USF SARASOTA-MANATEE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

This Tenure and Promotion Guide document the standards that will guide the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) Tenure and Promotion Committee (hereafter called the Committee) members and supports Tenure and promotion candidates in the preparation of their applications.

For candidates, this guide describes the breadth of activities that teaching, scholarship and service comprise and the extent to which evidence of faculty performance should be reflected in a tenure and promotion portfolio. In addition, suggestions for organizing portfolios are given. Careful thought, planning and attention to detail in the presentation of one’s scholarly record are critical to accurately communicate one’s accomplishments and their significance to the numerous colleagues and administrators who will review. All candidates should refer to the University’s Policy Document pertaining to the University’s protocol in relationship to Tenure and Promotion.

For the Committee, this guide provides working definitions of the dimensions underlying the domains of teaching, research and service. These dimensions indicate potential areas in which faculty may document their professional activities. For each dimension, the criteria that suggest ratings of Outstanding, Strong, and Satisfactory performance are delineated. These criteria are intended to provide a common understanding of the scope and rigor of the Tenure and Promotion review.

This document outlines the criteria for rating a candidate’s application in the three areas of teaching, research, and service as outlined in the University’s Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. The criteria presented within each of the domains broadly define the dimensions of teaching, research and service that should be considered in a candidate’s evaluation, and the ratings of Outstanding, Strong, and Satisfactory.

Committee members must not interpret the criteria listed in each rating frame as rigid requirements. A candidate may be rated as Outstanding without showing superiority in every dimension within the scoring frame. In addition, it must be recognized that the dimensions presented in the Guide cannot represent all aspects of teaching, research and service that are pertinent to Tenure and Promotion decisions. Faculty collegiality, facility in collaborative activities and regular practice of organizational citizenship are cross-cutting dimensions of faculty performance that demonstrate performance in teaching, research and service.

In summary, these guidelines are not intended to prescribe inflexible minimal criteria for tenure and promotion, but rather to communicate expectations to faculty candidates for tenure and promotion and expectations to the Committee and administrators about our College’s common understanding of faculty productivity.
REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARDS TENURE

An annual review of each faculty member is required and used to evaluate a faculty member’s performance. The evaluation is based on the faculty member’s self-generated activity report, evaluations of teaching efforts, and other pertinent data concerning the faculty member’s efforts. This annual review is an appropriate time for the Dean and the Annual Review Committee to assess faculty who are untenured and in tenure-earning positions as to the progress they have made toward being awarded tenure by the university. This evaluation should be in writing with a copy given to the faculty member who may then respond to the assessment of progress toward tenure if they choose to do so. The evaluation should be made in view of the university and college’s mission and goals, the faculty member’s annual assignment, the faculty member’s activity report and the evaluation of that report.

Within the written assessment of the faculty member’s progress toward earning tenure, there should be a very complete and explicit explanation of how the candidate’s assessment was derived, whether or not the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards achieving tenure, and if not, why not. If the candidate is not making satisfactory progress toward being granted tenure, the assessment should indicate those areas that need improvement and provide suggestions as to how the deficiencies may be corrected.

A mid-tenure review usually occurs upon completion of three years in a tenure-earning position at the university. Each faculty member is given a thorough and comprehensive review for the purposes of deciding whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards tenure; if the performance level is likely to continue in the future; and whether or not the faculty member should be offered a continuing contract or a terminal contract. This evaluation, referred to as the "mid-tenure review," should be made before the university’s deadline for extending terminal contracts expires and also allow enough time for the faculty member to appeal the evaluation if so desired.

Mid-tenure reviews will be performed initially at the academic-unit level and subsequently by the USFSM Tenure and Promotion Committee. Documentation for these reviews shall parallel that of the tenure and promotion process except that outside reviews shall not be requested. The USFSM Tenure and Promotion Committee shall provide a report to the Dean and the Regional Vice Chancellor. The report shall include an analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the case as well as a statement as to whether or not the USFSM Tenure and Promotion Committee believes the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion. After the USFSM Tenure and Promotion Committee submits its report, a joint meeting of the candidate and the Dean will be held to discuss the candidate’s progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

Prior to beginning the formal initiation of the tenure/promotion process, the college Dean should request a meeting with the faculty member with regard to his/her progress toward being awarded tenure. At this meeting, the faculty member should be given advice on whether or not to begin the formal tenure/promotion process. The Dean should then give the faculty a written explanation of the faculty’s readiness.
REVIEW FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Promotion to Associate Professor usually accompanies the awarding of tenure. To be eligible for promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must earn a rating of Outstanding in either teaching or scholarship activity, and a rating of either Outstanding or Strong in the other, as well as a record of service that is rated Strong or higher for the period under review. The dimensions of scholarship that are delineated here are applicable to promotion decisions regarding the rank of Associate Professor as well as Professor with the understanding that the standard of evidence for demonstrating Outstanding, Strong, and Satisfactory increases with the rank sought.

