

Reappointment,
Tenure,
Promotion,
and
Merit
Scoring System

Appalachian State University
Department of Public Health
and Exercise Science

PHES Revised 3-22-16; Effective July 1, 2016

Table of Contents

RTPM Scoring System Overview and Purpose	4
RTPM Scoring System Overview	4
Tenure Protocol	5
Promotion to Associate Professor	6
Promotion to Full Professor	6
Raise & Merit System Overview.....	7
Performance Area 1: Teaching.....	10
Teaching Overview.....	10
To calculate your overall teaching effectiveness score:	10
How teaching effectiveness RTPM points are determined (Table 2)	10
Teaching Enhancement.....	11
Table 1a: Teaching Enhancement Activities	11
Table 1b: Auxiliary Teaching	11
Table 1c: Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.....	11
Teaching Effectiveness.....	12
Table 2: Teaching Effectiveness Scoring Table.....	12
Teaching Mentorship	13
Table 3: Teaching Mentorship	13
Teaching Honors and Awards	13
Table 4: Teaching Honors & Awards	13
Performance Area 2: Scholarship.....	14
Scholarship Overview.....	14
Publications.....	15
Table 4a: Alpha Level Refereed Publications	15
Table 4b: Beta Level Refereed Publications.....	15
Table 4c: Delta Level Refereed Publications.....	15
Table 5a: Alpha Level Non-refereed Publications.....	16
Table 5b: Beta Level Non-refereed Publications.....	16
Table 6a: Alpha Level Books.....	16

Table 6b: Beta Level Books	17
Table 6c: Delta Level Books.....	17
Table 7: Other Publications.....	17
Presentations	18
Table 8a: National Alpha Level Presentation	18
Table 8b: National Beta Level Presentation.....	18
Table 8c: National Delta Level Presentation	18
Table 9a: Regional/State Alpha Level Presentation.....	18
Table 9b: Regional/State Beta Level Presentation.....	18
Table 9c: Regional/State Delta Level Presentation.....	19
Table 10: Professional Conference Attendance.....	19
Table 11: Professional Conference Moderator.....	19
Table 12: Other Presentations	19
Professional Editor and/or Reviewer	20
Table 13a: Editorship – Alpha Journal.....	20
Table 13b: Editorship – Beta Journal	20
Table 13c: Editorship – Delta Journal.....	20
Table 14a: Editorship – Alpha Book	20
Table 14b: Editorship – Beta Book.....	20
Table 14c: Editorship – Delta Book	21
Table 15: Journal Reviewer	21
Table 16: Book Reviewer.....	21
Table 17: Professional Convention Reviewer	21
Table 18: Other Editor and/or Reviewer.....	21
Grantsmanship.....	22
Table 19a: External Funded Grantsmanship Alpha.....	22
Table 19b: External Funded Grantsmanship Beta	22
Table 19c: External Funded Grantsmanship Delta.....	22
Table 20a: Internal Funded Grantsmanship Alpha	22
Table 20b: Internal Funded Grantsmanship Beta	23
Table 20c: Internal Funded Grantsmanship Delta	23

Table 21: Other Grantsmanship.....	23
Scholarship Honors and Awards	24
Table 22: Scholarship Honors & Awards.....	24
Performance Area 3: Service	25
Service Overview.....	25
Table 23a: International/National Service Activities	25
Table 23b: International/National Service Workshop, Symposium, Event	25
Table 24a: Multi-state Service Activities.....	26
Table 24b: Multi-state Service Workshop, Symposium, Event.....	26
Table 25a: State Service Activities	26
Table 25b: State Workshop, Symposium, Event	26
Table 26a: Univ/Dept/Area Service Activities.....	27
Table 26b: Univ/Dept/Area Service Workshop, Symposium, Event.....	27
Table 27a: Community/District Service	27
Table 27b: Community/District Service Workshop, Symposium, Event.....	28
Table 28: Service Grantsmanship.....	28
Table 29: Service Honors & Awards.....	28

RTPM Scoring System Overview and Purpose

RTPM Scoring System Overview

This document outlines a scoring system used for quantifying professional activities and making administrative decisions based on varying levels of professional engagement and productivity. Three major performance areas are identified:

- Teaching
- Scholarship
- Service

Each performance area has been weighted according to predetermined departmental standards for full-time tenure track and special faculty appointments (i.e. lecturer, practitioners-in-residence, etc.):

Performance Area	Weight	
	Tenure Track Faculty	Special Faculty Appointment
Teaching	40%	80%
Scholarship	30%	(no requirement)
Service	30%	20%

A minimum yearly point criterion for each performance area has been established at 70% of the weighted values from above. The minimum yearly point criteria are as follows:

Performance Area	Points	
	Tenure Track Faculty	Special Faculty Appointment
Teaching	28	56
Scholarship	21	(no requirement)
Service*	21	14

* The minimum yearly point criterion for service is **14** for 1st-year assistant professors

Activities and corresponding point values and criteria have been established and are categorized by the three major performance areas:

- Teaching: see Tables 1-3
- Scholarship: see Tables 4-19
- Service: see Tables 20-25

Tenure Protocol

The teaching, scholarship, and service criteria outlined below are intended to serve as guidelines for the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) in the tenure process. In addition to these criteria the "Faculty Handbook" states that institutional need and collegiality must also be considered in the tenure process. It is important to note that the PTC acts in an advisor capacity and tenure decisions are made by the Dean of the Beaver College of Health Sciences.

