

**College of Behavioral and Health Sciences
Department of Leadership
Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Criteria
Effective August 1, 2023**

The department has attempted to draft a set of criteria related to specific personnel actions that are comprehensive in scope. However, at any point along the path to tenure or promotion, reviewers (departmental and college committees, Chair, Dean, Provost, or President) are permitted to comment on job-related concerns, or a pattern of performance, not specifically enumerated in these criteria. Should such commentary be offered, these factors must be addressed by the candidate in all subsequent e-dossier submissions until such time as the concern has been alleviated to the satisfaction of the reviewers. Those job-related factors so identified in one review may play a significant role in future retention, tenure, or promotion decisions.

The criteria presented in this document represent performance targets, the achievement of which renders one eligible for retention, tenure, or promotion but is not a guarantee of the outcome being sought.

The department encourages all candidates who are under review to take the following actions:

- Review the Austin Peay State University [Tenure Procedures and Guidelines](#) document.
- Review policy related to academic tenure (Policy 1:025) and academic promotion (Policy 2:063).
- Review the Personnel Actions Calendar located on the [Academic Affairs website](#).
- Review the e-dossier section of the Academic Affairs website for helpful information.
- Utilize the [Last Minute Checklist](#) provided by Academic Affairs.
- All candidates are required to provide artifacts in support of all information mentioned in their dossier narratives. These supporting documents must be included in the “Supporting Materials” section of the e-dossier.
- All candidates must proofread, use reverse chronological order, and cross-reference supporting documents with information in the narratives.
- Suggested length of each individual narrative is 2 single spaced pages.

I. Faculty Retention, Tenure, and Promotion to Associate Criteria and Standards

A. Area 1: Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

1. Teaching Effectiveness and Related Activities

The following factors will be considered when making retention, tenure, and promotions recommendations regarding effectiveness in academic assignment.

- *Peer Review of Instruction/Review of Teaching Materials.* The faculty member must undergo the enhanced peer review of instruction process as outlined in the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Procedures and Guidelines document. The process involves a minimum of one required summative and formative review of teaching each year on the tenure track. (Those seeking

promotion must have at least two such reviews within one year before the promotion dossier is submitted.) Two peer reviewers conduct the evaluation and complete a rating instrument specifically designed for use with online courses. The instrument asks reviewers to rate four dimensions of instructional effectiveness – Course Design and Organization; Communication, Interaction, and Engagement; Course Content, and Assessment and Feedback.

- *Course Development/Re-Development Activity.* The candidate must provide evidence of course/curricular development and/or improvement activities. This can take the form of creating, designing, and developing a new course to be added to the curriculum, designing and developing an existing course (as opposed to using a course shell designed by someone else), and/or redesigning a course previously developed by the faculty member or by a colleague. Sufficient details must be provided to explain the faculty member's design, development, and/or redesign efforts.
- *Reflective Narrative Analysis of Student Evaluations of Instruction.* The candidate must provide a reflective narrative analysis in which they reflect on their student evaluation of instruction ratings. More specifically, the analysis must address any student concerns as reflected in the student evaluation of instructions ratings and any self-identified areas for professional growth and development along with relevant actions plans for addressing the same.
- *Access/Availability.* The candidate is expected to maintain agreed-upon office hours and have regular on-campus availability to support students and the work of the department. The candidate is also expected to advise a fair share of students as assigned by the department chair. The candidate must provide evidence of effective student advisement, e.g., e-mail communications with advisees.
- *Discretionary Activity* – While it is not expected, faculty are encouraged to supervise student research and support University service learning activities. These can be considered “plus” factors in the area of Effectiveness in Academic Assignment.

2. Non-Teaching and Teaching Chairs, Directors, and Coordinators

Academic program directors and department chairs who do not teach will be evaluated for retention and tenure in Category A ("Academic Assignment") on the basis of their effectiveness in their administrative position.

Department chairs who teach will be evaluated for retention and tenure on the factors identified in I.A.1. above as well as their effectiveness in their administrative position. For candidates receiving re-assigned time to handle specific responsibilities for the department, e.g., graduate coordinator, evidence must be provided of the duties or activities performed by the candidate in exchange for that reassigned time. This work will be treated as administrative in nature for review purposes.