REVIEW FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

To be eligible for promotion to Professor, candidates must provide documentation and reflection of ratings earned in each annual review following promotion to Associate Professor. The rank of Professor reflects a composite of an individual’s continuing academic and service contributions and accomplishments within USFSM as well as to her or his respective discipline or profession. Moreover, the rank of Professor denotes a status and level of significant achievement among her or his disciplinary peers. With few exceptions, to achieve the rank of Professor, the candidate must demonstrate national or international recognition for his/her scholarship. Standards call for true distinction in at least one of the three areas of teaching, scholarly research, and service, coupled with a record of substantial achievements in each of the other two areas. That is to say, campus-wide and College standards do not permit appointment to the rank of Professor without significant distinction, documented on a career basis, in either the teaching, scholarly research, or service area of responsibility. Regardless of the area of distinction, substantial contributions of a continuing nature in each of the remaining areas are also necessary for the achievement of the rank of Professor.

Although a candidate’s contributions and accomplishments over an entire career may be reviewed, emphasis will be placed on those achievements following the individual’s promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or during his or her tenure at USFSM. To be eligible for promotion to Professor, the candidate must earn a rating of Outstanding in either teaching or scholarship, and a rating of either Outstanding or Strong in the other, as well as a record of service that is rated Strong or higher from the time of promotion to associate professor and/or tenure.

PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING OUTSIDE REVIEWERS

All currently employed faculty members applying for tenure or for promotion to Associate or Professor are required by the College of Arts and Sciences’ policy to have their research and scholarship evaluated by "external" reviewers who are generally recognized for their contributions and stature in the field. These assessments are to be based upon a detailed review of the candidate’s written work, not simply a scrutiny of a curriculum vitae. Faculty members, in consultation with the Dean, will choose what material to forward for review and may include, for example, manuscripts in press and submitted, non-published and in-progress work, as well as peer-reviewed publications. These reviews become part of the Tenure/Promotion Application.
Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are expected to follow the external review process described in the promotion and tenure application. Specifically, candidates should recommend at least five reviewers to the College Dean. Recommendations should be accompanied by brief statements supporting the choices. If reviewers are recommended who have had significant previous contact with the candidate, reasons for that choice should be represented in sufficient detail to allay proper concerns about conflict of interest. While previous contact on a professional level does not constitute a conflict of interest, reviewers should not be selected from those with whom the candidate has had familiar or close social relationships, who are former professors of the candidate, or co-authors of the candidate (except to ascertain levels of participation and contribution to jointly authored works). Reviewers should be highly regarded and recognized scholars in the candidate’s field and able to evaluate the quality, productivity, and significance of his/her scholarly activity. Reviewers should ideally be from peer or better institutions and should also be tenured faculty members at higher academic ranks (for decisions regarding promotion) and tenured faculty at the same or higher academic ranks (for decisions regarding tenure only).

The Dean of the College, in consultation with the candidate, will create a list of five to six possible external reviewers from which at least three will be selected. In the event the Dean or the candidate believes additional recommendations are desirable or necessary, then (1) the candidate should make or be requested to make supplementary recommendations, and (2) the Dean may suggest additional reviewers to the candidate. Ordinarily this process should result in a list of reviewers acceptable to the candidate and college Dean. Should agreement not be reached, the College tenured faculty, in consultation with the college Dean, will select potential reviewers from lists provided by the candidate and the Dean.

The candidate will provide copies of a current vitae and other materials appropriate for an external review of scholarly work. The Dean will forward these materials with an invitation to the reviewers. It is recommended that the Dean tentatively solicit reviewers by phone in advance of the formal invitation by letter.
TEACHING

First and foremost faculty members are teachers. Therefore the baseline for faculty assignment is teaching. In general, in rounded math, teaching a three-credit course is 20-25% for the assignment each term. Teaching four courses in a semester is usually considered teaching a full load (there are exceptions). Other workload assignments and expectations are noted by redirecting a percentage of the FTE to other areas of performance.

