

Department of Human Physiology and Nutrition

CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND EVIDENCE FOR REAPPOINTMENT,
PROMOTION AND TENURE

Helen and Arthur E. Johnson Beth-El College of Nursing and Health Sciences
University of Colorado Colorado Springs
July 1, 2020

Preamble

The mission of the Department of Human Physiology and Nutrition is to inspire the next generation of health professionals through multidisciplinary, research-based, and applied education. The department is committed to quality teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, and effective leadership and service to the department, college, university campus, university system, profession and community. While professional practice is not evaluated as a separate category, it may be incorporated throughout and contribute to teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service. Faculty members will demonstrate exemplary ethical standards in the three areas, hereinafter referred to as teaching, scholarship and service. The department values collaboration with all faculty appointments (both within and outside of the department), collegiality, and the development of a faculty member as a 'whole' person.

The indicators of faculty achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service contained in this document are considered guidelines for the review of candidates. These indicators should be used as a framework to make a professional judgment about the candidate's record consistent with respect to the specific discipline of the candidate's expertise and current practice. Examples under each criterion are not rank-ordered. Judgments regarding any item and the record as a whole should not be reduced to quantitative counting, but should also consider the quality of the works presented in accordance with the standards of the respective disciplines. The onus is on the candidate to explain the quality of their work in the context of their discipline.

The criteria provided for *the initial reappointment review, comprehensive reappointment review, tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Full Professor* in the teaching, scholarship, and service categories generally reflect a 50%, 30%, 20% respective workload distribution. If the faculty member utilizes an approved differentiated workload related to teaching, scholarship, and service, then the expectations related to quality and growth in the affected categories will remain the same, but the volume of evidence required will be evaluated accordingly.

The department follows specific regental, campus, and college policies for conducting reappointment, tenure, promotion reviews (*APS 1022 Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review**, *UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001*, and *Johnson Beth-El College Policy for Reappointment Promotion and Tenure*).

INITIAL REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

At this level of review, candidates should provide evidence of the initiation of efforts to establish effective programs of teaching, research, and demonstrate willingness to serve in department and professional capacities. Review committees will vote on a recommendation for reappointment and, will vote under each of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service on whether the candidate is 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

COMPREHENSIVE REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

At this level, the candidate should have demonstrated that adequate progress is being made toward tenure. The faculty member is becoming established as a teacher and researcher, and a contributor to the department, and to some extent, to the campus or wider community in the area of service. At the comprehensive reappointment review level, evaluations reflect whether significant progress is being

made toward tenure. Review committees will vote on a recommendation for reappointment and, will vote under each of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service on whether the candidate is 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

At UCCS, the review for promotion to Associate Professor generally occurs at the same time as the tenure review. At this level, tenure may only be awarded to faculty members who are judged at least “meritorious” in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service, and “excellent” in either teaching or research. Candidates and evaluators are referred to the UCCS RPT Policy.

Tenure-track faculty members must have been appointed on the tenure-track at UCCS for at least three years and have undergone a comprehensive reappointment review before they may apply for tenure consideration. Exceptions to this three-year requirement may be made for individuals who already have been granted tenure at another institution and/or for whom specific alternative provisions are detailed in the letter of appointment. Initial appointment as an Associate Professor or Professor without tenure will substitute for the comprehensive reappointment review. The candidate’s dossier must include the relevant documentation in the initial letter of appointment in the latter cases.

If a candidate chooses to apply for early tenure, the standards of performance that apply to faculty on the seven-year tenure clock apply to faculty who apply for early tenure review. They must have a record of achievement in teaching, research, and service that is equal to the record expected of a faculty member applying for tenure at UCCS in the seventh year, as outlined above. An unsuccessful candidate for early tenure may reapply within the existing tenure clock.

PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Under Regent policy, promotion to Professor requires a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record of significant contributions to graduate and/or undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and a record, since receiving tenure or promotion to Associate Professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and leadership and service.

*As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of Human Physiology and Nutrition does not conduct a vote of all the members in the department as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process.