3. Tenure/Promotion to Associate Performance Target

Faculty performance in the areas identified under I.A.1 above will be jointly evaluated by the relevant review committee using a series of five-point Likert-scale items to capture the caliber of performance on each of the above areas. The average rating for each area at the time of a tenure application, across all years on the tenure track, must be 3.0 and the overall average for the four areas must be 3.20 to be tenure-eligible.

Sample Tenure Performance Target Scenarios:

A candidate would be tenure-eligible if any of the following patterns of accomplishment were attained:

- Attain an average rating, across all years on the tenure track, of 3.8 for Peer Review of Instruction and an average rating, across all years on the tenure track, of 3.0 on the other three areas – Course Development/ Re-Development Activity, Reflective Narrative Analysis of Student Evaluations of Instruction, and Access/Availability. This pattern equals a mean of 3.20.
- Attain an average rating, across all years on the tenure track, of 3.8 for Course Development/ Re-Development Activity and an average rating, across all years on the tenure track, of 3.0 on the other three areas -- Peer Review of Instruction, Reflective Narrative Analysis of Student Evaluations of Instruction, and Access/Availability. This pattern equals a mean of 3.20.
- Attain an average rating, across all years on the tenure track, of 3.8 for Reflective Narrative Analysis of Student Evaluations of Instruction and an average rating, across all years on the tenure track, of 3.0 on the other three areas – Course Development/ Re-Development Activity, Peer Review of Instruction, and Access/Availability. This pattern equals a mean of 3.20.
- Attain an average rating, across all years on the tenure track, of 3.8 for Access/Availability and an average rating, across all years on the tenure track, of 3.0 on the other three areas – Peer Review of Instruction, Course Development/ Re-Development Activity, Reflective Narrative Analysis of Student Evaluations of Instruction, and. This pattern equals a mean of 3.20.
- Attain an average rating, across all years on the tenure track, of 3.2 for all four areas identified under I.A.1. This pattern equals a mean of 3.20

4. Performance Target for Years 1 - 3

Retention from year 1 to year 3 requires that the candidate be making *meaningful* progress in achieving the tenure performance target in the area of Effectiveness in Academic Assignment. Meaningful progress means the candidate is meeting the tenure performance target for this area *or* has a performance trajectory that suggests the candidate is likely to meet or exceed the performance target for Effectiveness in Academic Assignment in the time allowed. Candidates should

specifically address this expectation in the narrative for their retention to year 3 dossier.

5. Performance Target for Years 4 - 5

Retention for years 4 and 5 requires that the candidate has made *significant* progress in achieving the tenure performance target in the area of Effectiveness in Academic Assignment. Significant progress means the candidate is meeting the tenure performance target *and* has demonstrated a pattern of performance that suggests the candidate will continue to meet or exceed the tenure performance target for Effectiveness in Academic Assignment in the time allowed. Candidates should specifically address this expectation in the narrative for their year 5 dossier.

B. Area 2: Scholarly and Creative Activity

The department of leadership has defined a hierarchy of scholarly and creative work in the discipline centered around the level of effort involved in completing the work and the impact and visibility of the work. The hierarchy is divided into three levels – Category A (with two sub-levels), Category B, and Category C. Work that appears toward the top of this hierarchy is widely regarded as more visible and impactful than work that appears toward the bottom of the hierarchy. Achieving the performance target for retention, tenure, and promotion involves accumulating points associated with completing different scholarly and creative activities as noted below.

It is not possible to provide a complete list of acceptable Scholarly and Creative Activities. If a candidate is unsure where a particular scholarly and creative activity falls within the hierarchy of such activity, the candidate may ask for a ruling from a committee of all tenured faculty, including the chair, if tenured. If the work itself is complete, the work should be submitted to the tenured faculty for review in advance of submitting the dossier. If the work is being contemplated, a description of the proposed work should be submitted for review by the tenured faculty. Where the placement of a work is clear from the information provided below, the candidate may appeal that placement for cause to the committee of all tenured faculty, including the chair, if tenured. In all cases, a majority vote of the tenured faculty plus the chair, if tenured, will determine the placement of the work.

