

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

It should be recognized that common sense and flexibility need to be used in the application of criteria. Faculty members truly outstanding in one area but less active or successful in others may well be contributing more to the well-being of the Department, College, or University than someone adequate in all areas but outstanding in none. With this in mind, this document provides minimum but not necessarily sufficient requirements in each area for the awarding of retention, tenure, or promotion. Successful faculty will meet these criteria in all areas and should exceed these criteria in one or more areas. See current policies: Policy on Academic Tenure (1.025), Faculty Appointments (2.051), and Policy on Academic Promotion (2.063) for additional information.

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 information below is related to the Department of Health and Human Performance criteria for personnel actions. The department encourages all candidates who are under review to consider the following:

- 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.

Note: The HHP department stands by these criteria and if met, should result in a favorable department-level vote.

- I. Faculty Retention per Year 1 to Year 3
  - A. Area 1: Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

All candidates must show evidence for sections a-d under Effectiveness in Academic Assignment.

1. Teaching effectiveness (APSU Policy 1:025.IV.A.1)
  - a. Enhanced Peer Review. For each scheduled summative assessment HHP Faculty must earn an overall minimum summative evaluation rating of “3=Satisfactory” from each evaluator. In the case where only one evaluation is required (please see RTP Procedures and Guidelines) the faculty member will also be required to earn an overall minimum summative evaluation rating of “3=Satisfactory.” A formula will be used to calculate overall rating (total earned points/total possible points for items scored). A faculty member who does not earn a Satisfactory rating on both scheduled summative assessments during any one cycle must a) participate in an additional summative assessment the subsequent semester, and b) submit within the reflective statement a

narrative that includes an explanatory statement (e.g., inexperience, overload, new course) and a teaching improvement plan to address areas of need.

- b. Reflective Statement: A brief narrative summary of continuous improvement in teaching is required for all candidates regardless of their earned rating on the summative evaluations. The reflection should address teaching performance based on enhanced peer review feedback and student evaluations.
  - c. Shows evidence of course/curricular development and/or improvements. All course/curricular development and/or improvements should emphasize a variety of teaching methods which can include but are not limited to study abroad, cross-campus collaboration, course component redesign, new technology/equipment utilization, critical reflection, feedback, service learning, flipped classroom, problem-based learning, and case study. Other ideas may be presented in writing to the Chair and current retention and tenure committee for review.
    - a. For courses developed (creating a new course and/or course and/or curricular development), the candidate must provide enough detail such that the review committee can determine how the new course improves the current curriculum.
    - b. For courses improved, the candidate must detail how they have qualitatively improved the course.
    - c. For accredited programs, faculty must show how accrediting standards/competencies are linked to topics within each course. This information must be provided in the syllabus.
  - d. Shows evidence of effective student advisement and/or clinical supervisory conferences (i.e. meetings with student-clinicians). Faculty member advises students as assigned by Chair.
  - e. Shows evidence of academic collaboration with other departments on campus or shows evidence of duties or activities for the department or university which reassigned time is given (e.g. SLO's, major field test, supervision of GTA's, etc.) (typically not part of HHP faculty responsibilities).
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 their teaching effectiveness as well as their effectiveness in their administrative position.

## B. Area 2: Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities (APSU 1:025.IV.B)

By end of year 3 (dossier submission to year 2, year 3, and year 4), candidate shows evidence of work (such as, and not limited to, draft of a scholarly article, data analysis, draft of a book chapter, email correspondence with editor or colleague for a book, completed federal grant application, IRB approval, etc.) relating to at least 2 activities from Category A and at least 3 activities from Category B and Category C (faculty must show at least 1 from Category B).

Note 1: Acceptable scholarship activities extend beyond the discipline to include the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). SoTL publications, presentations or grant awards are of equal value to a discipline-specific activity.

### Category A:

1. First author or co-author of a scholarly article published in a peer-reviewed journal at the national/international level.
2. First author or co-author of a peer reviewed scholarly publication (see Policy 1:025 for examples of scholarly publications).
3. First author or co-author of a federally funded grant (proposal required and grant must be awarded).

### Category B:

1. Grant funded equal to or exceeds \$5000 from an external source (proposal required).

2. Peer reviewed article in local or state journal.
3. Submission of a federally funded grant (proposal required; grant was not funded).
4. Presentation at a professional state, regional, national, or international conference.
5. Poster presentation at a professional state, regional, national, or international conference.
6. Development of inter-disciplinary or disciplinary technology (or clinical tool).
7. Publication of a book review or journal review in a scholarly journal.
8. Editor entire textbook (unpaid).