TEACHING

The department recognizes that individual teachers have a personal philosophy of teaching-learning and it is expected that these philosophies will be congruent with the values of the department and of the profession. Values of the department include creating a safe, stimulating and supportive environment for students; utilization of current, relevant and evidence-based information in the classroom and in practice; innovative course development and delivery; and student mentoring. Interprofessional education both within and outside of the department is strongly encouraged. Department faculty recognize and value the scholarship of teaching and its influence on and integration with the practice of teaching, the ability of professional practice to inform course content, and encourage and expect the critical analysis of teaching to improve and/or maintain high-quality teaching. It is expected that engagement of students in the teaching-learning process will be reflected in both philosophy and practice.

The candidate will articulate their teaching philosophy and describe how specific items in the teaching statement fulfill the criteria presented. Candidates will provide a body of evidence to demonstrate and support quality and effectiveness of teaching. The teaching statement and representative evidence presented will demonstrate professional development in teaching during the time under review. Candidates are encouraged to describe linkages between their teaching and research, and service.

Required items to submit for each review:

The department utilizes the following three methods of evaluation. Additional materials may be submitted to support the candidate's contributions as desired to support their case.

1. Syllabus for the most recent section of each course taught during the time under review. Syllabi should reflect the following:
 - Appropriate course learning objectives
 - Coherent course organization and structure
 - Pertinent content covered
 - Suitable methods of assessment to determine student outcomes
2. Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) or a similar, campus-approved system and form for each course taught during the time under review. The summative interpretation of all quantitative and qualitative information from FCQs will constitute no more than 1/3 of the evaluation of teaching.
3. Peer review of at least one class conducted during the time under review.
 - A majority of peer reviews of teaching will be conducted by tenure-track or tenured faculty who are at or above the rank of the candidate.
 - Additional materials may be submitted to strengthen the case for teaching quality and effectiveness as outlined in Appendix A – Elements to Support Teaching.

INITIAL REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

A candidate's teaching statement should describe how the required elements of evaluation listed above demonstrate a commitment to teaching by addressing:

- initial development of course structure and materials
- utilization of different teaching and learning methodology and assessment strategies
- planned responsiveness to reasonable student and peer feedback

Review committees vote on whether the candidate is either: 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

COMPREHENSIVE REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

A candidate's teaching statement should describe how the required elements of evaluation listed above demonstrate a commitment to teaching by addressing:

- development of course structure and materials
- utilization of different teaching and learning methodology and assessment strategies
- how they have responded to evaluations of their teaching
- how they have demonstrated professional development or success in teaching, and student outcomes

Implementation of alternative assessment strategies, changes in teaching practice, innovations in teaching methods, utilization of mentorship for teaching improvement, and course or curriculum development or revision will be taken into consideration (Appendix A).

Review committees vote on whether the candidate is either: 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

To be *on track for tenure* candidates must demonstrate that they have attained and/or sustained favorable teaching evaluations and positive student outcomes at the time of review as measured by the required items to be submitted for each evaluation. Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a mandatory requirement, etc., may be considered in the judgment of performance. In cases in which this standard is not met, the candidate must provide an explanation for the failure and an appropriate remedial plan.

TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The same criteria for comprehensive reappointment review apply for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. In addition to that criteria, the candidate will demonstrate a continued recorded of professional development in teaching supported by positive student outcomes and student and peer teaching evaluations.

Review committees vote on whether the candidate is either: 1) not meritorious; 2) meritorious; or 3) excellent.

For a *meritorious* rating, the candidate must demonstrate proficiency in teaching as evidenced by multiple measures including positive student outcomes and generally favorable teaching evaluations by students and peers. Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a mandatory requirement, etc., will be considered in the judgment of performance.

For a rating of *excellent*, the candidate must demonstrate, along with the qualities for meritorious, additional evidence of high-quality teaching and effectiveness (Appendix A). The candidate must justify how the additional evidence provided supports the case for excellent quality and effectiveness.

The candidate must also demonstrate achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond their immediate instructional setting (e.g. outside the department).

PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

The candidate will demonstrate expert teaching skills through a continued record of professional development in teaching supported by positive student outcomes and student and peer teaching evaluations. Candidates will be dynamic and excel in substantial development/implementation of courses, teaching materials and strategies, and assessment of learning and program outcomes. They will model for students the relationship of theory, research and practice, and effectively promote critical thinking. They will participate in and model appropriate interprofessional education both within and outside of the department as applicable. They will be recognized by peers and others as master teachers, mentors, and may receive honors for teaching. Candidates may design and test innovative teaching strategies.