Definitions:

- Sole author – the only author of the work responsible for 100% of the content
- First author – listed first in a publication or presentation where the order of authorship is **not** alphabetical or otherwise randomly determined. The first author is presumed to have made the greatest contribution (conceptually and practically) to the work among all co-authors.
- Co-author/Co-presenter – Unless otherwise noted, this refers to being one author in a paper with no more than *five* co-authors where the order of

authorship is alphabetical or otherwise randomly determined suggesting each co-author contributed roughly equally to the work.

Note:

- Evidence of articles/chapters accepted or "in press" shall be considered "published" provided that appropriate documentation is presented.

Category A:

Level 1 (each item worth 4 points) –

- Sole or first author of a scholarly article published in a discipline-specific, peer-reviewed journal at the national or international level.*
- Sole or first author of a scholarly article published in a scholarship of teaching and learning-focused, peer-reviewed journal at the national or international level.
- Sole or first author of a book (scholarly, applied scholarship, first-edition textbook, popular press book)
- Sole or first author of a chapter in a peer-reviewed scholarly book
- Co-author of an empirical/data-based paper based on data collected from human subjects published in a discipline-specific, peer-reviewed journal at the national or international level.
- Co-author of an empirical/data-based paper based on data collected from human subjects published in a scholarship of teaching and learning-focused, peer-reviewed journal at the national or international level.
- Co-author of a scholarly article published in a discipline-specific, peer-reviewed journal at the national or international level *that includes a student co-author*.
- Co-author of a scholarly article published in a discipline-specific, peer-reviewed *high impact* journal.
- Sole or first author of a competitive federally-funded grant or state-funded grant (proposal required and grant must be awarded).

Level 2 (each item worth 3 points)–

- Co-author of a scholarly article published in a peer-reviewed journal at the national or international level where the candidate makes a discipline-specific, statistical, or methodological contribution.*
- Co-author of a scholarly article published in a scholarship of teaching and learning-focused, peer-reviewed journal at the national or international level.
- Co-author of a book (scholarly, applied scholarship, first-edition textbook, popular press book)
- Co-author of a chapter in a peer-reviewed scholarly book
- Co-author of a competitive, federally-funded grant or state-funded

- grant (proposal required and grant must be awarded).
- Sole or first presenter of a scholarly paper at a peer-reviewed national, or international academic conference.

*An additional point may be earned if the work was published in a high impact factor journal, e.g., *The Leadership Quarterly*, *Journal of Management*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, etc.

Category B (each item worth 2 points):

- Sole or first author of an article published in non-peer reviewed journal (regional, national, international sponsor/focus)
- Sole or first author of a chapter in an editorially reviewed book
- Co-author of a book written for a lay audience, intended to popularize the discipline
- Revision of a previously published textbook where the candidate was a co-author
- Sole author or first author of an instructor's manual for a textbook
- Sole author or first author for a research monograph such as a final report to a grant funding agency
- Co-presenter delivering a paper at a peer-reviewed regional, national, or international academic conference (regional conference must have 50 presentations or 150 conference attendees to qualify).
- Co-presenter delivering a paper *with a student* at a peer-reviewed regional, national, or international academic conference (regional conference must have 50 presentations or 150 conference attendees to qualify).
- Sole author or first author of a significant technical report to a discipline-based association
- Lead editor of a book of readings
- Sole or first author of a poster presented at a peer-reviewed regional, national, or international academic conference
- Sole author or co-author of draft chapter(s) pursuant to a signed book contract

Category C (each item worth 1 point):

- One of more than five co-authors contributing equally to a scholarly paper published in a peer-reviewed journal at the national or international level
- Co-author of any article published in non-peer reviewed journal (local or state sponsor/focus) or newsletter

**Work in-progress may represent an intermediate indicator of progress toward achieving the tenure performance target and should be described in the dossier with evidence of progress.