In CAS at USFSM, only visiting instructors teach a full load (4/4) because they are not expected to perform service, beyond involvement with their discipline and the college. All permanent faculty members are provided with one course redirection of their workload to service, usually seen as 10%-25% distributed in fall and spring.

Tenure track faculty members usually have a teaching load of 2/3 or 3/2. Their teaching loads are reduced to 50-60% because their appointments require research and publication productivity, as well as service. Tenure seekers have the heaviest burden to produce research scholarship, so for them the third course assignment can be designed as a small special topics course, in which selected advanced students can work with the professor on his/her research. Thus, an element of the assignment credited to teaching can assist productivity in research.

The baseline for being an effective teacher includes but is not limited to (1) maintaining high standards, (2) keeping up on current research on teaching practices, (3) assuming responsibility for the curricula of their programs, (4) being academically rigorous, and (5) collaborating with faculty and students. In evaluating teaching performance, the Committee will examine a wide array of factors that impact teaching performance and will not rely on a single measure of performance. Two aspects of teaching are emphasized: evidence of teaching effectiveness and academic rigor.

Faculty members are fully responsible for providing evidence of their teaching-related activities. This evidence could be compiled into a teaching-related portfolio. This file could contain evidence, for example, that faculty members have created an online course, have used innovative pedagogical practices, and have completed teaching-related courses and workshops to help modify and improve their individual teaching. The Committee requires faculty to submit copies of their syllabi and the means and criteria by which they assess their students (e.g., rubrics and assessment tools, Power Point presentations, innovative techniques, up-to-date technology, and work samples from students). Additionally, the Committee requires a thoughtful reflective statement outlining the candidate’s philosophy of education and how the philosophy is demonstrated in teaching. Finally, the Committee highly recommends that student written evaluations be examined and a reflective analysis be provided demonstrating growth.

The faculty recognizes that some courses have lower averages on student evaluations than others regardless of the instructor. It is the candidate’s responsibility to request data from the Dean (e.g., means and standard deviation on those courses they wish the Committee to evaluate) and to construct an interpretation to the Committee in order to make a more accurate assessment of the student’s ratings.
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The following five categories will be taken into consideration when evaluating one’s portfolio: (1) continuous improvement in teaching over time (reflective), (2) content knowledge and expertise, (3) delivery, (4) academic rigor, and (5) student achievement.

The following accomplishments are based on but not limited to the following examples:

- substantial revisions of existing courses based upon student comments or new research
- number of teaching preparations per semester
- teaching evaluations demonstrate a consistent pattern of improvement
- teaching evaluations are consistently high
- receive teaching awards from either students or faculty organizations
- developing and implementing online courses
- integrating Web enhanced resources into existing courses
- developing new courses
- revising courses substantively
- developing and supervising experiential learning projects for students
- conducting collaborative research with students
- developing workshops
- teaching in continuing education classes
- continuing education/faculty development
- taking classes related to teaching
- participating in trainings/workshops related to teaching
- participating in campus programs to improve teaching
- developing technology skills to improve teaching
- using available programs to improve teaching
- teaching courses that demonstrate academic rigor (e.g., essay exams, research papers, requiring students to read peer-reviewed journal articles)
- student presentations at local, regional, national meetings
- student awards for research

CAS applies the principle of data-driven decisions and actions to teaching. Thus, CAS faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are learning from the data and modifying their teaching methods as appropriate. In the Teaching Narrative, they should discuss the data noting significant findings as well as explaining anomalies and discussing plans in response.

Effective teaching is not limited to the above, as these and the following criteria serve only as a guide for assessing potential elements of teacher effectiveness. The following categories provide a guide to aid the Committee in differentiating between Outstanding, Strong, and Satisfactory.

**OUTSTANDING IN TEACHING**

*Continuous improvement in teaching over time (reflective)*

Narrative in teaching portfolio reflects a thoughtful, respectful, thorough consideration of feedback about teaching and consistent reflection about ways of improving or maintaining a high standard of teaching. Furthermore, faculty members may wish to document any changes they
made related to their teaching. There is a clearly expressed alignment between the stated philosophy and teaching approach. Evidence of course development and revision of existing courses is offered.

