Role and Scope Document for The Department of Health and Human Development

Article I. Role and Scope of Unit

Mission of the Department of Health and Human Development

The mission of the Department of Health & Human Development is to enrich human well-being through teaching, research, and outreach.

Role and Scope of the Department

The Department of Health and Human Development serves the public by:

1. Educating and training professionals in various fields related to health and human well-being,
2. Conducting research and creative activities in areas related to health and human development, and
3. Conducting service/outreach activities that contribute to the general education and personal development of individuals, families, and systems within the University and community and at local, state, national, and international levels.

The Department of Health and Human Development offers a variety of undergraduate and graduate opportunities from which to choose. There are eight areas of undergraduate study and six areas of graduate study. Students may earn Bachelor of Science, Master of Education, or Master of Science degrees.

Academic programs are:

- Bachelor of Science in Community Health
- Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education and Child Services
- Bachelor of Science in Human Development and Family Science
- Bachelor of Science in Food & Nutrition
- Bachelor of Science in Health & Human Performance
- Bachelor of Science in Health Enhancement K-12
- Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management

- Bachelor of Science in Sustainable Food and Bioenergy Systems

Master of Education
- School Counseling

Master of Science
- Community Health
- Counseling
- Exercise and Nutrition Sciences
- Family and Consumer Sciences
- Family Financial Planning
- Sustainable Food Systems

Article II. Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty

Not applicable

Article III. Annual Review Process

An annual review assesses a faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year and is based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, assigned percentages of effort, annual assignments, annual productivity report, and evaluations of teaching. The outcome of the annual review is independent from retention, tenure, and promotion reviews, and a positive result does not guarantee the faculty member will be eligible for retention, tenure, and/or promotion.

Faculty members in the Department of Health and Human Development will schedule a meeting with the Department Head and submit all annual review materials to the Department Head at least one week prior to their annual review meeting. These materials shall include a current curriculum vitae, personalized report from the University's reporting system for the past calendar year, and a brief self-reflective narrative outlining the candidate's annual progress and goals for the forthcoming year with respect to scholarship, teaching, service, and integration.

The Department Head will review each faculty member's materials prior to the annual review meeting and develop a draft of the annual evaluation. Corrections and clarifications will be discussed during the review meeting with pre-tenured faculty. Post-tenured faculty have a meeting, at their request or the Department Head's. The Department Head will sign the faculty member's annual review evaluation. The faculty member will also sign the evaluation and retain the right to attach a rebuttal to it. A signed copy will be given to the faculty member and a signed copy will also be retained in the Department file.

Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator

Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment

The Primary Review Committee is an elected committee comprised of three members, all of whom must be tenured faculty in the Department of Health and Human Development. During a year when at least one candidate is pursuing promotion to full professor at least two of the Committee members will be full professor. During years when there is only retention and/or promotion and tenure to associate professor at least one Committee member will be at the rank of full professor. They serve one-year appointments and are elected by tenure track faculty vote in April the preceding academic year. One Committee member remains on as chair for a second term serving as chair.

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator

The primary review administrator for the Department of Health and Human Development is the Department Head of HHD.

Section 4.03 Identification of Responsible Entities

(a) Establish the Primary Review Committee either by facilitating the election or appointment of the members as described. *Primary Review Administrator*
(b) Select external reviewers and solicit review letters. *Primary Review Administrator*
(c) If internal reviews are part of the unit's review process, selecting and soliciting internal reviews. *Primary Review Administrator*
(d) Assuring the following materials are included in the Dossier:
   (i)   Internal and external reviewer letters of solicitation, letters from the reviewers and, in the case of external reviewers, a short bio-sketch of the reviewer should be included in the Dossier. *Primary Review Administrator*
   (ii) Applicable Role and Scope Document. *Primary Review Administrator*
   (iii) Letter of Hire, any Percentages of Effort changes, all annual reviews, and all evaluation letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU. *Primary Review Administrator*
   (iv) Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period. If the evaluations are not in electronic format, the unit will provide evaluation summaries. Upon request by review committees and review administrators, the unit will provide access to the original evaluations to review committees and administrators during the review. *Primary Review Administrator*
(e) Maintaining copies of all review committee Evaluation Letters and internal, (if applicable), and external review letters after the review. *Primary Review Administrator*

Section 4.04   Next Review Level

The next level of review after the Department of Health and Human Development is the Review Committee of the College of Education, Health and Human Development.