By the end of the 5th year of tenure-track employment the faculty member is expected to demonstrate effective teaching, productive participation in scholarship, and active engagement in service by accumulating a minimum of 350 points. The minimum criteria for each performance area is as follows:

Teaching:	140 points
Scholarship:	105 points
Service:	105 points

While accumulating the 350 points, minimum criteria must be met for each of the three performance areas as follows:

Teaching

- From the IDEA, an adjusted summary evaluation score in the middle 40% (45-55) during both the 4th and 5th years of tenure track employment.
- Participation in at least 2 teaching enhancement activities.

Scholarship

- Five refereed publications (with at least 3 at the Beta level as first, or co-first author).

Service

- One leadership role in an institutional matter.

Promotion to Associate Professor

The criteria for promotion to associate professor are identical to the criteria outlined for tenure (see Tenure Protocol section).

Promotion to Full Professor

To be promoted to full professor it is expected that the candidate, in addition to meeting the minimum criteria established in the “Faculty Handbook”, will demonstrate effective teaching, productive participation in scholarship, and active engagement in service by accumulating 700 points by the end of the 10th year of full-time employment. The minimum criteria for each performance area are as follows:

Teaching:	280 points
Scholarship:	210 points
Service:	210 points

In addition, minimum criteria for accumulating point must be met for each of the three performance areas as follows:

Teaching

- From the IDEA, an adjusted summary evaluation score in the middle 40% (45-55) during both of the years preceding consideration for promotion.
- Participation in at least 4 teaching enhancement activities.

Scholarship

At least 3 activities in any combination from the activities listed below:

- Alpha level, refereed publication as 1st or 2nd author,
- Alpha level funded grant as 1st or 2nd investigator,
- Alpha level book as 1st or 2nd author,
- Alpha level editorship

Service

- Distinguished leadership role in the discipline.

Once promoted to full professor, the faculty member would have the opportunity to negotiate a percentage reallocation in each of the performance areas (teaching, scholarship, and service). The range for reallocating percentages for each performance area is as follows:

Teaching:	40-60%
Scholarship:	10-40%
Service:	10-40%

- The minimum percentage for each performance area cannot be less than the minimum value of each range.
- The percentage values for each performance area must be in intervals of 10.
- When added, the percentages for each of the 3 performance areas must be 100.
- To determine a minimal point criterion once the percentages for each performance area are established, the percentage for each performance area would be multiplied by 70% (i.e., teaching 50% x 70% = 35 points).
- The established percentages would be in effect for a period of 3 academic years.
- Near the conclusion of each 3-year period, a full professor would have the opportunity to renegotiate the percentage allocation to each of the 3 performance areas.

Raise & Merit System Overview

The raise and merit system is used to reward professional productivity. To objectively determine an appropriate raise a performance score must be calculated. The performance score represents a faculty member's contribution to the area, department, university, profession at-large, and so forth. Accordingly, the greater one's contribution, the higher the performance score. The raise and merit system consists of three categories as indicated below:

- Basic Raise
- Merit
- PHES Departmental Discretionary Merit

Allocation of Money to the Raise & Merit Pool

The chair will divide the total amount of money that is allocated for raises and merit among the 3 categories as follows:

- Basic Raise: 50%
- Merit: 45%
- PHES Departmental Discretionary Merit: 5%

For example, if the total allocated for raises and merit is \$50,000, then the dollar value for each category is as follows:

- Basic Raise: \$25,000
- Merit: \$22,500
- PHES Departmental Discretionary Merit: \$2,500

Basic Raise

All faculty members are expected to make a basic contribution to their area, department, etc. by engaging in professionally relevant activities in each of the three major performance areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. To earn an area basic raise, it is expected that the faculty member demonstrates effective teaching, productive participation in scholarship, and active engagement in service by accumulating 70 points during the academic/fiscal/calendar year. To earn a basic raise, an individual must meet minimum point criteria in each of the three performance areas. The minimum criteria for each performance area are as follows:

Performance Area	Weight	
	Tenure Track Faculty	Special Faculty Appointment
Teaching	40%	80%
Scholarship	30%	(no requirement)
Service	30%	20%

* The minimum yearly point criterion for service is 14 for 1st year assistant professors

- 50% of the money allocated to raises and merit is reserved for basic raises
- The money allocated to the basic raise pool will be divided equally among all individuals who meet the minimum point criteria in each of the three performance areas.
- For example, if there were 25 faculty members who meet the basic raise criteria and the money allocated to the basic raise pool is \$25,000, then each faculty member would receive a \$1,000 raise.

