Faculty Performance Expectations
OUTDOOR ADVENTURE LEADERSHIP

Professional faculty members will be measured against the expectations listed under teaching and service (see section 5.224 and 5.226). Professorial faculty members will be measured against the expectations listed under teaching, scholarship and service (see sections 5.224-5.226).

All faculty members should be making progress toward performing at the preferred level in each of the areas applicable to their appointment. The acceptable level describes the minimum performance expected for continued employment. Note: unacceptable performance is defined as below an acceptable level and may require a plan for correction (see 5.370).

The preferred level describes the average or typical performance level for a faculty member making good progress toward final promotion. The exceptional level would characterize and recognize faculty who demonstrated significant achievements, well beyond the preferred level.

All faculty members must have the educational background required and have completed the required years in rank prior to the effective date of promotion or the required years of service prior to the date of awarding of tenure or a three-year extendable appointment (see section 5.223).

In addition, the faculty member's performance portfolio must be reviewed and demonstrate that there are sufficient contributions in each of the areas appropriate to the faculty member's appointment. Faculty must meet or exceed the acceptable performance level in each area applicable to their appointment. The number of areas required to exceed the acceptable level gradually increases (see table below) until all areas must be at the preferred level for final promotion (Senior Instructor 2 or Full Professor). Note: exceptional performance is not expected, nor required for promotion to any rank, however faculty members may elect to replace preferred performance in two areas with acceptable performance in one area and exceptional performance in the other.

Minimum Promotion and Tenure Performance Requirements

	Min Acceptable	Min Preferred	Min Exceptional
SR Instructor 1 (3 year extendable appt.)	1	1	
SR Instructor 2		2 — OR —	
	1		1
Associate	2	1	
Tenure	1	2 — OR —	
	2		1
Professor		3 — OR —	
	1	1	1

In reviewing the characteristics at each level, no faculty member will exactly fit the description in any one column. The evaluation goal is to identify the column that best describes an individual faculty member's performance in this area.

Teaching Performance Levels

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
Student evaluations • Rate instructor's teaching effectiveness "very good" or higher (see section 5.260)	**Student evaluations** • Rate instructor's teaching effectiveness at or near "outstanding" (see section 5.260)	**Student evaluations** • Rate the instructor's teaching effectiveness well into the "outstanding" category (see section 5.260)

Classroom Instruction
• Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction, such as
  o Professional development activities that impacted instruction
  o Work with colleagues that impacted instruction
 	
• Evidence of effective practices, such as
  o Reflection and self-improvement
  o Engaging teaching methods
  o Providing meaningful classroom experiences
	Classroom Instruction
	• Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction (see acceptable column)
	
	• Beyond evidence of effective practices (see acceptable column), also shares successful and/or innovative practices with colleagues
		Classroom Instruction
		• Recognized by colleagues as a highly skilled and knowledgeable instructor
		
		• Models excellent teaching
		
		• Demonstrates attention and responsiveness to student needs

Curricular Development
• Participates in curricular revisions by making meaningful recommendations for curricular changes that reflect student and market demands
• Integrates courses into departmental programs, such as
  o Effectively prepares students for subsequent courses
  o Effectively builds on students prior learning
  o Effectively addresses dept'l learning outcomes
	Curricular Development
	• Beyond integrating courses into departmental programs (see acceptable column), also is an effective partner in curricular and program design and delivery
	
	Mentoring
	• Actively involved in some student mentoring activities
		Curricular Development (see preferred column)
		
		Student/Colleague Mentoring
		• Significant student mentoring activities (either in quantity or quality of work with students)
		
		• Mentors colleagues to develop their instructional abilities (assessment, curricular design, effective delivery, etc.)

Departmental Needs • Cooperates with program faculty in meeting departmental loading needs	**Departmental Needs** (see acceptable column)	**Departmental Needs** (see acceptable column)

[Department Expectations take the form of added bullets (solid circles) under any or all of the headings above as well as added bullets (open circles) under any or all of the existing bullets above.]

