

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

FAM 651.544

Introduction

The purpose of these departmental guidelines is to provide faculty applying for retention, tenure or promotion, and the committees and administrators evaluating them with guidance regarding meeting and/or being above Departmental and University expectations. This document clarifies the meaning of the University criteria specified in FAM 300 in terms of the specific disciplinary and departmental context of Geological Sciences at CSUSB. The Department Evaluation Committee (DEC) and the Department Chair (Chair) will evaluate the documentation submitted under each category listed below on a case-by-case basis in order to determine both the quality and significance of the overall contribution of the faculty member being evaluated to the furtherance of the science and practice of geology, and to the mission of the Department. The mission of the Department is to provide high-quality training in the science of geology so as to equip our students (undergraduate and graduate) to successfully enter the geological workforce, and to contribute to the science of geology through faculty and students conducting and disseminating research in this field.

Overview of the Retention, Tenure and Promotion Process

The University document FAM 300 states that candidates will be evaluated in three basic areas:

Teaching

Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions

University and/or Community Service

Evidence of achievements in these three areas shall be presented in the form of a Faculty Activities Report (FAR) (See FAM 300 for details on preparing a FAR and any additional documentation). All faculty members that are subject to periodic evaluation or performance review have the sole responsibility for assembling the FAR, and providing the necessary explanations and documentation. Nonetheless, if the DEC or

the Chair finds any deficiencies in the faculty member's documentation of teaching, and/or research, scholarly and creative contributions, and/or service contributions, the committee or chair may request clarification, expansion or additional information from the faculty member through the Office of Academic Personnel before preparing an evaluation. Evidence of achievement shall encompass only the period under review (see FAM 300 for details). A faculty member subject to future performance review should begin assembling the appropriate materials as soon as possible and should maintain and continually update his or her FAR. Each faculty member is responsible for ensuring that each item included in his or her FAR is fully explained and documented. Failure to do so could result in the DEC and Chair not considering that item for evaluation. Items listed in more than one category should be noted as such, and their contribution to each category explained.

As per FAM 300, faculty members under review will be ranked for each of the three areas noted above as *Above Expectations*, *Meets Expectations*, *Below Expectations*, or *Well Below Expectations*. Although faculty members are given separate ratings for each of these three areas, the Department recognizes that the three areas are related and should be looked at collectively. In assigning ratings, the DEC and Chair will also take into account the faculty member's overall contribution to the Department.

For *retention after the second year*, a faculty member should at least **meet expectations** in at least two categories and should be rated no lower than **below expectations** in the third category. A rating of **below expectations** in two categories and **meets expectations** or higher in the third category is also permissible for retention but will result in recommendations from the President or designee as to what needs to be done to obtain successful future reviews.

For *retention after the fourth year*, a faculty member should at least **meet expectations** in all three categories. A rating of **below expectations** in one category is permissible for retention but will result in recommendations from the President or designee as to what needs to be done to obtain successful future reviews.

For *tenure*, a faculty member must at least **meet expectations** at present rank in all three categories.

To earn a positive recommendation for *promotion* from the DEC and Chair, the faculty member must earn an evaluation of **above expectations** (at the present rank) in at least one of the three categories, TEACHING, RESEARCH or SERVICE, with a minimum rating of **meets expectations** (at the present rank) in the other two. The faculty member is strongly encouraged to work towards an **above expectations** record in Teaching and/or Research as these have a higher departmental priority than an

above expectations record in Service. In addition, in their evaluation of the faculty member's achievements, the DEC and Chair will take into account the average amount of time, over the period under review, measured as a percentage of a normal academic load, i.e. 15 WTUs per quarter, that the faculty member was assigned to spend on Teaching, Research and Service. The faculty member should provide this information in the form of a table in his or her FAR, listing for each quarter the courses taught and the assigned WTUs for each course. The table should also list any specific research and/or service activities for which assigned time was officially granted, along with the number of WTUs granted and the source funds from which the Department was reimbursed for the assigned time: Department, College, Academic Affairs, or external funding.

In the case of a rating **below** or **well below expectations** (at any rank) the DEC and/or Chair shall explain and justify the rating.

Guidelines

A. TEACHING IN THE GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES

The Department of Geological Sciences follows the criteria for performance review as set forth below in accordance with the University document FAM 300. The categories considered include:

1. Command of Subject Matter

Command of subject matter is assessed by classroom visitation reports and by instructional materials submitted by the faculty member under review as attachments to his or her FAR. Student comments on Student Observation of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) forms also provide an indication of student perceptions of the faculty member's command of the subject matter. Student comments are taken into consideration in the context of the other indicators mentioned below, with the understanding that students have a limited basis on which to judge a faculty member's command of the subject matter. Student perceptions of a faculty member's command of the subject matter may be colored by a number of factors such as the instructor's confidence level, the instructor's ease in relating to students, and the student's degree of comfort with the instructor's teaching style. These factors are important in creating a positive learning environment for students, but do not necessarily provide reliable indicators of command of the subject matter. The FAR should also document the faculty member's efforts to remain abreast of new developments the fields in which he or she teaches, including evidence of conference attendance, evidence of reading current literature in the field, and incorporating new advances in the field into his or her classes, where appropriate.

2. Course Design/Preparation, Instructional Material, and Organization

Course design/preparation, instructional materials and organization are assessed by

syllabi and by samples of teaching materials attached to the FAR, as well as by classroom visitation reports and SOTE comments. The faculty member may also include statements in his or her FAR describing the rationale for the design and organization of his or her courses. The faculty member should also describe in his or her FAR his or her contribution to departmental curricular initiatives, including any new courses that were proposed and/or developed.