Merit

- Merit is used to reward those individuals who exceed a basic contribution to their area, department, etc. and earn more than the minimum point criteria in each of the three major performance areas.
- 45% of the money allocated to raises and merit is reserved for merit. For example, \$22,500.

- This 45% is sub-divided into the following categories: teaching (40%), scholarship (30%), and service (30%). For, example: teaching = \$9,000, scholarship = \$6,750, and service = \$6,750
- Any points exceeding the minimum yearly point criteria are applied toward merit within the category in which the points are earned. For example, the minimum yearly point criterion for teaching is 28 points. If an individual earned 38 points for teaching, then 10 points are applied to teaching merit.
- To calculate merit in each of the three performance areas, merit points for the department are totaled within each category. Then each individual earns a share of the money in each performance area equal to the corresponding percentage of points they earned in each category. For example, if an individual earned 10 points in the teaching merit pool, and the total number of points in that category is 200, and the total amount of money allocated to that pool is \$9,000, then the individual earns a \$450 teaching merit raise.
- A three-year moving average is used to determine merit scores for any given academic/ fiscal/ calendar year. For example, each year's merit scores would be calculated by using the current scores and the two previous year's scores.

PHES Departmental Discretionary Merit

- 5% of the money allocated for raises and merit is reserved for discretionary purposes. For example, \$2,500
- Individuals are eligible to receive area discretionary merit raises only if they exceed the area basic raise criteria.
- The area discretionary merit money is distributed to individuals within the area at the discretion of the chair.
- Possible uses include, but are not limited to:
 1. Exceptional performance by faculty
 2. Activities not yet assigned a point value

How Points for Activities are Determined

1. Points for activities are based on a number of factors including:
 - Professional judgment
 - Impact of activity on profession
 - Quality of activity
 - Rigor necessary to complete activity
 - Value of activity as a percentage of overall points required for basic contribution in the performance area
 - Norm-referenced comparison of activity to other activities within the same performance area
2. If an individual engages in an activity that is not yet identified, a point value will be assigned to the activity by the chair based on:
 - Professional judgment
 - Impact of product on profession
 - Quality of product
 - Rigor necessary to develop product
 - Percentage of overall points required for basic contribution in the performance area
 - Norm-referenced comparison of product to other activities within the same performance area
 - Written justification from the individual who developed the product suggesting a point value

Raise Example

The following example assumes:

- A 5% annual raise
- That the average annual salary in the department is \$50,000
- That there are 30 full-time tenure track and special appointment faculty members in the department
- That the total dollar amount allocated for raises in the department is \$75,0000 ($\$50,000 \times 30 \times 0.05$)
 - Basic Raise pool = \$37,500 (50% of total merit pool)
 - Merit pool = \$33,750 (45% of total merit pool)
 - Teaching = \$13,500 (40% of merit pool)
 - Scholarship = \$10,125 (30% of merit pool)
 - Service = \$10,125 (30% of merit pool)
 - Discretionary merit pool = \$3,750 (5% of total merit pool)
- Each of the 30 faculty members in the department scored at least 70 total points each (≥ 28 [teaching], ≥ 21 [scholarship], and ≥ 21 [service]) and earned a basic raise; therefore, all of the funds in the basic raise pool will be distributed equally to each of the 30 faculty members as a \$1,250 raise ($\$37,500/30$)

Example:

- Dr. Jane Doe earned 100 merit points during this past academic/ fiscal/ calendar year with a teaching score of 35, a scholarship score of 33, and a service score of 32.
- To receive a basic raise, she needed to earn at least 70 points, with a minimum teaching score of 28, a minimum scholarship score of 21, and a minimum service score of 21. Dr. Doe will receive a basic raise of \$1250 ($\$37,500/30$).
- A three-year moving average is used to determine her merit points for this academic/ fiscal/ calendar year. Dr. Doe earned 30 merit points during this academic/ fiscal/ calendar year, which is the difference between her total merit score and the 70-point minimum basic raise criterion.
- For this year, merit point totals in each performance area for Dr. Doe are as follows: Teaching = 7 (35-28), Scholarship = 12 (33-21) and Service = 11 (32-21)
- Assuming that in each of the past two academic/ fiscal/ calendar years, Dr. Doe earned the following merit points in teaching 10 and 7, in scholarship 10 and 8, and in service 7 and 9 respectively.
- Her merit score, which will be used to determine her merit raise, for teaching is 8 ($(7 + 10 + 7) / 3$), for scholarship is 10 ($(12+10+8) / 3$), and for service is 9 ($(11 + 7 + 9) / 3$).
- Assume that the total number of merit points for the department in teaching is 250, in scholarship is 200, and in service is 300. In teaching each merit point is worth \$53 ($\$13,500/250$). In scholarship each merit point is worth \$50.60 ($\$10,125/200$). In service each merit point is worth \$33.75 ($\$10,125/300$).
- Dr. Doe's merit raise is as follows: Teaching = \$424 ($\53×8 points), Scholarship = \$506 ($\50.60×10 points), Service = \$303.75 ($\33.75×9 points).
- Dr. Doe had an exceptional academic/ fiscal/ calendar year and engaged in an activity that brought great prestige to the department. However, the activity was not yet identified on the list of professional activities. Since she met the criteria for a basic raise she was eligible for a discretionary merit raise. Therefore, at the discretion of the chair, Dr. Doe received an additional discretionary merit raise of \$200.
- In summary, Dr. Doe earned a total raise of \$2,683.75. Her raise is itemized below:
 - Basic Raise: \$1,250
 - Merit: \$1,233.75
 - Area Discretionary Merit: \$200