The candidate must demonstrate continuing growth and expert teaching skills as measured by multiple methods of teaching evaluation. The candidate must provide and justify multiple indicators to support high-quality, effective teaching, and dedication to student learning (Appendix A). Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a mandatory requirement, etc., will be considered in the judgment of performance. Candidates will demonstrate leadership in curriculum development, mentor others in course development, and may provide leadership on university, state or national committees (i.e. curriculum development, professional standards, certification).

Under Regent policy, promotion to Professor requires a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent. Review committees vote whether the criteria above have been met, but do not assign a specific rating for teaching alone.

SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE WORK

The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. We value original work that generates new knowledge, work that integrates existing knowledge, the development of evidence to support and promote evidence-based practice to advance our professions, and applied research. We recognize the study of teaching and learning in our disciplines as a form of scholarship. We also recognize the study of professional practice and/or evidence-based practice in our disciplines as forms of scholarship.

In the assessment of scholarship, the department places greater emphasis on items that have undergone peer review than those that have not. Non-peer reviewed work will also be considered as part of the candidate's record but will be weighted less than peer reviewed work in consideration of the body of work. Such material may be submitted to outside peer review (generally non-blind) for evaluation and such review may then enhance the weight given to that material compared to non-peer reviewed work (e.g., white papers, technical reports, etc.).

Quantity is necessary but is not sufficient by itself to demonstrate research merit. Although quality is deemed of greater importance than quantity, the department expects evidence of continuous productivity in scholarly pursuits over a period of years. Candidates will explain their contributions to papers, grants or contracts, the relevance and influence of the work (e.g., how the information enhances the profession; how the work moves the profession forward) and the rationale behind where papers were disseminated. Faculty are encouraged to seek venues to communicate their scholarly activity that will reach a national or international audience. This may be accomplished by publishing research findings in journals with a broader readership or high visibility, or by presenting at conferences that attract participants from the broader community.

Faculty are expected to take a principal role on papers, grants and/or contracts. Work as lead author, or supervising author when mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students, will carry the most weight. Co-authored work with collaborators (e.g. within the department, college, UCCS, CU system, or at other institutions) will be considered equivalent to lead or supervising-authored papers, grants or contracts if the candidate provides clear evidence of a significant contribution by the candidate to the paper, grant or contract; otherwise, the collaborative work will be weighted less.

INITIAL REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

Candidates will present evidence of scholarly potential through the continuing development as a researcher and progress toward publication. This might include efforts in establishing a lab, drafts of works in progress or those submitted for publication, presentations at professional meetings, and/or grant proposals either in preparation or submitted.

Review committees vote on whether the candidate is either: 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

COMPREHENSIVE REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

Candidates must demonstrate that they are making significant progress in scholarship at the time of tenure by presenting multiple scholarly activities, compiled and documented from those listed in Appendix B - Elements to Support Scholarship. The candidate will present clear evidence that a focused research program has been established since their initial appointment and has begun to produce rigorous, publishable work that makes a meaningful contribution to the discipline.

Exceptional quality of scholarly work will be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where there is a lower quantity of work. These activities should include items that are peer reviewed or are deemed to have an appropriate professional impact at the regional, national, or international levels. Candidates will be applying for internal and/or external funding for their research.

Review committees vote on whether the candidate is either: 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The candidate must demonstrate a body of work that makes an original scholarly contribution. A variety of completed work, compiled and documented from those listed in Appendix B - Elements to Support Scholarship, will be submitted as evidence of a focused and productive program. Candidates will be presenting at professional meetings, publishing peer-reviewed papers, and applying for external funding. In all cases, the quality of the scholarship and impact on the profession through the influencing of peers and/or practitioners are of utmost importance.

Review committees vote on whether the candidate is either: 1) not meritorious; 2) meritorious; or 3) excellent.