#### Category C:

1. Article published in non-peer reviewed state publication.
2. Article published with the student as first author (this may count as a Category A item depending on the contribution of the faculty; consult with department chair for clarity).
3. Significant contribution to professional document for organization or governing body.
4. Poster presentation at local level.
5. Presents the results of scholarly research or best practices local level.
6. Grant funded inside APSU or grant from an external source less than \$5000.
7. Accepted book proposal.
8. Primary writer of newspaper article or non-peer reviewed magazine (in related field).

Note 2: Any Category A submission beyond the required two will count as one Category B item or two Category C items.

Note 3: For all publications, evidence of articles accepted or "in press" shall be considered as having met the publishing criteria.

#### C. Area 3: Professional Contributions and Activities (APSU Policy 1:025.IV.C)

Faculty meetings are required unless a legitimate excuse is presented to the chair.

Shows evidence of consistent involvement in one activity from Category A and consistent pattern of involvement in 2 out of the 3 other Categories (i.e., Category B or C or D).

##### Category A: Service to Campus

1. Committee service or program specific service.
2. Service on Faculty Senate or special task forces.
3. Other participation or campus leadership (e.g. university's governing and policy-making processes, chair of university search committee).
4. Advisor or co-advisor to student organizations.
5. Participates in high-impact learning opportunities with campus or community (i.e. service that includes students).
6. Other campus service.

##### Category B: Service to One's Discipline (select at least one)

1. Memberships in professional organizations.
2. Assumes leadership role in a professional organization.
3. Professional service as session chair, discussant, paper reviewer, other.
4. Reviewer of professional journal article(s) or edited chapter in your field.
5. Reviewer of textbook.
6. Committee member on student thesis/dissertation.

##### Category C: Service to the Community (select at least one)

1. Discipline-related presentations to community groups.
2. Discipline-related advice and consultations to community groups.
3. Other discipline-related service to the local community or larger society.

Category D: Professional Development. This category includes attendance in training in two of the following: workshops, seminars, continuing education, conference, online training, or

similar activities related to professional growth (e.g. certifications).

*Note 1: With permission of chair, faculty may submit the equivalence of any item in Categories A, B, C or D to Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee.*

## II. Faculty Retention Years 4-5

### A. Area 1: Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

All candidates must show evidence for sections a-d under Effectiveness in Academic Assignment.

#### 1. Teaching effectiveness (APSU Policy 1:025.IV.A.1.)

- a. Enhanced Peer Review. For each scheduled summative assessment HHP Faculty must earn an overall minimum summative evaluation rating of “3=Satisfactory” from each evaluator. In the case where only one evaluation is required (please see RTP Procedures and Guidelines) the faculty member will also be required to earn an overall minimum summative evaluation rating of “3=Satisfactory.” A formula will be used to calculate overall rating (total earned points/total possible points for items scored). A faculty member who does not earn a Satisfactory rating on both scheduled summative assessments during any one cycle must a) participate in an additional summative assessment the subsequent semester, and b) submit within the reflective statement a narrative that includes an explanatory statement (e.g., inexperience, overload, new course) and a teaching improvement plan to address areas of need.
- b. Reflective Statement. A brief narrative summary of continuous improvement in teaching is required for all candidates regardless of their earned rating on the summative evaluations. The reflection should address teaching performance based on enhanced peer review feedback and student evaluations.
- c. Shows evidence of course/curricular development and/or improvements. All course/curricular development and/or improvements should emphasize a variety of teaching methods which can include but are not limited to study abroad, cross-campus collaboration, course component redesign, new technology/equipment utilization, critical reflection, feedback, service learning, flipped classroom, problem-based learning, and case study. Other ideas may be presented in writing to the Chair and current retention and tenure committee for review.
  - a. For courses developed (creating a new course and/or course and/or curricular development), the candidate must provide enough detail such that the review committee can determine how the new course improves the current curriculum.
  - b. For courses improved, the candidate must detail how they have qualitatively improved the course.
  - c. For accredited programs, faculty must show how accrediting standards/competencies are linked to topics within each course. This information must be provided in the syllabus.
- d. Shows evidence of effective student advisement and/or clinical supervisory conferences (i.e. meetings with students). Faculty member advises students as assigned by Chair.
- e. Shows evidence of academic collaboration with other departments on campus or shows evidence of duties or activities for the department or university which reassigned time is given (e.g. SLO's, major field test, supervision of GTA's, etc.) (typically not part of HHP faculty responsibilities).
- f. For tenure track faculty who have clinical teaching responsibilities, the candidate must show evidence they have met the minimum level of supervision for all service delivery.

#### 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 their teaching effectiveness as well as their

effectiveness in their administrative position.

B. Area 2: Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities (APSU 1:025.IV.B)

Note 1: Acceptable scholarship activities extend beyond the discipline to include the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). SoTL publications, presentations or grant awards are of equal value to a discipline-specific activity.

Shows evidence of near completion of at least 2 activities from Category A and at least 3 activities from Category B and Category C (faculty must show at least 1 from Category B).