Performance Area 1: Teaching

Teaching Overview

RTPM scores for teaching are based on:

- Teaching Enhancement Activities (Tables 1a-1c)
- Teaching Effectiveness (Table 2)
- Teaching Honors & Awards (Table 3)

To determine points for teaching effectiveness, please refer to the IDEA Diagnostic Form Report:

To calculate your overall teaching effectiveness score:

1. Identify your adjusted summary evaluation T-score for each course that you teach
2. Add the scores for each course and divide by the number of courses. This is your average teaching effectiveness T-score.
3. Use Table 2 to determine the number of points that correspond with your average effectiveness T-score from step 2. This number represents the points you earned for teaching effectiveness.

How teaching effectiveness RTPM points are determined (Table 2)

- T-score categories and ranges are those specified on the IDEA Diagnostic Form Report:
- The categories and ranges include:
 - Highest 10% (≥ 63)
 - Higher (56-62)
 - Similar (45-55)
 - Lower Average (38-44)
 - Much Lower (≤ 37)
- To determine a reasonable point value that corresponds with each T-score the following steps were completed:
 1. First, an average point value for teaching must be established. This value is based on the pre-determined departmental standard of 40% for teaching. To calculate an average teaching score, one would multiply the departmental standard (40) by an average score (70%). Thus, an average teaching score would be 28 points (40×0.7).
 2. Next, T-scores and point values were matched. Initially, the T-score of 45, which represents the first score in the Middle 40% category, was matched with the average point value (28) calculated in step 1.
 3. Finally, each T-score above and below 50 was assigned a corresponding point value above or below 28 in one-point increments. (i.e., $46 = 29$ and $44 = 27$).

Teaching Enhancement

Table 1a: Teaching Enhancement Activities

Points	Activity	Criteria
4	National/Regional/State Coursework for Credit – on site	*All participation in activities must be documented or a written action plan indicating how activity will be used to enhance teaching effectiveness.
4	National/Regional/State/University Coursework for Credit – distance learning	
3	University Sponsored Coursework for Credit – on site	
3	National/Regional/State Multi-day Workshop Participation	
2	University Multi-day Workshop Participation	
2	National/Regional/State Sponsored Full-day Workshop Participation	
1	University Sponsored Full-day Workshop Participation	
1	National/Regional/State Partial-day Workshop Participation	
0.5	University Sponsored Partial-day Workshop Participation	
2	Individual Growth Plan – Based on PHES Peer Observation & IDEA data	
1	Extended invitation to qualified observer	
1	Observation of effective teacher	
2	Other	

Table 1b: Auxiliary Teaching

Points	Activity	Criteria
3	Design & Development of a New Course via AP&P	*All participation in activities must be documented.
2	Other	

Table 1c: Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Points	Activity	Criteria
2	Construction of an annotated bibliography for course reference	*All participation in activities must be documented, a written action plan indicating how activity will be used to enhance teaching effectiveness, and a written summary of outcome measurement techniques (i.e. student survey, test scores) and of effectiveness. *A maximum of 6 points in this area per year.
2	Implementation of a novel teaching method or activity (including use of technology)	
2	Implementation of a novel examination or testing practice	
2	Development of ungraded assessments to enhance students' learning	
2	Implementation of a novel strategy for dealing with class management problems	
2	Other	

Teaching Effectiveness

Discipline (IDEA Data)	57	55	54	51	53	52	54	52	56	54
Institution	56	54	55	53	55	53	55	53	56	54

IDEA Discipline used for comparison:
Park/Rec/Leisure/Fit Stud

To find your T-Score, locate the Adjusted Summary Evaluation Score here then find the Average T score. You will report the Average T score, not the Adjusted Summary Evaluation Score on your RTPM.

Table 2: Teaching Effectiveness Scoring Table

IDEA Category	Average T score	Points			Criteria
		Tenure Track	Special Appointment	Full Professor (Negotiated)	
Much Higher	65	48	76		*IDEA administered in every class that you teach
	64	47	75		
Higher	63	46	74		
	62	45	73		
	61	44	72		
	60	43	71		
	59	42	70		
	58	41	69		
	57	40	68		
56	39	67		*IDEA administration adheres to the protocol outlined by the PHES Teaching Enhancement Committee.	
Similar	55	38	66		
	54	37	65		
	53	36	64		
	52	35	63		
	51	34	62		
	50	33	61		
	49	32	60		
	48	31	59		
	47	30	58		
	46	29	57		
Lower	45	28	56		
	44	27	55		
	43	26	54		
	42	25	53		
	41	24	52		
	40	23	51		
	39	22	50		
38	21	49		*Scores above and below the highest and lowest scores illustrated on the table earn points in one-point increments. For example, a T score of 19 would earn 36 points and a T score of 18 would earn 35 points, etc.	