For a *meritorious* rating, the candidate must demonstrate they have established a regional- to national-level reputation with demonstrated scholarly productivity based upon a clearly defined line of scholarship as a principal investigator. This will be accomplished by documenting scholarly activities compiled from those listed in Appendix B - Elements to Support Scholarship. The record of scholarship will demonstrate quality and consistency over time and potential for distinction in the field or profession. These activities will include peer-reviewed papers, presentations, and grant/contract proposals that are deemed to have an appropriate professional impact. Collaborative work as a co-investigator is encouraged and will support the candidates' case for recognition within and impact on the field or profession. An average publication rate of one peer-reviewed article, as first or supervising author, per year since the comprehensive reappointment review is expected. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity is less. The case for quality will be stated by candidate and supported by measures germane to the field of study.

For a rating of *excellent*, the candidate must demonstrate that they are a productive scholar with an established national and/or international reputation based upon a clearly defined line of scholarship as a principal investigator. The candidate will present a balance of scholarly activities commensurate with the rating of meritorious, plus document significant contributions to, and distinction within, the field or profession, supported by a higher quantity and quality of scholarly work and evidence of funding.

PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

The candidate must demonstrate substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a principal investigator since tenure and/or promotion. Quantity is necessary but is not sufficient by itself to demonstrate excellence in scholarship. Although quality is deemed of greater importance than quantity, the department expects candidates to have maintained productivity in a variety of scholarly pursuits since tenure and/or promotion. Publications in peer-reviewed journals that are congruent with the faculty member's scholarly agenda are expected. Other guidelines of indicators of scholarly maturity may include publications of a scholarly book, continuity of seeking external grant and/or contract funding, invitations to present at major national conventions, awards for scholarship, or mentorship of faculty in research. Candidates will explain their contributions to papers, grants or contracts, and the relevance of and influence of the work (e.g., how the information enhances the profession; how the work moves the profession forward). Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity is less. The case for quality will be stated by candidate and supported by measures germane to the field of study. Collaborative work as a co-investigator is encouraged and will support the candidates' case for recognition within and impact on the field. Presentations at professional meetings and non-refereed publications may be considered as secondary evidence of ongoing scholarly activity. In addition, there must be evidence of national or international esteem for the individual's publications as important and authoritative works in the candidate's specialty discipline. This may be accomplished by publishing research findings in journals with a broader readership or high visibility, or by presenting at conferences that attract participants from the broader community.

Under Regent policy, promotion to Professor requires a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent. Review committees vote whether the criteria above have been met, but do not assign a specific rating for scholarship.

LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE

Our department values leadership and service that contributes to, and helps advance, our individual disciplines while supporting our departmental mission and goals. We recognize that leadership and service can take many forms and can be informal as well as formal. In the assessment of service, the department places greater emphasis on the formal forms of leadership and service as outlined in Appendix C – Elements to Support Service.

We expect all faculty to regularly and consistently contribute to service within the department regardless of their level of reappointment, review, tenure and/or promotion. As faculty advance through the reappointment, review, tenure and/or promotion process, they should demonstrate a progression toward assuming leadership roles within the department with subsequent progression of the provision of service and leadership to include the college, campus, university, profession and community spheres.

INITIAL REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

The candidates will begin a process of identifying appropriate service contributions. Each candidate must have met his or her departmental service obligations including regular attendance at department meetings and collegiality in interactions with students, faculty, staff and administration. The candidate should be planning for increased service contributions within the department and addition of service contributions within the college.

Review committees vote on whether the candidate is either: 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

COMPREHENSIVE REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

Candidates must demonstrate that they are making significant progress in service at the time of tenure by demonstrating initial efforts in appropriate types and levels of leadership and service contribution as listed in Appendix C – Elements to Support Service. Candidates must have met their growing commitment and obligations to the department and be planning for service contributions to the college, campus, university, profession, and/or community. Collegiality in interactions with students, faculty, staff and administration are expected. In evaluating faculty service, both the quality and quantity (depth and breadth) of contributions will be considered.

Review committees vote on whether the candidate is either: 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Review committees vote on whether the candidate is either: 1) not meritorious; 2) meritorious; or 3) excellent.

For a *meritorious* rating, candidates should be meeting their primary obligations to the department and college as listed in Appendix C – Elements to Support Service. Collegiality in interactions with students, faculty, staff and administration are expected. In evaluating faculty leadership and service, both the quality and quantity (depth and breadth) of contributions will be considered.