Article V. Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator

Section 5.01   Intermediate Review Committee - Composition and Appointment

The College of Education Health and Human Development RTP Review Committee. Refer to College of Education, Health and Human Development Role and Scope document for composition and appointment.

Section 5.02   Intermediate Review Administrator

Dean of the College of Education Health and Human Development. Refer to College of Education, Health and Human Development Role and Scope document for requirements.

Section 5.03   Level of Review following Intermediate Review Administrator

The next level of review after the Intermediate Review Administrator is the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee. Refer to the College of EHHD's Role and Scope Document for information regarding the selection of members for the University RTP Committee.

Article VI. Review Materials

Section 6.01   Materials Submitted by Candidate

Materials for Dossier
According to the Faculty Handbook under "Candidates Rights and Responsibilities" the following materials are required for the dossier:
1. The "cover sheet," obtained from the Provost's office.
2. A comprehensive CV with Teaching, Scholarship, and Service activities of the candidate.
3. A Personal Statement that includes a description of the candidate's area of scholarship.
4. Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation shall include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition itemized by year over the relevant Review Period. The Department of Health

and Human Development requires the following in the dossier in reference to section 4 of the Faculty Handbook "Candidates Rights and responsibilities":

- Self-evaluation of Teaching: 1) a teaching philosophy describing his/her approach to teaching and learning, 2) a reflection about the interaction between the candidate's teaching philosophy and student evaluation scores from the Departmentally approved form (qualitative and quantitative), 3) a reflection on feedback from his/her internal reviews of teaching, and 4) a description of professional development efforts to stay current in his/her field.
- Self-evaluation of Scholarship: in-depth statement of research describing research program(s), scholarly outputs and the relationship between the candidate's research program and his/her research outputs, a comprehensive list of research products during the review period, and if involved in collaborative scholarly contributions, refer to section 6.02.
- Self-evaluation of Service: in-depth statement of service describing level of service responsibilities, a table of service by level (Department, College, University, professional) for the period of review.

5. For tenure and promotion reviews, only scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the Review Period may be considered. For retention reviews, departments will establish within their Role and Scope documents requirements regarding publication status. Candidates will provide documentation of the acceptance for publication, performance, or exhibition.
6. Scholarly products that have been accepted for publication but not yet published or published in a journal not readily available through University databases must be included among the candidate's materials. Creative scholarly products, such as works of art or films, must be made available to reviewers by means specified in the applicable Role and Scope Documents.

The Department of Health and Human Development requires an internal review of teaching within the dossier. Candidates will receive a peer review by a Departmental colleague at least three times during the review period prior to the receipt of tenure and at least one peer review between receiving tenure and submitting materials to be reviewed for promotion to full professor. The review shall include three areas of teaching: knowledge, planning/organization, and instructional practices.

Procedures for conducting an internal peer review of teaching performance are:

1. The Department Head will assign a tenured Department colleague (peer-reviewer) who will observe the teacher during one teaching cycle for each annual review period. The teaching observation cycle includes: a) pre-observation conference, b) classroom/community teaching observation, c) post-observation conference.
2. The peer-reviewer must understand and determine how the teacher will meet the level of sustained effectiveness.
3. The peer-reviewer must discuss the review with the teacher during the post-observation

conference.

4. The peer-reviewer provides the Department Head and faculty member the written review to include statements regarding candidate's effectiveness for knowledge, planning/organization, and instructional practices.
5. The peer-reviewer will consider all candidate-provided documents, information derived through observation, and conference discussion to assess the following domains of teaching effectiveness: knowledge of content area, planning/organization, and instructional practices.

The candidate will provide the teaching peer-reviewer with a teaching portfolio to include the following documents prior to each of the scheduled peer-review of teaching performance:

- Statement of teaching philosophy.
- Lesson plan for the classroom/community teaching observation for one class or community teaching observation.
- Course syllabus for course to be reviewed.
- Previous internal reviews of teaching.

Section 6.02   Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

The candidate will include documentation of collaborative scholarly contributions in his/her in-depth statement of research. Documentation should include a table by published products and funded external grants explaining what the candidate's responsibility (lead author/PI, research design, writing, theory, data collection, data analysis, editing, etc.) was in terms of authorship.