Teaching Mentorship

Table 3: Teaching Mentorship

Points	Activity	Criteria
4	Chair, Thesis Committee	*All participation in activities must be documented.
2	Member, Thesis Committee	
2	Chair, University Honors Program	
1	Reader, University Honors Program	
2	Director, Student Project	
1-2	Director, Undergraduate Research Assistant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 credit hour Independent Study (1 point) • 2-3 credit hour Independent Study (2 points) 	
2	Other	

Teaching Honors and Awards

Table 4: Teaching Honors & Awards

Points	Level	Criteria
15	National	*Honor or awards must be documented.
10	Regional	
8	State	
5	University	
2	Community	

Performance Area 2: Scholarship

Scholarship Overview

RTPM scores for scholarship are based on the following major activities:

- Publications (Tables 4-6)
- Presentations (Tables 7-10)
- Professional Editor/Reviewer (Tables 11-16)
- Grantsmanship (Tables 17-18)
- Other (Table 19)
- Scholarship Honors & Awards (Table 20)

Scores:

In most cases within a single category, points are allocated based on progressive levels of responsibility. The allocation of points is based on the following percentages:

- 100% - highest level of responsibility (ex. 1st author* – 30 points)
- 70%- 2nd highest level of responsibility (ex. 2nd author – 21 points)
- 40%- 3rd highest level of responsibility (ex. 3rd author – 12 points)
- 15%- 4th highest level of responsibility (ex. 4th author – 4.5 points)
-

*First author points should be awarded to the lead author of the manuscript. The lead author may be listed first or last on the manuscript. Only one author can receive first author points, with the exception that faculty who co-author publications and/or co-present may choose to add the points for 1st and 2nd author and then divide points equally.

First-Year Assistant Professor Scholarship Matriculation:

In order to aid first-year assistant professors in initiating a cycle of scholarship, a percentage of the total points allocated to the activity will be credited for submissions in each of the following major scholarship activities: publications, presentations, and grantsmanship. The criteria for giving credit for submissions in any of the identified scholarship activities is as follows:

- The individual is a first-year assistant professor
- 33% of the points allocated to a scholarship activity will be awarded for submission of the activity
- If the scholarship activity is published, presented, or funded, then the individual will receive the remaining points (66%) allocated to the scholarship activity.

Publications

Table 4a: Alpha Level Refereed Publications

Points	Authorship	Criteria
30	1 st	Higher tiered peer reviewed journal in discipline as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher rejection rate, • Higher circulation, and • Higher impact on profession. • Judgment of leading professionals in discipline, and • Participation in activity can be documented. • Points awarded upon validated/proof of acceptance
21	2 nd	
12	3 rd	
4.5	≤4 th	

Table 4b: Beta Level Refereed Publications

Points	Authorship	Criteria
20	1 st	Intermediate tiered peer reviewed journal in discipline as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate rejection rate, • Moderate circulation, and • Moderate impact on profession. • Judgment of leading professionals in discipline, and • Participation in activity can be documented. • Points awarded upon validated/proof of acceptance.
14	2 nd	
8	3 rd	
3	≤4 th	

Table 4c: Delta Level Refereed Publications

Points	Authorship	Criteria
10	1 st	Lower tiered peer reviewed journal in discipline as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower rejection rate, • Lower circulation, and • Lower impact on profession. • Judgment of leading professionals in discipline, and • Participation in activity can be documented. • Points awarded upon validated/proof of acceptance.
7	2 nd	
4	3 rd	
2	≤4 th	

Table 5a: Alpha Level Non-refereed Publications

Points	Authorship	Criteria
10	1 st	Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Published review of book in a national, regional, state level publication, Published review/abstract of an article in a national, regional, state level pub, Author of article in national, regional, state level non-professional publication (magazine, newspaper, newsletter etc.). Participation in activity can be documented. Points awarded upon validated/proof of acceptance
7	2 nd	
4	3 rd	
2	≤4 th	

Table 5b: Beta Level Non-refereed Publications

Points	Authorship	Criteria
5	1 st	Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Published review of book in a local or university-based publication Published review/abstract of an article in a local or university-based pub, Author of article in local or university-based non-professional publication (magazine, newspaper, newsletter, etc.). Participation in activity can be documented. Points awarded upon validated/proof of acceptance
3.5	2 nd	
2	3 rd	
1	≤4 th	

Table 6a: Alpha Level Books

Points	Authorship	Criteria
40	1 st	Higher tiered book in discipline as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publisher status in discipline, Higher impact on profession, and Judgment of leading professionals in discipline. 1st Edition Subsequent editions earn 33% of the points allocated to authorship of a book Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional text Participation in activity can be documented Points awarded upon validated/proof of acceptance
28	2 nd	
16	3 rd	
6	≤4 th	