A rating of *excellent* requires meeting service responsibilities outlined for *meritorious* with additional responsibilities in a leadership role (e.g. committee chair) at the department and college level, and contributions at the campus, university, profession and/or community levels, as outlined in Appendix C – Elements to Support Service. In evaluating service, both the quality and quantity of the contributions will be considered.

PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

The candidates must provide evidence of meeting service responsibilities within the department, in addition to multiple leadership and service contributions to the department, college, campus, university, profession and/or community as delineated in Appendix C – Elements to Support Service. Candidates will demonstrate collegiality in interactions with students, faculty, staff and administration and a dedication to helping the department achieve its goals. In evaluating faculty leadership and service, both the quality and quantity (depth and breadth) of contributions will be considered.

Under Regent policy, promotion to Professor requires a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent. Review committees vote whether the criteria above have been met, but do not assign a specific rating for service alone.

POST-TENURE REVIEW

The purpose of the post-tenure review is to (1) facilitate continued faculty development consistent with the academic needs and goals of the department; and (2) ensure professional accountability.

Standards and processes for post-tenure review of faculty are governed by *Article V of the Laws of the Regents*. These are further delineated in a series of CU Administrative Policy Statements. Campus guidance is supplied in *UCCS Policy # 200-016*. The Human Physiology and Nutrition faculty adopts the UCCS campus Post Tenure Review policy (*UCCS Policy 200-016*) with the following additions:

1) The candidate's Executive Summary will address the current professional plan. The summary will articulate how the faculty member has met or has made significant progress toward meeting the goals and performance objectives that were established in the faculty member's current professional plan. Reasons that goals and performance objectives have not been (or will not be) met will be explained. If goals and performance objectives were changed during the period under review, reasons for the change should be explained (e.g., change in differentiated workload, change in administrative duties, etc.).

2) The provost's office, with the assistance of the dean's office, will prepare the template in Digital Measures Workflow for the candidate to submit. The template will include the following:

- a) Primary unit RPT criteria
- b) Curriculum vitae
- c) Digital Measures summary report from the last 5 years
- d) Candidate's Executive Summary (1-3 page self-evaluation)
- e) FCQ summary pages for past 5 years
- f) Current professional plan (established per *UCCS Post-Tenure Review Policy 200-016*). The current professional plan developed by the faculty member will be the main focus of the review. The committee will review the faculty member's self-set goals from the professional plan, the personal statement, and the curriculum vita to determine whether accomplishments are evident in the areas outlined in those goals. The outcome of the review will be a determination of whether appropriate effort was made in the targeted areas selected by the faculty member.
- g) Professional Plan addressing next 5 years. The professional plan is a qualitative document that provides an overview of the likely areas of professional accomplishment over the next five years
- h) Faculty differentiated workload statement(s) (if applicable)
- i) Annual performance evaluation reports (e.g., merit reviews) from previous 5 years, including evaluation letters from all levels of review

j) Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA/Digital Measures) for each of the last 5 years) Sabbatical report if taken within the five-year period being reviewed

l) Additional materials (optional)

Faculty who receive a “below expectations” rating on their Annual Performance Rating must develop a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) with their supervisor. If the goals of the PIA are met, the faculty member continues in the regular 5-year review cycle. If the goals are not being met, an extensive review process shall be conducted (*UCCS Post-Tenure Review Policy 200-016*).

Since post tenure appointments are subject to workload differentiations, the dossier should be evaluated based on approved workload distributions. If no evidence of approved workload distribution is provided (via letter from the Department Chair and Dean), the faculty will be evaluated on Teaching (50%), Research/Scholarship/Creative Works (30%), and Leadership and Service (20%).

During the Post-Tenure Review, faculty members will be considered to “meet expectations” if the faculty member has met or has made significant progress toward meeting a majority of the goals and performance objectives that were established in the faculty member’s current professional plan. The Post-Tenure Review committee may also determine that a faculty member has “exceeded expectations” or is “outstanding” based on the documentation provided by the faculty member. The Post-Tenure Review committee will provide a brief narrative explanation of its findings.

Appendix A: Elements to Support Teaching

The elements below are provided as examples. They are not all-inclusive. Nor should they be treated as a checklist of required elements. The candidate is to use these examples to help justify their case for both quality and effectiveness in teaching.