Generally, an overall average score above the USFSM CAS average on Annual Reports during the review period equates to outstanding. It is the Candidates responsibility to identify the way in which the course was delivered (e.g., an online course). The Committee recognizes that overall means may differ depending on the way courses are delivered.

Content knowledge and expertise

Syllabi reflect course content that is current in the discipline. Syllabi contain content that will prepare students to master the knowledge and skills identified by relevant learned societies or that reflect conscientious dissent from these standards. The syllabi demonstrate academic rigor whereby the student is exposed to current peer-reviewed research, required to complete written assignments, and evaluated with critical analytical tools such as essay exams.

Course delivery

Syllabi reflect a logical, thoughtfully sequenced course. Expectations are stated explicitly and assignments explained in detail. Student evaluations indicate that instruction was delivered effectively, the instructor was very prepared, explained concepts clearly, and effectively used a variety of instructional strategies to deliver content.

Teaching materials, handouts, course format, course requirement, instructional approaches are clearly aligned with the course objectives and are creative/innovative, reflecting a variety of instructional approaches. The faculty member is available during posted office hours.

Student achievement

Student products reflect outstanding achievement and/or substantial learning/ progress over time. Teaching narrative, instructional materials, student evaluations, and observations of teaching indicate a high level of skill in involving and motivating all students. Individual students’ needs and perspectives are clearly respected and valued.

STRONG IN TEACHING

Continuous improvement in teaching over time (reflective)

Narrative in teaching portfolio reflects consideration of feedback about teaching and reflection about ways of improving teaching. Furthermore, faculty members may wish to document any changes they made related to their teaching. A correspondence between stated philosophy and teaching approach is evident. Evidence of course development and revision of existing courses is offered. Generally, an overall average student evaluation score at or above the USFSM CAS average equates to strong.
Content knowledge and expertise

Syllabi and course content reflect many of the current issues in the field. Syllabi contain content that will prepare students with knowledge and skills identified by relevant learned societies. The syllabi demonstrate some academic rigor (e.g., few written assignments, mostly multiple choice exams, few peer-reviewed articles are assigned).

Course delivery

Syllabi are organized and class activities appear to be logically sequenced. Assignments are clearly explained. Student evaluations indicate that the instructor was prepared, explained concepts well, and used effective teaching strategies (candidates should outline their teaching strategies in their narratives).

Teaching materials, handouts, course format, instructional approaches are aligned with the course objectives and reflect a variety of instructional approaches. The faculty member is available during posted office hours.

Student achievement

Student products are of good quality and clearly reflect considerable learning and progress over time. Teaching narrative, instructional materials, student evaluations, and observations of teaching demonstrate a commitment to and general success in involving and motivating all students.

Satisfactory in teaching

Continuous improvement in teaching over time (reflective)

Narrative in teaching portfolio reflects efforts to self-evaluate and attend to helpful feedback, but a corresponding change in teaching behavior is limited. Correspondence between the stated philosophy and teaching approaches is implied. An overall average student evaluation score reflecting that most courses meet the USFASM CAS average equates to satisfactory.

Content knowledge and expertise

Syllabi and course content contain some of the current issues in the field. Syllabi contain content that will prepare students with principal knowledge and skills identified by relevant learned societies. Syllabi indicate little academic rigor (e.g., only multiple choice exams, no writing assignments, little to no outside peer-reviewed readings).

Course delivery

Syllabi suggest that the course format was adequately organized and student evaluations for the most part report that the instructor was usually prepared and mostly explained concepts in comprehensible ways. Teaching materials, handouts, course format, instructional approaches are
somewhat aligned with the course objectives and reflect some variation in approach. The faculty member is often available during posted office hours.

_Student achievement_

Student products are of acceptable quality and reflect adequate learning progress over time. Teaching narrative, instructional materials, student evaluations, and observations of teaching reflect efforts to involve and motivate all students, but student feedback and teaching observations across multiple semesters indicate that some students’ needs and perspectives are not being successfully addressed.

**SCHOLARSHIP**

The most fundamental expectation in the area called “research” is scholarly productivity and impact. The Committee considers faculty members’ complete scholarly record. In general, yearly publications of high quality in peer-reviewed journals are expected or books published by an academic press. However, the faculty recognizes that many research projects take more than one year to complete. The faculty also recognize that when peer reviewed articles appear in print is largely determined by the journal. As a result, faculty members may have years with multiple publications and other years with few. Faculty can present an explanation to the Committee regarding variations in publication. In addition, the Committee will consider the quality of the refereed publications. Therefore, faculty members must provide evidence of the quality of the journals that publish their scholarly work (e.g., rankings, impact scores). Depending on the discipline, the Committee will expect a mix of collaborative, first author, and single authorships. Scholarly activities prior to employment at USFSM also will be considered.