Section 6.03   Peer Review Solicitation Procedure

Documentation. Candidates seeking promotion and tenure will follow the methods and procedures for an external peer reviews established by the Department and detailed below will include items as appropriate to his/her letter of appointment which include the following:

1. Curriculum Vitae. The candidate will indicate publications, presentations, grant activity, scholarship, and other creative accomplishments.
2. Personal Statement from Dossier. The candidate will describe: his/her scholarship responsibilities in relation to the curriculum vitae, scholarship program, the importance or significance of his/her research to the field.
3. Supporting Documents. The candidate will submit supporting copies of his/her scholarship that best represent contributions to the field.

Procedures. External peer reviews of research are required for promotion and tenure reviews but not for retention reviews. A minimum of four external reviewers is required for promotion and tenure reviews. External reviewers are respected authorities appropriate to the candidate's area of Scholarship who will provide an independent and objective evaluation of the candidate's Scholarship and are familiar with the usual expectations for faculty performance at comparable institutions and/or programs to MSU-Bozeman. External reviewers independently

assess the quality of the faculty member's scholarship and write letters of evaluation for inclusion in the dossier. According the MSU Faculty Handbook section 3c peer reviewers must comply to the conflict of interest statement as follows: "No person may participate in the review of any person with whom they have a personal, business, or professional relationship that could be perceived to preclude objective application of professional judgment. A conflict of interest occurs when the evaluating party could realize personal, financial, professional, or other gain or loss as a result of the outcome of the review process, or when the objectivity of the evaluating party could be impaired by virtue of the relationship. Examples of persons who may be excluded by professional relationship include undergraduate and/or graduate mentors, postdoctoral mentors, collaborators who are co-investigators on grants and/or co-authors on a significant portion of scholarly products completed during the review period, colleagues who depend on instrumentation controlled or operated by the candidate, and/or co-inventor of a patent."

University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," Section 7b states the following: "Selecting external reviewers and soliciting review letters. External Reviews from at least four (4) respected authorities appropriate to the candidate's area of Scholarship are required by the University as part of review for tenure and promotion. The primary administrator or committee will identify external reviewers who will provide an independent and objective evaluation of the candidate's Scholarship. The soliciting entity may invite recommendations from the candidate, but at least one half of the external reviewers should be reviewers recommended by the primary administrator or committee."

The candidate will provide names of potential external reviews to the Department Head by the dates indicated in the timeline provided by the Office of the Provost. An additional list of names for external review will be provided to the Department Head by the Department RTP Committee. The candidate will provide a copy of materials for external review to the Department Head prior to the applicable deadlines as set forth by the Office of the Provost.

Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents

Section 7.01 Retention Review

Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position.

Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review

Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may

select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

Section 7.03   Promotion to Professor Review

The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion.

Article VIII.   Retention Reviews

Section 8.01   Timing of Retention Review

Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in candidate's Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 8.02   University Standards

The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:
   (a) Effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and
   (b) Integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
   (c) Satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

Section 8.03   Performance Indicators and Weighting

Performance indicators and weighting are defined in Section 9.03. The same indicators and weights that are used in the tenure review are used in the retention review.

Section 8.04   Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Effectiveness in Scholarship is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. *Effectiveness* includes, but is not limited to, establishing a research agenda that is in the candidate's discipline, evidenced by the creation of scholarly products (see Section 9.03) throughout the review period.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a record on average of 1-2 scholarly products per year at the time of retention. These products shall represent both Level 1 and Level 2 indicators (see section 9.03), and publications may be submitted, accepted, in press, or

published at the time of review. The record must be substantive enough that it is reasonable to expect the candidate to achieve the standards for tenure at the time of tenure review.

Collaborative work is highly valued in the Department, and there are no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship. Standards for determining author order vary within and across disciplines within the Department. The candidate is expected to identify their individual contributions to each scholarly work (see Section 6.02).

Effectiveness in Teaching is as described in Section 9.04.

Effectiveness in Service is as described in Section 9.04.

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Evidence of performance indicators are listed in Section 9.05. The same performance indicators and evidence that are used in tenure review are used in retention review, with the addition that *submitted* products are to be documented with a copy of the submitted work along with verification of submission.

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

For retention review, scholarly products that are submitted, accepted, in press, or published at the time of review will be considered if they are included in the dossier and are appropriately documented according to Section 9.05.

Article IX. Tenure Review

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in the Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 9.02 University Standard

The University standards for the award of tenure are:
- sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period,
- integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- accomplishment in scholarship.

Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Performance Indicators in Scholarship

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to scholarship. The indicators listed in Level 1 carry primary weight and are considered the primary activities by which performance in scholarship is evaluated. Those from Level 2 also contribute to performance but carry less weight. All items from Levels 1 and 2 are referred to as "scholarly products." Additional indicators will be considered if deemed appropriate and consistent with the definition of indicators stated in the Faculty Handbook.

Level 1
- Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and textbooks
- Edited Books (Candidate as editor)
- External grants funded as PI or Co-PI
- Invited Professional Presentations (i.e., plenary or keynote)

Level 2
- Papers or presentations at professional meetings (international, national, regional, state)
- Refereed papers or presentations at professional meetings (international, national, regional, state)
- Grant proposals submitted (external and internal) as PI or Co-PI
- Internal grants funded as PI or Co-PI
- Non-refereed publications (e.g., non-refereed proceedings and technical reports; trade journals)
- Development and publication of scholarly products (e.g., software or curriculum materials)

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in scholarship, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

Performance Indicators in Teaching

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to teaching. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in teaching is evaluated.

- Delivering quality instruction as assessed by faculty peer review of teaching
- Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods and/or curriculum materials (note that publications resulting from such activities are performance indicators of scholarship)

- Mentorship of graduate students (e.g., supervising or substantially contributing to graduate student research)
- Mentorship of undergraduate students (e.g., supervising undergraduate research or independent study projects)
- Evaluations of instruction via University-approved instruments

Student evaluations are vulnerable to various forms of bias (e.g., evaluations may be based on criteria other than quality of instruction). Therefore, evaluation scores and averages should be applied with caution as a measure of teaching effectiveness and supplemented by other evidence. In particular, written student comments may be viewed as formative feedback to be used for instructor improvement but are not considered a form of evaluation.

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in teaching, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

Performance Indicators in Service

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to service. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in service is evaluated.

- Membership on committees and leadership roles held in the Department, College, or University
- Professional service in local, state, national, or international organizations in professional disciplines (e.g., conference abstract reviewer; accreditation; leadership roles)
- Outreach to local, state, national, or international communities
- Reviewer or editor for professional journals, monographs, books, or grant applications
- Professional consultations that may or may not result in a co-authored publication

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in service, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators.

Performance Indicators in Integration

As indicated in Section 9.02, candidates are expected to demonstrate integration across at least two of the categories of scholarship, teaching, and service. The nature and extent of integrated activities will vary depending on the candidate's discipline and area(s) of specialization. The following list offers examples of potential indicators of integration, with the understanding that integration can take many forms. The candidate must clearly define and describe how integration is achieved in the dossier.

- Integration of scholarship and teaching: implementing a research activity within a course.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: offering seminars to introduce students to the process of conducting research.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: collaborating in research and/or publication with a student.
- Integrating of scholarship and service: lending research expertise through consulting.
- Integration of scholarship and service: implementing research results in a community setting.
- Integration of teaching and service: designing and/or delivering professional development for P-12 teachers or special programs for P-12 students.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Scholarship Expectations

Accomplishment in scholarship is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. With respect to publication quality, the Department RTP Committee will assess accomplishment based on the evidence provided by External Reviewers. *Accomplishment* includes, but is not limited to, an ongoing and sustained research agenda that has led to a regular record of publication in refereed journals.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the tenure review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive record of peer-reviewed products at the time of tenure review. The usual Departmental expectation for scholarly productivity is that tenure candidates averages between one and two scholarly products per year in Level 1 and Level 2, collectively. However, at the time of tenure review it is expected that multiple items from Level 1 will appear in the candidate's body of work with the emphasis on *peer reviewed publications*. Typical of this Department is an average of one to two peer reviewed publications per year. Publications may be accepted, in press, or published at the time of review.

Regardless of quantity of products, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work as documented by External Reviewers is of primary importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of journals and other scholarly venues, as documented by External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered extremely important in the review process. It should be noted that publication impact factors or h-indices and the like are not typically an important measure of prestige or scholarly accomplishment within all the disciplines in the Department of Health and Human Development.

Collaborative work is highly valued in the Department, and there is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship. Standards for

determining author order vary within and across disciplines within the Department. The candidate is expected to identify their individual contributions to each scholarly works (see Section 6.02).