Influence of the course content/program on students' learning, Examples of evidence include:

- student projects
- student pre- and post-tests of course content
- summative course evaluations
- formative course evaluations (mid-term or end of term)
 - formative course evaluations are highly encouraged for faculty with minimal teaching experience or faculty teaching a new course or new preparation for the first time.
- comprehensive examinations
- course syllabi
- detailed lecture notes and/or lesson plans
- student portfolios
- student surveys
- effective use of technology in the classroom

Influence of instructor's teaching practice on student learning and engagement with the course material. Examples of evidence include:

- course evaluations
- peer evaluations
- evaluation of faculty member as a guest lecturer for a class internal or external to the department
- student portfolios
- student letters
- practicum evaluations
- follow-up studies
- student surveys
- work with students outside of the classroom setting

Influence of the course/program content on students' practice. Examples of evidence include:

- supervisor or preceptor evaluations
- students' self-evaluations
- course evaluations
- video recordings (e.g., of student experiences)
- student portfolios
- student initiation of new models
- employer surveys
- student media appearances (e.g., newspaper, radio, TV, social media)
- student publications

Student perceptions of the usefulness of course content. Examples of evidence include:

- course evaluations
- student letters
- student surveys
- follow-up studies of graduates

Advising and/or mentoring relationships with students developed over time to improve professional practice. Examples of evidence include:

- master's thesis supervision
- master's research project supervision
- undergraduate research
- independent studies
- student letters
- student portfolios
- supervision of internship experience
- evidence of mentored undergraduate and/or graduate student progression in academia or professional career.

Professional reputation in teaching with constituents at local, regional, state, or national levels who translate research into practice or develop new knowledge in the faculty member's discipline. Examples of evidence include:

- external reviews
- status on local, regional, state, and national committees
- letters from colleagues
- invited presentations or speeches

Successful collaboration with faculty colleagues that results in program success in meeting and exceeding state and national standards within the faculty member's discipline. Examples of evidence include:

- leadership and/or participation in the design, alignment, and improvement of program curriculum
- leadership, participation, and/or contribution to the development, design, alignment, and improvement of programs delivered online
- leadership and/or participation in the development of folios for learned society recognition
- leadership, participation, and/or contribution to processes and activities relative to state and national accreditation
- leadership, participation, and/or contribution to ensuring that students meet the learning objectives for courses
- leadership, participation, and/or contribution to ensuring that course learning objectives meet curricular needs

Development as a teaching professional based on past performance and the development of a plan and focus for teaching. Examples of evidence include:

- adjustments made to improve course evaluations

- professional development plan
- student letters
- annual reviews
- department chair letter
- peer observations or external evaluation
- professional development activities (e.g. teaching conferences, FRC courses, etc.)
- Online Learning Consortium Score

Appendix B: Elements to Support Scholarly/Creative Work

The elements below are provided as examples. They are not all-inclusive. Nor should they be treated as a checklist of required elements. The candidate is to use these examples to help justify their case for both quantity and quality of scholarship.

Professional publications that report research, translate research into practice, or develop new knowledge or perspectives. These publications should influence peers, practitioners or the profession and may be published or accepted for publication. Peer-reviewed forms of scholarship are considered to be more influential than non-peer reviewed works. Examples of evidence include:

- peer-reviewed journal articles
- peer-reviewed books
- peer-reviewed textbooks
- peer-reviewed book chapters
- peer-review review articles
- books
- book chapters
- textbooks
- articles in journals
- articles in newsletters
- editorials
- monographs

Professional presentations at conferences, symposia, clinics, etc., on a local, regional, national or international level.

- invited talks
- oral presentations
- poster presentations
- abstracts in conference proceedings

Competency and continuity in applying for and/or procuring grants or contracts for research or support of research or programs that translate research or improve service through dissemination of innovative practice. Examples of evidence include:

- grant or contract proposals submitted
- grant reviews received
- grant or contract proposals funded
- leveraging internal grant funding to apply for or obtain external grant or contract funding

Successful mentorship of student research

- Student presentations
- Student publications
- Student research awards
- Student research grant submissions and/or funding

Professional reputation with constituents at local, state, national, or international levels which translate research into practice or develop new knowledge in the faculty member's discipline.