Rationale: The single most important goal of professional activity should be to stay current with the scholarship within the field. Staying current with the literature is also the foundation for all other professional activities. Faculty members must document and explain the various aspects of their ongoing scholarship to receive a baseline score of Satisfactory.

Once the requirement for submitting a document that explains the various aspects of the scholarly record is met, items from the following list may demonstrate evidence of strong or outstanding scholarship:

- completing the writing of a book which contributes to the profession
- publishing research articles in refereed journals
- receiving a book contract
- publishing a new edition of a book
- publishing book chapters
- obtaining a refereed grant
- citations in major reviews, articles, and books
- revising a manuscript that has been submitted for peer review
- submitting manuscripts for peer review
• publishing non-refereed articles
• manuscripts in preparation
• constructing reviews of professional literature
• attending workshops on grant-writing, publishing, technology use
• presenting papers at regional, national, and international professional meetings
• being a co-author on student presentations at regional or national meetings
• submission of a grant
• guiding collaborative scholarly activities at a Professional Development School or other setting

Note that this list is not exclusive. We recognize the diversity of the disciplines in which these activities/criteria will be used to evaluate faculty and the diversity of ways that faculty make scholarly contributions to their respective fields. Candidates who believe they have made a scholarly contribution to the discipline in a manner not listed above should include it in their evaluation materials with a justification for why the Committee should consider it. Please also note that some of the documents listed above may overlap with other areas such as service or teaching. It is up to the faculty member to explain why the activity should be considered as relevant to scholarship. When faculty members are making their impact assertions, they should keep in mind that some, Committee members may not be in the same discipline, and, thus they should clarify points about the substance of their publications.

The following categories provide a guide to aid the Committee in differentiating between Outstanding, Strong, and Satisfactory.

OUTSTANDING IN SCHOLARSHIP

Quality of Scholarship/Dissemination

The scholarly record suggests regular substantive contributions which consistently meet the highest standards of quality in the field.

Scholarly products are regularly disseminated through venues that include refereed publication in the most respected/relevant journals/publications in the field and presentations/addresses at the most respected professional conferences, with an intended audience of academics, practitioners, or both.

Coherent Program of Scholarship

The scholarly record reflects a coherent, organized, and systematic program of scholarship.

Productivity over Time

The scholarly record reflects a high level of productivity that is consistent across the faculty’s career. Typically, the Committee positively rewards faculty who publish, on average, at least one peer reviewed article per year. The Committee also recognizes that some disciplines more heavily rewards the publication of peer reviewed academic books as well as peer reviewed
journal articles.

*Mentorship and Collaboration*

The scholarly record indicates *regular, successful mentorship* of and collaboration with students, instructors, or tenure earning faculty.

**STRONG IN SCHOLARSHIP**

*Quality of Scholarship/Dissemination*

The scholarly record suggests *substantive contributions* that meet high standards of quality in the field.

Scholarly products are *disseminated* through venues that include refereed publication in *respected/relevant journals in the field* and *presentations(addresses at respected professional conferences)*, with an intended audience of academics, practitioners, or both.

*Coherent Program of Scholarship*

The scholarly record reflects *a fairly well-articulated, organized, coherent and systematic program of scholarship*.

The scholarly record reflects *regular attempts and periodic success to secure grants and other resources* to support the conduct of inquiry or other creative activities.

*Productivity over Time*

*In general, scholarly productivity is consistent across time, but the level of productivity is less than exceptionally high.*

*Mentorship and Collaboration*

The scholarly record indicates *regular attempts to mentor and collaborate with students, instructors, or tenure earning faculty*.

**SATISFACTORY IN SCHOLARSHIP**

*Quality of Scholarship/Dissemination*

The record suggests *limited contributions* that meet average standards of quality in the field. Scholarly products are generally *disseminated* through less selective *journal, conferences (local, state levels)*.
Coherent Research Program

The scholarly record suggests the beginnings of an organized, systematic program of scholarship and clear evidence of intent to develop a scholarly agenda.

Productivity over Time

In general, scholarly productivity is adequate but not consistent across the time period under evaluation.

