence of scholarship/research. The candidate has a national or international reputation based on research contributions to a particular area or areas of research. Shows substantial success (e.g., awards, publications, and grants) in mentoring student through the research process.

Sources of Evidence for Scholarship/Research

Most Important

- Published refereed articles in scholarly journals.
- Funded grants and or contracts.
- Published books.
- Published chapters in books.

More Important

- Published abstracts of original research.
- Published full-length papers in proceedings of professional meetings.
- Evidence of submission of grants and contracts.
- Published articles in non-refereed proceedings and journals.
- Keynote speaker at international and national conferences.

Important

- Manuscripts in review.
 - Presentations at professional meetings.
-

III. SERVICE

Service consists primarily of University, College, and Departmental committee/administrative work and service to one's profession. It includes such activities as accepting work on special projects and committees related to the operation of the Department, College, or University; serving in administrative positions in the Department, College, or University; working with public projects that benefit the community; and participating in the operation and conduct of professional associations. Service also embraces the organizational citizenship behavior of the candidate. To be considered service the activity must be clearly related to the professional competence or position of the faculty member.

Criteria for Service

Unsatisfactory Performance (Level 1)

Performance of assigned and volunteer service duties in the Department, College, or University is minimally acceptable. Minimal evidence of service to profession and the public. Faculty member is marginally involved in service activities. Quality of service is deemed marginal.

Satisfactory Performance (Level 2)

Meets expectations for assigned and volunteer service duties in the Department, College, or University. Evidence of service to profession and the public. Clear evidence of the quality and impact of faculty member's service.

Good Performance (Level 3)

In addition to meeting expectations for assigned and volunteer service duties in the Department, College, or University, the candidate is increasingly being elected to service positions. There is increasing evidence of faculty member's leadership in service activities.

Exemplary performance (Level 4)

Evidence of high distinction in faculty member's service to Department, College, or University. Exemplary service to profession and the community. International, national, regional, and/or state recognition of faculty member's exceptional leadership in service activities.

Sources of Evidence for Service

Most Important

- Department, College and/or University administrative work.
- Service on Department, College and/or University committees.
- Leadership on Department, College and/or University committees.
- Involvement as an officer, board member, committee member, or member of local, state, regional, national, or international professional organization.
- Participation in editorial review process for refereed journals or books.
- Membership on editorial board of professional journals.

More Important

- Member or chair of external evaluation teams.
- Consultant in area of expertise.
- Service in the grant review process.
- Service awards.

Important

- Letter of commendation, written appraisals, or letters.
- Editor or co-editor for books, proceedings and other publications.
- Membership on professionally related public service organizations.

Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Journal List

Referred journals included in the following electronic databases:

CINAHL
ERIC
GenderWatch
PsychInfo
PubMed
SocioFile
Sport Discus

Criteria for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenure-Track Faculty

The following tables summarize areas and levels of performance that are to be utilized in evaluating faculty for advancement. Only tenure-track faculty may be awarded tenure and thus they will be evaluated in all three areas as specified in Table 1A. Although the number of areas for evaluation for non-tenure track faculty are reduced and reflect the type of appointment, the standards for retention and promotion within a given area are indicative of excellence.

Table 1A

	Teaching	Scholarship	Service
Assistant Professor			
Retention	Level 2	Level 2	Level 2
Promotion to Associate	Level 3	Level 3	Level 2
Associate Professor			
Retention	Level 3	Level 3	Level 2
Tenure	Level 3	Level 3	Level 2
Promotion to Professor*	Level 3/4	Level 4	Level 3/4
Professor			
Retention	Level 3/4	Level 4	Level 3/4
Tenure at Professor*	Level 3/4	Level 4	Level 3/4

*Either Teaching or Service must be at Level 4.

Table 1B

Criteria for Retention and Promotion of Lecturer Faculty

	Teaching	Scholarship	Service
Assistant Professor			
Retention	Level 2	-	Level 2
Promotion to Associate	Level 3	-	Level 2
Associate Professor			
Retention	Level 3	-	Level 2
Promotion to Professor	Level 4	-	Level 3
Professor			
Retention	Level 4	-	Level 3

Table 1C
Criteria for Retention and Promotion of Research Faculty

	Teaching	Scholarship	Service
Assistant Professor Retention Promotion to Associate		Level 2 Level 3	Level 2 Level 2
Associate Professor Retention Promotion to Professor		Level 3 Level 4	Level 2 Level 3
Professor Retention		Level 4	Level 3