Table 6b: Beta Level Books

Points	Authorship	Criteria
25	1 st	Intermediate tiered book in discipline as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publisher status in discipline, • Moderate impact on profession, and • Judgment of leading professionals in discipline. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Edition Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapters in a professional text, or • Non-professional, discipline related text <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in activity can be documented • Points awarded upon validated/proof of acceptance
17.5	2 nd	
10	3 rd	
4	≤4 th	

Table 6c: Delta Level Books

Points	Authorship	Criteria
10	1 st	Lower tiered book in discipline as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publisher status in discipline, • Lower impact on profession, and • Judgment of leading professionals in discipline. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Edition Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapters in a non-professional, discipline related text, or • University-based publications (i.e. Hubbard Center Texts). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in activity can be documented • Points awarded upon validated/proof of acceptance
7	2 nd	
4	3 rd	
2	≤4 th	

Table 7: Other Publications

Points	Authorship	Criteria
		Any activities not yet identified will be assigned a point value by the Chair based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effort required to develop product, • Quality of product, • Impact of product on profession, • Norm-referenced comparison of product to other activities within the same performance area, • Professional judgment, and • A written justification from the individual who developed the product suggesting a point value.

Presentations

Table 8a: National Alpha Level Presentation

Points	Presenter	Criteria
15	1 st	Higher tiered presentation in discipline as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer reviewed, research-based, discipline oriented. Invited speaker, research-based, discipline oriented. Activity can be documented
11	2 nd	
6	3 rd	
4	≤4 th	

Table 8b: National Beta Level Presentation

Points	Presenter	Criteria
10	1 st	Intermediate tiered presentation in discipline as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer reviewed, research-based, discipline oriented. Invited speaker, non-research-based, discipline oriented. Activity can be documented
7	2 nd	
4	3 rd	
2	≤4 th	

Table 8c: National Delta Level Presentation

Points	Presenter	Criteria
3	1 st	Lower tiered presentation in discipline as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-peer reviewed, non-research-based. Invited speaker, non-research-based, non-discipline oriented. Activity can be documented
2	2 nd	
1	3 rd	
.5	≤4 th	

Table 9a: Regional/State Alpha Level Presentation

Points	Presenter	Criteria
12	1 st	Higher tiered presentation in discipline as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer reviewed, research-based, discipline oriented. Invited speaker, research-based, discipline oriented. Activity can be documented
8.5	2 nd	
5	3 rd	
2	≤4 th	

Table 9b: Regional/State Beta Level Presentation

Points	Presenter	Criteria
8	1 st	Intermediate tiered presentation in discipline as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer reviewed, research-based, discipline oriented. Invited speaker, non-research-based, discipline oriented. Activity can be documented
5.5	2 nd	
3	3 rd	
1	≤4 th	

Table 9c: Regional/State Delta Level Presentation

Points	Presenter	Criteria
2	1 st	Lower tiered presentation in discipline as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-peer reviewed, non-research-based. • Invited speaker, non-research-based, non-discipline oriented. • Activity can be documented
1	2 nd	
.5	3 rd	
.25	≤4 th	

Table 10: Professional Conference Attendance

Points	Level	Criteria
3	International/National	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance can be documented • Up to 3 points per year may be earned
2	Regional (multi-state)	
1	State & Local	

Table 11: Professional Conference Moderator

Points	Criteria
1	Professional Moderator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance can be documented • 1 point per conference maximum • 3 points per year maximum

Table 12: Other Presentations

Points	Authorship	Criteria
		Any activities not yet identified will be assigned a point value by the Chair based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effort required to develop product, • Quality of product, • Impact of product on profession, • Norm-referenced comparison of product to other activities within the same performance area, • Professional judgment, and • A written justification from the individual who developed the product suggesting a point value.

Professional Editor and/or Reviewer

Table 13a: Editorship – Alpha Journal

Points	Level	Criteria
40	Editor-in-chief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alpha level, refereed publication (see Table 4 for Alpha level criteria) Participation in activity can be documented. Points for this activity are awarded only once per academic/fiscal/calendar year per journal.
28	Assoc./Section	
16	Guest, theme	
6	Guest, section	

Table 13b: Editorship – Beta Journal

Points	Level	Criteria
20	Editor-in-chief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beta level, refereed publication (see Table 4 for Beta level criteria) Participation in activity can be documented. Points for this activity are awarded only once per academic/fiscal/calendar year per journal.
14	Assoc./Section	
8	Guest, theme	
3	Guest, section	

Table 13c: Editorship – Delta Journal

Points	Level	Criteria
5	Editor-in-chief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delta level, refereed publication (see Table 4 for Delta level criteria) Participation in activity can be documented. Points for this activity are awarded only once per academic/fiscal/calendar year per journal
3.5	Assoc./Section	
2	Guest, theme	
1	Guest, section	

