

HPLE Promotion and Tenure Expectations

According to the University Constitution and Bylaws:

1. Faculty are expected to meet the educational background and teaching experience as specified in the bylaws (5.223).
2. Faculty are expected to meet the performance levels for promotion and tenure recommended in the proposed revision (see table right).
3. Performance tables in the areas of teaching and service are drawn from the proposed revision, collapsing repeated text into references to prior columns to clarify non-distinguishing characteristics and to emphasize changes.
4. Performance table in the area of scholarship was developed by the department to reflect current practice.
5. All tables are built assuming the proposal's description for each area of a faculty member's work. Like the proposal, professional development and collegiality are subsumed within the tables.

Teaching Performance Table

In reviewing the characteristics at each level, no faculty member will exactly fit the description in any one column. The evaluation goal is to identify the column that best describes an individual faculty member's performance in this area.

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
Student evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate instructor's teaching effectiveness "very good" or higher as defined by the Constitution and Bylaws Classroom Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Professional development activities that impacted instruction ◦ Work with colleagues that impacted instruction • Evidence of effective practices, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Reflection and self-improvement ◦ Engaging teaching methods ◦ Providing meaningful classroom experiences Curricular Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participates in curricular revisions by making meaningful recommendation for curricular changes that reflect student and market demands • Integrates courses into departmental programs, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Effectively prepares students for success across the curriculum ◦ Effectively builds on students prior learning ◦ Effectively addresses departmental learning outcomes Departmental Needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperates with program faculty in meeting departmental loading needs 	Student evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate instructor's teaching effectiveness at or near "outstanding" as defined by the Constitution and Bylaws Classroom Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction (see acceptable column) • Beyond evidence of effective practices (see acceptable column), also shares successful and/or innovative practices with colleagues Curricular Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beyond integrating courses into departmental programs (see acceptable column), also is an effective partner in curricular and program design and delivery Mentoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively involved in some student mentoring activities Departmental Needs (see acceptable column)	Student evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate the instructor's teaching effectiveness well into the "outstanding" category as defined by the Constitution and Bylaws Classroom Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognized by colleagues as a highly skilled and knowledgeable instructor • Perceived as a mentor for "best practices in teaching" by faculty on campus. Demonstrates evidence of advanced study of current cutting edge pedagogy (attended conferences and/or workshops) • Models excellent teaching by staying abreast of best teaching practices and implementing them in various class settings Curricular Development (see preferred column) Student / Colleague Mentoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant student mentoring activities (either in quantity or quality of work with students) • Mentors colleagues to develop their instructional abilities (assessment, curricular design, effective delivery, etc.) Departmental Needs (see acceptable column)

Performance Levels for Promotion and/or Tenure

	Min Acceptable	Min Preferred	Min Exceptional
SR Instructor 1	1	1	
SR Instructor 2 (if approved)		2 — OR —	
Associate	1	1	1
Tenure	2	2 — OR —	1
Professor	1	3 — OR —	1

Scholarship Performance Table

In reviewing the characteristics at each level, no faculty member will exactly fit the description in any one column. The evaluation goal is to identify the column that best describes an individual faculty member's performance in this area. The criteria below refer to an accumulation of evidence across a 5-year timespan. When evaluating faculty performance in this area during any portion of a 5-year evaluation period (such as annual evaluation or mid-cycle review), consider both the faculty member's progress-to-date and any anticipated publications, presentations, and/or grant applications during the remainder of the 5-year timespan.

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
Originality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each publication, presentation, and/or grant application cited included some original content from this faculty member A combination of at least three publications, presentations and/or grant applications were cited Meaningfulness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must include at least one publication May include one or more presentations May include external grant application(s), even if not funded Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All publications, presentations, and/or grant applications passed at least a generous review process Dissemination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three publications, presentations, and/or grant applications cited received at least multi-state dissemination 	Originality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each publication, presentation, and/or grant application cited included some original content from this faculty member, some of which included significant original content A combination of at least four publications, presentations and/or grant applications were cited Meaningfulness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must include at least one national publication or two multi-state publications May include one or more presentations May include modest external grant award(s) (e.g. \$10K one-time grant) Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One publication, presentation, and/or grant application cited passed at least a moderately competitive review process Dissemination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one publication, presentation, and/or grant application cited was nationally disseminated 	Originality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quantity and/or quality of publications, presentations, and/or grant applications cited were well above average with significant original content from this faculty member, some as lead author Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A combination of at least five publications, presentations and/or grant applications were cited, including at least two publications a single pivotal publication in the field, widely recognized for its impact, which results in invitations to conferences, workshops or other follow-up activities Meaningfulness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognized as a scholar/expert in field (either in a multi-state region or nationally) Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant national publication Invited speaker at major conference Consultant for significant State or national body Sizable external grant award(s) (e.g. multi-year grant in excess of \$200K) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See examples listed under originality regarding quantity and/or quality of publications, presentations, and/or grant applications cited Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most publications, presentations, and/or grant applications cited passed at least a moderately competitive review process, including at least one formally refereed article that underwent a highly competitive review process Dissemination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least three publications, presentations, and/or grant applications were nationally disseminated

The following lists are not intended to be comprehensive, but representative to guide HPEL faculty in evaluating potential venues:

- The **determination of multi-state versus national** is based on the breadth of audience reached. In some cases, multiple regional activities may result in a national reach.
- Examples of multi-state venues** (or the equivalent thereof): presentations at regional conferences such as NWAAPERD; publications in well-respected regional journals such as Northwest Public Health Journal; exercise science/health education/physical education/outdoor recreation work that has significant impact in Oregon, such as in conjunctions with Oregon Department of Education, local and regional school districts, etc.
- Examples of venues with generous review processes:** publications in non-refereed journals; presentations at local organizations/schools (though some types of presentations are more restrictive and may be rated more competitively)
- Examples of venues with moderately competitive review processes:** publications in peer reviewed journals with impact factors less than 3; presentations at regional conferences with a peer review process.
- Examples of venues with highly competitive review processes:** publications in peer reviewed journals with impact factors greater than 3, also presentations at national or international meetings including the following organizations (ACSM, SBM, FASEB, AAHPERD, AHP,)

Service Performance Table

In reviewing the characteristics at each level, no faculty member will exactly fit the description in any one column. The evaluation goal is to identify the column that best describes an individual faculty member's performance in this area.

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
Departmental Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active participant in departmental work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advising students in departmental programs; writing letters of recommendation; assisting at preview days, registration and orientation activities; and other advising related activities Effective contributor on his/her fair share of departmental committees Effectively carrying out his/her fair share of individual departmental tasks University/Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some activity beyond department or program (e.g. serve on active University committee most years under review). Active service in professional organization or capacity may substitute for a University committee, some community service. 	Departmental Service (see acceptable column) University/Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> University service on active committees (at least one committee every year under review, more if committee(s) is not very active). Active service in professional organization or capacity may substitute for a University committee. Effective partner in accomplishing assignments Leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some documentable accomplishment in a leadership role at the departmental, institutional or professional level during period under review (department chair, program coordinator, faculty program director, chair active committee, lead taskforce, significant individual task, etc.), some community service 	Departmental Service (see acceptable column) University/Professional Service (see preferred column) Leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognized as a faculty leader on campus Served in multiple leadership roles Significant accomplishments at the institutional level as a faculty leader (either multiple committees or taskforces, as a program director, as a department chair, or other significant leadership responsibilities resulting in multiple documentable achievements that furthered the institutional mission), significant community service