Examples of evidence include:

- reviews of research, papers, presentations, articles, and/or books from peers at the local, state, national, or international levels
- letters of commendation from peers at the local, state, national, or international levels
- elected offices in professional organizations that support the translation of research into practice or develop new knowledge in the faculty member's discipline

Works in progress. On-going work may be used to assess the candidate's overall level of effort and scholarly potential. Examples of evidence include:

- leading a longitudinal study
- manuscripts in review or under revision
- grants under review without a decision
- IRB approved projects in data collection or analysis phases

Appendix C: Elements to Support Leadership and Service

The elements below are provided as examples. They are not all-inclusive. Nor should they be treated as a checklist of required elements. The candidate is to use these examples to help justify their case for both quantity and quality of contributions in service.

Professional leadership and service to the department. Examples of evidence include:

- regular participation in department meetings
- department committee or task force leadership
- department committee or task force membership and participation
- department search committee chair or member
- department faculty evaluation committee chair or member
- service as department chair, program coordinator, or director
- mentoring faculty in teaching or research/scholarship/creative works
- representing the department at college, campus, university, professional or community events (e.g., major/minor fair, student recruiting or orientation events, health fairs, etc.)

Professional leadership and service to the college. Examples of evidence include:

- college assembly leadership
- college assembly participation
- college committee or task force leadership
- college committee or task force membership and participation
- college search committee chair or member
- college faculty evaluation committee chair or member
- service as associate dean
- mentoring faculty in teaching or research/scholarship/creative works
- regular participation in college graduation ceremonies

Professional leadership and service to the campus. Examples of evidence include:

- participation in faculty governance, such as service/participation on the campus Faculty Representative Assembly
- leadership in faculty governance, such as offices held or service/participation on the campus Faculty Assembly Executive Committee
- campus committee or task force leadership
- campus committee or task force membership and participation
- service in campus leadership as a director, administrative associate, or other appointed administrative position

Professional leadership and service to the university. Examples of evidence include:

- participation in faculty governance, such as service/participation on the University Faculty Council
- leadership in faculty governance, such as offices held or service on the University Faculty Council Executive Committee
- university committee or task force leadership

- university committee or task force membership and participation
- service in campus leadership as a director, administrative associate, or other appointed administrative position

Professional community, regional, or national leadership and service. Context regarding service or leadership role, responsibilities and time commitment should be included in the leadership and service statement. Examples of evidence include:

- professional service related to the university or department mission, such as board membership, community service projects, and presentations
- professional service, such as committee offices, committee membership and participation, task force membership and participation
- professional practice related to the university or department mission, such as counseling, consulting, or direct service

Professional leadership and service to community, regional, national, and/or international professional organizations. Context regarding service or leadership role, responsibilities and time commitment should be included in the leadership and service statement. Examples of evidence include:

- professional service, such as committee offices, committee membership and participation, task force membership and participation, or conference committees and participation
- professional practice related to the university or department mission, such as counseling, consulting, or direct service
- professional service and leadership in the governance of community, regional, national and/or international professional organizations
- editorship of a professional journal
- service as a reviewer for abstracts, articles or papers in conference proceedings
- service as a reviewer for journals of the faculty member's discipline
- service as a reviewer for grant proposals in the faculty member's discipline
- service on a grant funding board in the faculty member's discipline

Leadership roles in service activities are generally considered more influential than serving as a member in a particular endeavor.

Helen and Arthur E. Johnson Beth-El College of Nursing and Health Sciences
HUMAN PHYSIOLOGY AND NUTRITION
REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY
Version History

Version 1:

Initial Draft approved by the HPNU faculty, 4/25/2019

Approved by the Interim Dean Amy Silva-Smith, 5/22/2019

Reviewed by Provost Tom Christensen 5/22/2019; revisions requested, 6/28/2019

Edits by HPNU faculty reviewed by Dean Kevin Laudner, 9/13/2019, 11/01/2019

Edits by FAC received, 04/13/2020

Revised Draft approved by the HPNU faculty, 04/14/2020

Accepted and approved by Dean Kevin Laudner, 04/15/2020

Accepted and approved by the College Faculty Affairs Committee, 04/19/2020

Approved by Provost Tom Christensen, 06/05/2020

Effective Date, 07/01/2020