Category A:

1. First author or co-author of a scholarly article published in a peer-reviewed journal at the national level.
2. First author or co-author of a peer reviewed scholarly publication (see Policy 1:025 for examples of scholarly publications).
3. First author or co-author of a federally funded grant (proposal required and grant must be awarded).

Category B:

1. Grant funded equal to or exceeds \$5000 from an external source (proposal required).
2. Peer reviewed article in local or state journal.
3. Submission of a federally funded grant (proposal required; grant was not funded).
4. Presentation at a professional state, regional, national, or international conference.
5. Poster presentation at a professional state, regional, national, or international conference.
6. Development of inter-disciplinary or disciplinary technology (or clinical tool).
7. Publication of a book review or journal review in a scholarly journal.
8. Editor entire textbook (unpaid).

Category C:

1. Article published in non-peer reviewed state publication.
2. Article published with the student as first author (this may count as a Category A item depending on the contribution of the faculty; consult with department chair for clarity).
3. Significant contribution to professional document for organization or governing body.
4. Poster presentation at local level.
5. Presents the results of scholarly research or best practices at local level.
6. Grant funded inside APSU or grant from an external source less than \$5000.
7. Accepted book proposal.
8. Primary writer of newspaper article or non-peer reviewed magazine (in related field).

Note 2: Any Category A submission beyond the required two will count as one Category B item or two Category C items.

Note 3: For all publications, evidence of articles accepted or "in press" shall be considered as having met the publishing criteria.

C. Area 3: Professional Contributions and Activities (APSU Policy 1:025.IV.C)

Faculty meetings are required unless a legitimate excuse is presented to the chair.

Shows evidence of consistent involvement in one activity from Category A and consistent pattern of involvement in 2 out of the 3 other Categories (i.e., Category B or C or D).

Category A: Service to Campus

1. Committee service or program specific service.
2. Service on Faculty Senate or special task forces.
3. Other participation or campus leadership (e.g. university's governing and policy-making

- processes, chair of university search committee).
4. Advisor or co-advisor to student organizations.
  5. Participates in high-impact learning opportunities with campus or community (i.e. service that includes students).
  6. Other campus service.

Category B: Service to One's Discipline (select at least one)

1. Memberships in professional organizations.
2. Assumes leadership role in a professional organization.
3. Professional service as session chair, discussant, paper reviewer, other.
4. Reviewer of professional journal article(s) or edited chapter in your field.
5. Reviewer of textbook.
6. Committee member on student thesis/dissertation.

Category C: Service to the Community (select at least one)

1. Discipline-related presentations to community groups.
2. Discipline-related advice and consultations to community groups.
3. Other discipline-related service to the local community or larger society.

Category D: Professional Development. This category includes attendance in training in two of the following: workshops, seminars, continuing education, conference, online training, or similar activities related to professional growth (e.g. certifications).

*Note 1: With permission of chair, faculty may submit the equivalence of any item in Categories A, B, C or D to Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee.*

III. Tenure and Promotion to Associate (Accomplishments since time hired at APSU)  
A. Area 1: Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

All candidates must show evidence for sections a-d under Effectiveness in Academic Assignment.

1. Teaching effectiveness (APSU Policy 1:025.IV.A.1.)
  - a. Enhanced Peer Review. For each scheduled summative assessment HHP Faculty must earn an overall minimum summative evaluation rating of "3=Satisfactory" from each evaluator. In the case where only one evaluation is required (please see RTP Procedures and Guidelines) the faculty member will also be required to earn an overall minimum summative evaluation rating of "3=Satisfactory." A formula will be used to calculate overall rating (total earned points/total possible points for items scored). A faculty member who does not earn a Satisfactory rating on both scheduled summative assessments during any one cycle must a) participate in an additional summative assessment the subsequent semester, and b) submit within the reflective statement a narrative that includes an explanatory statement (e.g., inexperience, overload, new course) and a teaching improvement plan to address areas of need.
  - b. Reflective Statement: A brief narrative summary of continuous improvement in teaching is required for all candidates regardless of their earned rating on the summative evaluations. The reflection should address teaching performance based on enhanced peer review feedback and student evaluations.
  - c. Shows evidence of course/curricular development and/or improvements. All course/curricular development and/or improvements should emphasize a variety of teaching methods which can include but are not limited to study abroad, cross-campus collaboration, course component redesign, new technology/equipment utilization, critical reflection, feedback, service learning, flipped classroom, problem-based learning, and case study. Other ideas may be presented in writing to the Chair and current retention and tenure committee for review.