Teaching Expectations

Effectiveness in teaching is achieved through the candidate's positive contributions to the design, delivery, and instruction of courses and labs, both in the Department and in other venues. *Effectiveness* is judged primarily from multiple peer reviews conducted by Departmental faculty who observe the candidate in the classroom or lab during the review period. Written reports from peer reviewers document the candidate's teaching performance and serve as evidence to evaluate effectiveness.

Undergraduate advising is conducted through the advising office. However, all faculty are expected to contribute to student mentorship within the Department. At the time of the tenure review, a candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence of ability to mentor students. Evidence may include providing career guidance, undergraduate or graduate mentorship. This list is representative, but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of mentoring, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here.

Course evaluations serve to provide a measure of student perception of teaching. The Department expectation is that normally, for each course taught, the overall mean score from the University-approved student evaluation instrument across all domains is equal to or greater than 70% of the maximum score. For the Department this average is at or above 3.5 on a 5-point scale. Similarly, any issues related to teaching noted in the retention review should be addressed prior to tenure review.

Service Expectations

Effectiveness in service will be achieved if the candidate demonstrates active participation and competent execution of tasks in any of the areas of service described by the performance indicators. Service is expected to include at least one assignment to a Department, College, or University committee at MSU per year. Provide at least one professional service or outreach effort per year at the national level. Participation in other activities that contribute to the candidate's discipline or profession (e.g., task forces or special programs) is also valued, especially when such participation raises the stature and reputation of the Department or the University in the state, the nation, or internationally.

Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier.

Evidence of Performance Indicators in Scholarship

The list of evidence presented in Tables 1 and 2 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to the performance indicators for scholarship will be considered in the review.

Only scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the tenure review period will be considered. For works published in a journal not readily available through University databases, the candidate must include a digital copy of the accepted work in the dossier. For works accepted for publication but not yet published, the candidate must include a digital copy of the accepted work accompanied by an official letter or email indicating acceptance.

Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions (refer to section 6.02).

Level 1: Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and textbooks	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Edited Books (Candidate as editor)	Full citation of the book and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
External grants funded as PI or Co-PI	Grant number or code with URL or other contact where more information can be found. Brief description (title, funding agency and level, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
Invited professional presentations (e.g., plenary or keynote):	Letter of invitation, copy of program, or full citation.
Receptions of national competitive awards for scholarship	Letter of award

Table 1. Level 1 Performance Indicators in Scholarship and Typical Evidence

Level 2: Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings:	Full citation for the proceedings, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Extension Publications (Montguide/Fact Sheets)	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Invited papers or presentations at professional meetings (international, national, regional, state)	Full citation including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date.
Refereed papers or presentations at professional meetings (international, national, regional, state)	Full citation including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date.
Grant proposals submitted (external and internal) as PI or Co-PI	Grant number or code with URL or other contact where more information can be found. Brief description (title, funding agency and level, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
Internal grants funded as PI or Co-PI	Brief description (title, source of funding, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
Non-refereed publications (e.g., non-refereed proceedings and technical reports; trade journals)	Full citation for the publication or report, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Development and publication of scholarly products (e.g., software or curriculum materials)	Brief description of the product including an overview of content and format, intended use, potential audience, and location where it is publicly available.
Receptions of regional, state, university-level, college-level, department-level competitive awards for scholarship	Letter of award

Table 2. Level 2 Performance Indicators in Scholarship and Typical Evidence

Evidence of Performance Indicators in Teaching

The list of evidence presented in Table 3 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for teaching will be considered in the review.

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Delivering quality instruction as assessed by faculty peer review of teaching	Written report or letter from peer observer each year through the tenure review period, submitted directly by the observer to the Department Head and maintained in Department files.
Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods and/or curriculum materials	Syllabus or other documentation of new methods or materials with evidence supporting innovation. Brief description of the implementation process, audience, and outcomes.
Mentorship of graduate students (e.g., supervising or substantially contributing to graduate student research)	Brief description including graduate student name, research question/focus, funding (if any), and progress to date.
Mentorship of undergraduate students (e.g., supervising undergraduate research or projects):	Brief description including undergraduate student name, research question/focus, funding (if any), and progress to date.
Evaluations of instruction via University-approved instruments	Table of courses/workshops taught during the review period to include: number of credit and/or contact hours for each course, and number of students/learners per course, and semester or date of course/workshop. Evaluation scores for all courses/workshops taught during the review period. Scores from the departmentally approved form will display averaged scores for each domain for each course taught and a column documenting the accumulative average across all courses. Candidates will supply a table documenting a brief synopsis of student evaluation comments (positive and constructive) from the departmentally approved form for each course during the review period. If appropriate, include a broad description of changes made in response to student feedback.
Receptions of competitive awards for teaching	Letter of award

Table 3. Performance Indicators in Teaching and Typical Evidence

Evidence of Performance Indicators in Service

The list of evidence in Table 4 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for service will be considered in the review.