Mentorship and Collaboration

The scholarly record indicates attempts to mentor and collaborate with students, instructors, or tenure earning faculty.

SERVICE

In evaluating service-related activities, the Committee will examine all aspects of a candidate’s service and not rely on a single measure of performance. As we are a small campus with a very limited number of faculty representing their discipline, it is important that faculty members verify a sustained commitment to service-related activities and that they fulfill their service obligations cooperatively and collegially. Applicants are fully responsible for providing evidence of their service-related activities.

All permanent faculty members are assigned workloads that include service to the university as well as to the community and/or the profession. Because service is part of each faculty member’s contract with the university, it is appropriately evaluated as part of any performance review.

The expectation for all faculty members is that they assist in the activities and duties of the institution, the profession, and the broader community served by USFSM. Note that the Committee recognizes that the service load will differ among faculty and across ranks (e.g., tenure earning faculty will have fewer service-related activities than tenured faculty). The Committee will also take into account the percentage of administrative assignments that are service-related based on the time allotted to service.

In their narrative, faculty members should briefly indicate level of responsibility to help the Committee understand the service commitments. For instance, membership in an organization might entail meeting attendance and event participation; serving on a committee of that organization would entail more involvement; and chairing that committee would entail even more involvement. Normal faculty involvements, such as CAS/USFSM governance and disciplinary curricula/assessment are not considered “service”; however, the Committee will consider designated appointments related to these responsibilities.
The following three categories are taken into consideration when evaluating a candidate’s service portfolio:

Service descriptors in each of the three service categories are provided. These examples are not a definitive list; rather they are intended to supply a broad range of evidence to be presented and considered. Participation in each of the categories is expected, but relative emphasis of each category will vary among candidates.

A. Service to the Institution (examples)

• Academic Advising
• Committee service (e.g., Annual Review, Search, Grievance, Faculty Governance, Student Awards)
• Leadership in service activities (chair of committee, etc.)
• Project committee or task force
• Sponsoring or advising a university student organization
• Recruiting and orienting new students
• Contributing to news media as a USFSM representative

B. Service to the Profession or Academic Discipline (examples)

• Officer, committee, or board member of a professional organization
• Editor of a professional publication (associate editor, consulting editor, etc.)
• Editorial Board Member of a professional publication
• Reviewer for professional journals, grant proposals, books and chapters, conference proposals
• Volunteer support for professional conferences (e.g., chairing a session)
• Contributing to news and popular media as an expert in the field

C. Service to the Local, State, Regional, National, and Global Community

• Officer or Board Member of an education-related civic organization
• Participant in educational community activities and programs
• Volunteer service to civic organizations related to faculty member’s discipline or university’s mission
• Liaison to Professional Development School

Community oriented service credited to a faculty member’s work assignment should be related in some way to their academic expertise or to the university’s mission and commensurate with the percentage assigned to service activities.

Please note that the above list is not exclusive. Faculty members can provide evidence of other service-related activities.
OUTSTANDING IN SERVICE

Service to the Institution

Narrative and documentation in the portfolio consistently demonstrate high levels of leadership on university/college councils/committees. Faculty consistently promotes the goals and mission of the university and college.

Service to the Profession or Academic Discipline

Narrative and documentation in portfolio consistently demonstrate a leadership role in his/her profession. Faculty assumes leadership roles in professional organizations. Faculty serves as journal editor and/or reviewer, assumes leadership role on accreditation and review teams.

Service to the Community

Faculty demonstrates high levels of leadership of constituencies in the community.

STRONG IN SERVICE

Service to the Institution

Narrative and documentation in the portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty participates on university and college councils and/or committees and contributes often to the goals and mission of the university and college.

Service to the Profession or Academic Discipline

Narrative and documentation in the portfolio consistently demonstrates faculty participates often to his/her professional organizations, participates in a leadership capacity in professional organizations, serves as journal reviewer, and serves on professional accreditation and review teams.

Service to the Community

Narrative and documentation in the portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty contributes often to constituencies in the community

SATISFACTORY IN SERVICE

Service to the Institution

Narrative and documentation in portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty generally serves to promote the goals and mission of the university and college.
Service to the Profession or Academic Discipline

Narrative and documentation in portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty generally shows development of an on-going agenda of service to multiple levels and constituencies.

Service to the Community

Narrative and documentation in portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty shows general cooperation and collaboration with constituencies in the community.