- a. For courses developed (creating a new course and/or course and/or curricular development), the candidate must provide enough detail such that the review committee can determine how the new course improves the current curriculum.
  - b. For courses improved, the candidate must detail how they have qualitatively improved the course.
  - c. For accredited programs, faculty must show how accrediting standards/competencies are linked to topics within each course. This information must be provided in the syllabus.
  - d. Shows evidence of effective student advisement and/or clinical supervisory conferences (i.e. meetings with students). Faculty member advises students as assigned by Chair.
  - e. Shows evidence of academic collaboration with other departments on campus or shows evidence of duties or activities for the department or university which reassigned time is given (e.g. SLO's, major field test, supervision of GTA's, etc.) (typically not part of HHP faculty responsibilities).
  - f. For tenure track faculty who have clinical teaching responsibilities, the candidate must show evidence they have met the minimum level of supervision for all service delivery.
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 their teaching effectiveness as well as their effectiveness in their administrative position.

**B. Area 2: Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities (APSU 1:025.IV.B)**

To be eligible for tenure, candidate is required to complete at least 2 activities from Category A and at least 3 activities from Category B and Category C (faculty must show at least 1 from Category B).

Note 1: Acceptable scholarship activities extend beyond the discipline to include the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). SoTL publications, presentations or grant awards are of equal value to a discipline-specific activity.

**Category A:**

1. First author or co-author of a scholarly article published in a peer-reviewed journal at the national level.
2. First author or co-author of a peer reviewed scholarly publication (see Policy 1:025 for examples of scholarly publications).
3. First author or co-author of a federally funded grant (proposal required and grant must be awarded).

**Category B:**

1. Grant funded equal to or exceeds \$5000 from an external source (proposal required).
2. Peer reviewed article in local or state journal.
3. Submission of a federally funded grant (proposal required; grant was not funded).
4. Presentation at a professional state, regional, national, or international conference.
5. Poster presentation at a professional state, regional, national, or international conference.
6. Development of inter-disciplinary or disciplinary technology (or clinical tool).
7. Publication of a book review or journal review in a scholarly journal.
8. Editor entire textbook (unpaid).

**Category C:**

1. Article published in non-peer reviewed state publication.
2. Article published with the student as first author (this may count as a Category A item depending on the contribution of the faculty; consult with department chair for clarity).

3. Significant contribution to professional document for organization or governing body.
4. Poster presentation at local level.
5. Presents the results of scholarly research or best practices local level.
6. Grant funded inside APSU or grant from an external source less than \$5000.
7. Accepted book proposal.
8. Primary writer of newspaper article or non-peer reviewed magazine (in related field).

Note 2: Any Category A submission beyond the required two will count as one Category B item or two Category C items.

Note 3: For all publications, evidence of articles accepted or “in press” shall be considered as having met the publishing criteria.

#### C. Area 3: Professional Contributions and Activities (APSU Policy 1:025.IV.C).

Faculty meetings are required unless a legitimate excuse is presented to the chair.

Shows evidence of consistent involvement in one activity from Category A and consistent pattern of involvement in 2 out of the 3 other Categories (i.e., Category B or C or D).

##### Category A: Service to Campus

1. Committee service or program specific service.
2. Service on Faculty Senate or special task forces.
3. Other participation or campus leadership (e.g. university’s governing and policy-making processes, chair of university search committee).
4. Advisor or co-advisor to student organizations.
5. Participates in high-impact learning opportunities with campus or community (i.e. service that includes students).
6. Other campus service.

##### Category B: Service to One’s Discipline (select at least one)

1. Memberships in professional organizations.
2. Assumes leadership role in a professional organization.
3. Professional service as session chair, discussant, paper reviewer, other.
4. Reviewer of professional journal article(s) or edited chapter in your field.
5. Reviewer of textbook.
6. Committee member on student thesis/dissertation.

##### Category C: Service to the Community (select at least one)

1. Discipline-related presentations to community groups.
2. Discipline-related advice and consultations to community groups.
3. Other discipline-related service to the local community or larger society.

Category D: Professional Development. This category includes attendance in training in two of the following: workshops, seminars, continuing education, conference, online training, or similar activities related to professional growth (e.g. certifications).

*Note 1: With permission of chair, faculty may submit a request to submit the equivalence of any item in Categories A, B, C or D to Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee.*

#### IV. Promotion to Associate Professor

- A. Same as tenure requirements.

#### V. Promotion to Full Professor

- A. Same as Tenure requirements. See Austin Peay State University Policy 1:025 for eligibility requirements. Please note: Only activities completed after promotion to associate professor are considered for promotion to full professor. Per RTP Procedures and Guidelines, faculty



applying for promotion to full professor shall also include two summative enhanced peer evaluations (within one year prior to the current promotion action).

VI. Expectations for tenured faculty not being reviewed for promotion, including full professors.

A. Faculty members are required to participate in the annual faculty evaluation currently in place.

HHP Dept. revised 3-27-2023