1. Tenure/Promotion to Associate Performance Target:

In the area of Scholarly and Creative Activity, the candidate is eligible to be considered for tenure if the following performance target has been achieved at the time a tenure dossier is submitted:

- Earn a total of 16 points by completing two (2) items from Category A, one of which must come from Category A Level 1, and earn the additional points necessary to reach 16 points by completing items from any category or combination of categories above.

Sample Tenure Performance Target Scenarios:

A candidate would be tenure-eligible if any of the following patterns of accomplishment were attained:

- Complete one (1) item from Category A1 above and complete three (3) *additional* items, all from Category A1 = 16 points, OR
- Complete one (1) item from Category A1 above and complete four (4) *additional* items, all from Category A2 = 16 points, OR
- Complete one (1) item from Category A1 above, one item from A2 and complete four (4) *additional* items from Category B, and one (1) *additional* item from Category C = 16 points, OR
- Complete one (1) item from Category A1 above, one (1) item from Category A2 above and complete nine (9) *additional* items, all from category C = 12 points, OR
- Complete one (1) item from Category A1 above, one (1) item from A2, and complete a combination of *additional* items equaling nine (9) points from across all categories.

2. Retention Eligibility Standard for Years 1 - 3

Retention for years 1 through 3 requires that the candidate be making *meaningful* progress in meeting the tenure eligibility requirements in the area of Scholarly and Creative Activity. Meaningful progress means the candidate has completed work *or* has works or activity in progress that suggest the candidate is likely to achieve the tenure performance target for Scholarly and Creative Activity in the time allowed. Candidates should specifically address this expectation in the narrative for their year 3 dossier.

3. Retention Eligibility Standard for Years 4 - 5

Retention for years 4 and 5 requires that the candidate be making *significant* progress in meeting the tenure eligibility requirements in the area of Scholarly and

Creative Activity. Significant progress means the candidate has partially achieved the tenure performance target *and* has works or activity in progress that suggest the candidate is very likely to meet or exceed the tenure performance target for Scholarly and Creative Activity in the time allowed. Candidates should specifically address this expectation in the narrative for their year 5 dossier.

C. Professional Contributions and Activities

The department has defined two categories of Professional Contributions and Activities – Professional Contributions and Professional Activities and Development. Professional Contributions represent items that reflect a leadership-oriented service commitment or service work that results in a substantive work-product in support of the department, College, University, or the profession. Professional Activities and Development represent items that reflect an attendance-based or affiliation-based commitment on the part of the candidate. Achieving performance targets for retention, tenure, and promotion involves accumulating points associated with completing items from these categories as noted below.

It is not possible to provide a complete list of acceptable Professional Contributions and Activities. If a candidate is unsure into which category a particular professional contribution and activity falls, the candidate may ask for a ruling from a committee of all tenured faculty, including the chair, if tenured. If the contribution or activity has taken place, a narrative summary of the work should be submitted to the tenured faculty for review in advance of submitting the dossier. If the work is being contemplated, a description of the proposed work should be submitted for review by the tenured faculty. Where the placement of an activity is clear from the information provided below, the candidate may appeal that placement for cause to the committee of all tenured faculty, including the chair, if tenured. In all cases, a majority vote of the tenured faculty plus the chair, if tenured, will determine the placement of the work.

Professional Contributions (Each item worth 2 points per academic year)

- Review one or more papers for journal/conference reviewer
- Serve as journal editor or associate editor
- Serve on conference planning committee for professional association related to members academic area of expertise
- Serve on community committees related to members academic area of expertise
- Serve as an officer of a professional association related to members academic area of expertise
- Serve as lead advisor to a student organization
- Serve as a Faculty Senate officer
- Chair University or College committee
- Serve as lead on departmental program review*
- Coordinate departmental assessment activities*
- Design/propose significant redesign of departmental curriculum*
- Design/propose new program (e.g., concentration, certificate, major)*

- Delivering an invited talk to a local, regional, or national professional organization

Professional Activities and Development (Each item worth 1 point per academic year)

- Maintain professional memberships/affiliations
- Attend Center for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence (CAFÉ) events, including Distance Education sponsored events/training
- Serve as Faculty Senate representative
- Serve on journal editorial board
- Serve as a member of a University or College committee(s)
- Serve on department committee(s)
- Attend professional association conferences or demonstrate by other means the person is staying current in their field

*This item is not considered a required activity associated with being a program coordinator and can therefore be considered as professional contribution rather than part of the individual's academic assignment.