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Membership on committees and leadership roles held in the Department, College, or University	Name and level of each committee and dates of service.
Professional service in local, state, national, or international organizations in professional disciplines (e.g. conference abstract reviewer; accreditation; leadership roles)	Name of each organization (with description as needed), offices or roles held, dates of service, and notable accomplishments.
Outreach to local, state, national, or international communities	Brief description of outreach activities, audience, and outcomes.
Reviewer or editor for professional journals, monographs, books, or grant applications	Citations including name of journal, editorial role, dates of service, and workload.
Professional consultations that may or may not result in a co-authored publication	Brief description of consulting activities, audience, and outcomes.

Table 4. Performance Indicators in Service and Typical Evidence

Evidence of Performance Indicators for Integration

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Integration of at least two areas across scholarship, teaching, and service	Evidence may be unique to each program and/or discipline and can include, but not be limited to: student/community/constituent involvement in research, using personal research experiences in the classroom, textbook writing, P-12/community curriculum development, translating research for community members/constituents, or writing about teaching innovations.

Table 5. Performance Indicators for Integration and Typical Evidence

Article X. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Section 10.01   University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

Article XI. Promotion to Rank of Professor

Section 11.01   Timing of Review

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service at the rank of Associate Professor, however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they meet the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank.

Section 11.02   University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are:
    (a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
    (b) sustained integration of no less than two of the following areas during the review period, and
    (c) excellence in scholarship.

Section 11.03   Performance Indicators and Weighting

The performance indicators and weighting used for this review are the same as those defined in Section 9.03 of this document, with the following exception: candidates will receive one peer review of teaching between receiving tenure and submitting materials to be reviewed for promotion to full professor.

Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Scholarship Expectations
Excellence in scholarship is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. With respect to publication quality, the Department RTP Committee will assess excellence based on the evidence provided by External Reviewers. *Excellence* includes, but is not limited to, receiving national or international recognition from peers and colleagues as having made important

scholarly contributions to the candidate's discipline. The Department expects that scholarly results will be disseminated through both publications and presentations.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive record of peer-reviewed scholarly products that impact the field. The expectation of the Department is that candidates will sustain their scholarly output with an average of 1-2 *peer reviewed publications* per year. These products may represent both Level 1 and Level 2 indicators, and publications may be accepted, in press, or published at the time of review. At the time of promotion review it is expected that a substantial portion of the candidate's body of work will be comprised of Level 1 items. Due to the diverse nature of scholarship within the Department, expectations will vary across disciplines.

Regardless of quantity of products, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work as documented by External Reviewers is of primary importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of journals and other scholarly venues, as documented by External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered extremely important in the review process. It should be noted that publication impact factors or h-indices and the like are not typically an important measure of prestige or scholarly productivity within all of our disciplines in the Department of Health and Human Development.

Collaborative work is highly valued and there is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate accomplishment in scholarship. Standards for determining author order vary within and across disciplines within the Department. The candidate is expected to identify the level of individual contribution to scholarly works [see Section 6.02].

Teaching Expectations
The expectation for this review is effectiveness in teaching, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04.

Service Expectations
The expectation for this review is effectiveness in service, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04.

Section 11.05   Evidence of Performance Indicators

Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier. The description of evidence of performance indicators is found in Section 9.05 of this document.

Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document

The Department of Health and Human Development will undertake a full review of our Role and Scope Document every three years. The Department RTP Committee shall be responsible for revising and updating the document. Tenurable faculty within the Department shall vote on proposed changes. The revised document will be submitted to the UPTC Chair after the review committee completes all reviews for that year.

Article XIII. Approval Process

Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document
(a) tenurable faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit;
(b) promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of all associated intermediate units (usually colleges);
(c) University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTC); and
(d) provost.

Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document
(a) promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of the intermediate unit;
(b) University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTC); and
(c) provost.

Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document
(a) University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTC);
(b) Faculty Senate;
(c) Deans' Council; and
(d) provost.