Table 14a: Editorship – Alpha Book

Points	Level	Criteria
30	Whole Book	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alpha level book (see Table 6 for Alpha level criteria) Name on document as editor. Participation in activity can be documented. Points for this activity are awarded only once per academic/fiscal/calendar year per book. Subsequent editions earn 33% of the points allocated to editorship of a book
14	Chapter	
6	Section	

Table 14b: Editorship – Beta Book

Points	Level	Criteria
20	Whole Book	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beta level book (see Table 6 for Beta level criteria) Name on document as editor. Participation in activity can be documented. Points for this activity are awarded only once per academic/fiscal/calendar year per book. Subsequent editions earn 33% of the points allocated to editorship of a book
10	Chapter	
4	Section	

Table 14c: Editorship – Delta Book

Points	Level	Criteria
10	Whole Book	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delta level book (see Table 6 for Delta level criteria) • Name on document as editor. • Participation in activity can be documented. • Points for this activity are awarded only once per academic/fiscal/calendar year per book. • Subsequent editions earn 33% of the points allocated to editorship of a book
4	Chapter	
2	Section	

Table 15: Journal Reviewer

Points	Level	Criteria
1	Alpha, Beta, Delta	Evidence of refereed journal level (see Table 4 for level criteria) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name on document as reviewer. • Participation in activity can be documented. • 1 point earned per manuscript reviewed.

Table 16: Book Reviewer

Points	Level	Criteria
3	Book	Evidence of book level (see Table 6 for level criteria) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name on document as reviewer. • Participation in activity can be documented. • Points for this activity are awarded only once per academic/fiscal/calendar
1	Chapter Section	

Table 17: Professional Convention Reviewer

Points	Level	Criteria
1	Alpha, Beta, Delta	Evidence of convention level (see Table 7 for level criteria) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in activity can be documented. • 1 point earned per manuscript reviewed.

Table 18: Other Editor and/or Reviewer

Points	Authorship	Criteria
		Any activities not yet identified will be assigned a point value by the Chair based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effort required to develop product, • Quality of product, • Impact of product on profession, • Norm-referenced comparison of product to other activities within the same performance area, • Professional judgment, and • A written justification from the individual who developed the product suggesting a point value.

Grantsmanship

Table 19a: External Funded Grantsmanship Alpha

Points	Authorship	Criteria
30	1st	Alpha level grants are evidenced by <i>(two or more of the following)</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly competitive nature, • Granting agency is highly esteemed in discipline, • High dollar value of grant: >\$100,000.00
21	2nd	
12	3rd	
4.5	≤4th	

Table 19b: External Funded Grantsmanship Beta

Points	Authorship	Criteria
20	1st	Beta level grants are evidenced by <i>(two or more of the following)</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderately competitive nature, • Granting agency is moderately esteemed in discipline, • Modest dollar value of grant: >\$5,000.00
14	2nd	
8	3rd	
3	≤4th	

Table 19c: External Funded Grantsmanship Delta

Points	Authorship	Criteria
10	1st	Delta level grants are evidenced by <i>(two or more of the following)</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low competitive nature, • Granting agency is esteemed in discipline, • Low dollar value of grant: >\$500.00
7	2nd	
4	3rd	
2	≤4th	

Table 20a: Internal Funded Grantsmanship Alpha

Points	Authorship	Criteria
10	1st	Alpha level grants are evidenced by <i>(one or more of the following)</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly competitive nature, • High dollar value of grant: >\$3,000.00
7	2nd	
4	3rd	
2	≤4th	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Points awarded upon money received • Participation in activity can be documented. • No more than one non-funded grant per year receives ½ credit.

Table 20b: Internal Funded Grantsmanship Beta

Points	Authorship	Criteria
5	1st	Beta level grants are evidenced by <i>(one or more of the following)</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Moderately competitive nature,• Modest dollar value of grant: >\$1,000.00• Points awarded upon money received• Participation in activity can be documented.• No more than one non-funded grant per year receives ½ credit.
3.5	2nd	
2	3rd	
1	≤4th	

Table 20c: Internal Funded Grantsmanship Delta

Points	Authorship	Criteria
3	1st	Delta level grants are evidenced by <i>(one or more of the following)</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Low competitive nature,• Low dollar value of grant: >\$100.00• Points awarded upon money received• Participation in activity can be documented.• No more than one non-funded grant per year receives ½ credit.
2	2nd	
1	3rd	
0.5	≤4th	

Table 21: Other Grantsmanship

Points	Authorship	Criteria
		Any activities not yet identified will be assigned a point value by the Chair based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Effort required to develop product,• Quality of product,• Impact of product on profession,• Norm-referenced comparison of product to other activities within the same performance area,• Professional judgment, and• A written justification from the individual who developed the product suggesting a point value.