1. Tenure/Promotion to Associate Performance Target:

In the area of Professional Contributions and Activities, the candidate is eligible to be considered for tenure if the tenure performance target has been achieved at the time a tenure dossier is submitted:

- Earn a total of 16 points by maintaining professional memberships/affiliations each year on the tenure-track (6 points) and accumulating an additional 10 points from either of the categories defined above.

Sample Tenure Eligibility Scenarios:

- Maintain professional memberships/affiliations (6 points), review papers for a journal for two years (4 points), serve as a Faculty Senate officer for one year (2 points), serve on departmental committees for two years (2 points), and attend a professional conference for two years (2 points) = 16 points, OR
- Maintain professional memberships/affiliations (6 points), serve as lead advisor to a student organization for two years (4 points), serve as a Faculty Senate representative for three years (3 points), and serve on departmental committee for three years (3 points) = 16 points, OR
- Maintain professional memberships/affiliations (6 points), serve on departmental committee for six years (6 points), serve as lead on departmental program review (2 points), attend two CAFÉ events (2 points) = 16 points, OR
- Maintain professional memberships/affiliations (6 points), coordinate

department assessment activities for three years (6 points), serve on a University committee for one year (1 point), serve on a College committee for one year (1 point), attend a professional association conference (1 point), serve on a departmental committee for one year (1 point) = 16 points

- Maintain professional memberships/affiliations (6 points), attend six CAFÉ events (6 points), serve on University committees for two years (2 points), and serve on departmental committees for two years (2 points) = 16 points

2. Retention Eligibility Standard for Years 1 - 3

Retention for years 1 through 3 requires that the candidate be making *meaningful* progress in achieving the tenure performance target in the area of Professional Contributions and Activities. Meaningful progress means the candidate has completed work *or* has works or activity in progress that suggest the candidate is likely to achieve the tenure performance target in the area of Professional Contributions and Activities in the time allowed. Candidates should specifically address this expectation in the narrative for their year 3 dossier.

3. Retention Eligibility Standard for Years 4 - 5

Retention for years 4 and 5 requires that the candidate be making *significant* progress in achieving the tenure performance target in the area of Professional Contributions and Activities. Significant progress means the candidate has partially achieved the tenure performance target *and* has works or activity in progress that suggest the candidate is very likely to meet or exceed tenure eligibility requirements for Professional Contributions and Activities in the time allowed. Candidates should specifically address this expectation in the narrative for their year 5 dossier.

II. Promotion to Professor Criteria and Standards

A. Area I, II, and III Performance Targets

The candidate seeking promotion to professor must meet all three of the following requirements.

1. Promotion to professor candidates should meet the tenure performance target associated with Effectiveness in Academic Assignment, i.e., a minimum 3.0 average for all four areas with an overall average of 3.2.)

AND

2. Promotion to professor candidates must earn an additional 20 points beyond those points earned for promotion to associate professor and must include two peer-reviewed publications. However, promotion to professor would not require

the candidate to achieve one activity from either level within Category A. For promotion to professor, all items in Category A above, regardless of level, would be worth four (4) points. In addition, the following activity would be worth (4) points.

- One of more than five co-authors contributing equally to a scholarly paper published in a peer-reviewed journal at the national or international level

AND

3. Promotion to professor candidates should earn a total of 12 points by maintaining professional memberships/affiliations each year (5 points) and accumulating an additional 7 points from either of the categories defined above.

B. Expected Time frame and Performance Expectations

The promotion to professor performance targets were written under the assumption that candidates seeking promotion to professor will do so at the earliest possible opportunity, i.e., five years after their promotion to associate professor. Candidates seeking promotion to full professor after 10 years at the rank of associate professor may be expected to exceed the performance targets identified in this document for promotion to professor.