Service Performance Levels

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional

Departmental Service
• Active participant in dept'l work:
   o Advising students in dept'l programs; writing letters of recommendation; assisting at preview days, registration and orientation activities; and other advising related activities
   o Effective contributor on his/her fair share of dept'l committees
   o Effectively carrying out his/her fair share of individual dept'l tasks
 	
University/Professional Service
• Some activity beyond department or program (e.g. serve on active University committee most years under review). Active service in professional organization or capacity may substitute for a University committee.
	Departmental Service (see acceptable column)
	
	University/Professional Service
	• University service on active committees (at least one committee every year under review, more if committee(s) is not very active). Active service in professional organization or capacity may substitute for a University committee.
	
	• Effective partner in accomplishing assignments
	
	Leadership
	• Some documentable accomplishment in a leadership role at the departmental, institutional or professional level during period under review (department chair, program coordinator, faculty program director, chair active committee, lead taskforce, significant individual task, etc.)
		Departmental Service (see acceptable column)
		
		University/Professional Service (see preferred column)
		
		Leadership
		• Recognized as a faculty leader on campus
		
		• Served in multiple leadership roles
		
		• Significant accomplishments at the institutional level as a faculty leader (either multiple committees or taskforces, as a program director, as a department chair, or other significant leadership responsibilities resulting in multiple documentable achievements that furthered the institutional mission)

[Department Expectations take the form of added bullets (solid circles) under any or all of the headings above as well as added bullets (open circles) under any or all of the existing bullets above.]

Scholarship Performance Levels

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional

Originality
• Each publication, presentation, and/or grant application cited includes some original content from this faculty member
• A combination of at least three publications, presentations and/or grant applications were cited
 	
Meaningfulness
• Must include at least one publication
• May include one or more presentations
• May include external grant application(s) even if not funded
 	
Review
• All publications, presentations, and/or grant applications passed at least a generous review process
 	
Dissemination
• Three publications, presentations, and/or grant applications cited received at least multi-state dissemination
	Originality
	• Each publication, presentation, and/or grant application cited includes some original content from this faculty member, some of which included significant original content
	• A combination of at least four publications, presentations and/or grant applications were cited
	
	Meaningfulness
	• Must include at least one national publication or two multi-state publications
	• May include one or more presentations
	• May include modest external grant application(s) (eg. $10K one-time grant)
	
	Review
	• One publications, presentations, and/or grant applications passed at least a moderately competitive review process
	
	Dissemination
	• At least one publications, presentations, and/or grant applications was nationally disseminated
		Originality
		• The quantity and/or quality of publications, presentations and/or grant applications cited were well above average with significant original content from this faculty members, some as lead author. Examples:
		  o A combination of at least five publications, presentations and/or grant applications were cited, including at least two publications
		  o A single pivotal publication in the field, widely recognized for its impact, which results in invitations to conferences, workshops or other follow-up activities.
		
		Meaningfulness
		• Recognized as a scholar/expert in field (either in a multi-state region or nationally). Examples:
		  o Significant national publication
		  o Invited speaker at a national conference
		  o Consultant for significant state or national body
		  o Sizeable external grant award(s) (eg. multi-year grant in excess of $200K)
		• See examples listed under originality regarding quantity and/or quality of publications, presentations, and/or grants applications cited
		
		Review
		• Most publications, presentations, and/or grant applications passed at least a moderately competitive review process, including at least one formally refereed

		article that underwent a highly competitive review process. **Dissemination** • At least three publications, presentations, and/or grant applications cited were nationally disseminated

The following lists are not intended to be comprehensive, but representative to guide HPEL faculty in evaluating potential venues:
• The determination of multi-state versus national is based on the breath of audience reached. In some cases, multiple regional activities may result in a national reach;
• Examples of multi-state venues (or the equivalent thereof): presentations at regional conferences such as NWAAHPERD; publications in well-respected regional journals such as Northwest Public health Journal; exercise science/health education/physical education/outdoor recreation work that has significant impact in Oregon such as in conjunction with Oregon Department of Education, local and regional school districts, etc.
• Examples of venues with generous review processes: publications in non-refereed journals; presentations at local organizations/schools (though some types of presentations are more restrictive and may be rated more competitively)
• Examples of venues with moderately competitive review processes: publications in peer-reviewed journals with impact factors less than 3; presentations at regional conferences with a peer review process.
• Examples of venues with highly competitive review processes: publications in peer-reviewed journals with impact factors greater than 3; presentations at national or internationals meetings including the following organizations (ACSM, SBM, FASED, AAHPERD, AJHP)