Scholarship Honors and Awards

Table 22: Scholarship Honors & Awards

Points	Level	Criteria
	National	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Points negotiated with chair• Honor or award can be documented
	Regional	
	State	
	University	
	Community	

Performance Area 3: Service

Service Overview

RTPM scores for service are based on service activities at the following levels:

- International/National (Table 21)
- Multi-State (Table 22)
- State (Table 23)
- University/Department/Area (Table 24)
- Community/District (Table 25)
- Service Honors & Awards (Table 26)

First-Year Assistant Professor Service Matriculation:

In order to aid first-year assistant professors in providing service to the department, university, etc., the basic raise criteria for service is reduced by 33% from 21 points to 14 points.

Table 23a: International/National Service Activities

Points	Activity	Criteria
20	Member of Executive Board, Discipline-oriented Committee	Participation in activity can be documented
15	Chair, Discipline-oriented Committee	
8	Member, Discipline-oriented Committee	
2	Member, National Level Discipline-oriented Organization (dues paid) *Up to 3 points per year may be earned for membership in national, regional, state, and/or community/district organizations.	
	Officers of committees receive a negotiated value between the point values for member and chair	
	Other	

Table 23b: International/National Service Workshop, Symposium, Event

Points	Workshop, Symposium, Event: Leadership role	Criteria
15	Multi-day	Participation in activity can be documented
10	Full-day	
7	Partial-day (lecture/presentation)	
	Other	

Table 24a: Multi-state Service Activities

Points	Activity	Criteria
15	Member of Executive Board, Discipline-oriented Committee	Participation in activity can be documented
10	Chair, Discipline-oriented Committee	
6	Member, Discipline-oriented Committee	
2	Member, Regional Level Discipline-oriented Organization (dues paid) *Up to 3 points per year may be earned for membership in national, regional, state, and/or, community/district organizations	
	Officers of committees receive a negotiated value between the point values for member and chair	
	Other	

Table 24b: Multi-state Service Workshop, Symposium, Event

Points	Workshop, Symposium, Event: Leadership role	Criteria
12	Multi-day	Participation in activity can be documented
8	Full-day	
5	Partial-day (lecture/presentation)	
	Other	

Table 25a: State Service Activities

Points	Activity	Criteria
10	Member of Executive Board, Discipline-oriented Committee	Participation in activity can be documented
8	Chair, Discipline-oriented Committee	
3	Member, Discipline-oriented Committee	
1	Member, State Level Discipline-oriented Organization (dues paid) *Up to 3 points per year may be earned for membership in national, regional, state, and/or, community/district organizations	
	Officers of committees receive a negotiated value between the point values for member and chair	
	Other	

Table 25b: State Workshop, Symposium, Event

Points	Workshop, Symposium, Event: Leadership role	Criteria
10	Multi-day	Participation in activity can be documented
7	Full-day	
4	Partial-day (lecture/Presentation)	
	Other	

Table 26a: Univ/Dept/Area Service Activities

Points	Activity	Criteria
12	Chair, University Committee	Participation in activity can be documented.
10	Member, Faculty Senate	
10	Advisor, Professional Student Club/Organization	
10	Chair, Department Committee	
6	Member, Committee	
4	Lead Observer, PHES Teaching Enhancement Process	
2	Secondary Observer, PHES Teaching Enhancement Process	
2	Attending Graduation, Open House, or Convocation *Faculty may earn 2 points per event with a maximum of 6 points per year for attending graduation, open house, &/or convocation.	
2	Mentorship Assisting with individual growth plan, teaching enhancement or advisement (meeting with mentee at least 3 times in year, documentation letter required from mentee)	
	Officers of committees receive a negotiated value between the point values for member and chair	
	Other	

Table 26b: Univ/Dept/Area Service Workshop, Symposium, Event

Points	Workshop, Symposium, Event: Leadership role	Criteria
5	Multi-day	Participation in activity can be documented
3	Full-day	
2	Partial-day (lecture/Presentation)	
	Other	

Table 27a: Community/District Service

Points	Activity	Criteria
7	Member of Executive Board, Discipline-oriented Committee	Participation in activity can be documented
5	Chair, Discipline-oriented Committee	
3	Member, Discipline-oriented Committee	
1	Member, Community/District Level Discipline-oriented Organization (dues paid) *Up to 3 points per year may be earned for membership in national, regional, state, and/or, community/district organizations	
	Officers of committees receive a negotiated value between the point values for member and chair	
	Other	

Table 27b: Community/District Service Workshop, Symposium, Event

Points	Workshop, Symposium, Event: Leadership role	Criteria
5	Multi-day	Participation in activity can be documented
3	Full-day	
2	Partial-day (lecture/Presentation	
	Other	

Table 28: Service Grantsmanship

Points	Award Amount	Criteria
10	>100,000.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service grants are evidenced by: • Granting agency is non-profit in discipline • Activity resulting from grant money has an impact potential on profession • Student clubs are excluded from point awarding. • Points awarded upon money received. • Participation in activity can be documented.
7	>50,000.00	
4	>5,000.00	
2	>500.00	

Table 29: Service Honors & Awards

Points	Level	Criteria
	National	Points negotiated with chair Honor or award can be documented
	Regional	
	State	
	University	
	Community	