3. Effectiveness of Instruction

Effectiveness in teaching is assessed by SOTE scores and comments, by classroom visitation reports, and by samples of teaching materials attached to the FAR. The faculty member may also comment in his or her FAR on their own observations as to what particular aspects of their teaching have been most effective.

4. Academic Assessment of Students

Academic assessment of students is evaluated by samples of tests, quizzes, assignments, etc., attached to the FAR. As noted in FAM 300, faculty may also attach samples of assessed student work (with student identifying information removed). Student comments on the types of assessment, on the clarity of instructions for assessments, and particularly on the quality of feedback received are also taken into consideration. Course syllabi are also reviewed for clarity of explanation of the assessments used in the course.

In addition, a faculty member may also optionally submit evidence of participation in the collection and review of departmentally agreed upon (and/or individually developed, course-based) assessment measures, and by designing and implementing new exercises and/or new methods of teaching (e.g., active learning) aimed at improving student performance. Faculty may also include documentation to illustrate success in helping students achieve course-based or departmental learning outcomes.

All of these criteria are evaluated and used in assessing the faculty member's performance under this heading. Classroom and laboratory instruction, as well as supervision of individual student projects (undergraduate and graduate), and supervision of fieldwork (undergraduate and graduate), are the primary areas of consideration of teaching effectiveness.

For supervision courses, the faculty member should include in the FAR a list of supervision courses taught during the period under review that includes the quarter and year the course was taught, names of students supervised and titles of research or mapping projects undertaken by each student. For regular courses, please attach syllabi for all courses taught during the period under review. Normally one representative syllabus for each course is sufficient, but if any significant changes occurred in either the teaching of a particular course or in the syllabus itself during the period of review, then a copy of the syllabus showing these changes should also be

attached. Although samples of instructional materials and assessment instruments are normally attached to the classroom visitation reports, faculty should also submit samples of instructional and/or assessment materials they have developed in classes not visited during the period under review in order to fully document their commitment to effective teaching.

All faculty members are generally expected to receive SOTE scores comparable to departmental norms (e.g., within one standard deviation of the departmental mean for comparable types of courses). The Chair will circulate annually, for various categories of courses, the departmental means and standard deviations of SOTE scores. The DEC and Chair shall include these norms in their reports so as to make them available to higher levels of review. The Department of Geological Sciences recognizes that new courses or new preparations sometimes receive lower SOTE scores than well-established courses or versions of courses that the instructor has offered in the past. The Department also recognizes that there are some courses that students often find more challenging than others. In such cases the DEC and Chair will take these factors into account in their evaluations. SOTE scores and comments are interpreted in light of the overall pattern of teaching rather than for a single course. To illustrate this the faculty member should provide in his or her FAR in an appropriate format, e.g. as a table or graph, their SOTE scores over the period under review. The SOTE scores should be grouped into those from GE and Service courses, those from required courses for the major, and those from elective courses for the major. In addition, the faculty member must document in his or her FAR what measures were taken to address any deficiencies recognized in past evaluations or weaknesses indicated by SOTE scores or comments and the results achieved by these measures.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS OR ABOVE EXPECTATIONS IN THE AREA OF TEACHING

Meets Expectations

a. At the rank of Assistant Professor

During years two and three of the probationary period, the MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor must demonstrate command of the subject matter. Strong indications of developing abilities must also be demonstrated in the other teaching criteria. During subsequent years, proficiency in all teaching criteria must be evident.

b. At the rank of Associate Professor

The MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor must demonstrate proficiency in each of the four teaching criteria. See above for examples.

c. At the rank of Professor

The MEETS EXPECTATIONS teacher at the rank of Professor must continue to demonstrate proficiency in each of the four teaching criteria (see above for examples).

In addition, he or she must also demonstrate a record of involvement and achievement indicative of a commitment to continued professional performance in teaching.

Involvement can be demonstrated by participating in departmental curricular initiatives, by continuing to develop new courses when needed, by updating content in existing courses, by participating in collection and review of departmentally agreed upon (and/or individually developed, course-based) assessment measures, by designing and implementing new exercises and/or new methods of teaching (e.g., active learning) aimed at improving student performance, etc. Achievement may be demonstrated by exercising leadership in departmental curricular initiatives, by successful approval and teaching of new courses proposed, and/or by SOTE scores that are consistently within or above departmental norms.

Above Expectations

To be considered ABOVE EXPECTATIONS in the area of teaching, the faculty member must meet the requirements set forth above for MEETS EXPECTATIONS appropriate to rank. In addition to this, the faculty member must provide clear documentation as to quality of performance in at least one of the following additional criteria:

a. A preponderance of evidence in the FAR demonstrating excellence in teaching as indicated by

1) classroom visitation reports, 2) SOTE scores and comments (or alternative student evaluation instruments), 3) additional appropriate documentation related to teaching.

To be rated above expectations, the faculty member's SOTE scores should be consistently within departmental norms, and should more often than not exceed those norms.

b. At the rank of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor, demonstrate a record of involvement and achievement indicative of a commitment to continued professional performance in teaching. Involvement can be demonstrated by participating in departmental curricular initiatives, by continuing to develop new courses when needed, by updating content in existing courses, by participating in collection and review of departmentally agreed upon (and/or individually developed, course-based) assessment measures, by designing and implementing new exercises and/or new methods of teaching (e.g., active learning) aimed at improving student performance, etc.

Achievement can be demonstrated by exercising substantial leadership in departmental curricular initiatives, such as development of new programs or substantial revision of

existing programs. Note that not only involvement but also achievement is required for a rating of above expectations.

c. Provide a fully documented record of an award for some aspect of teaching within or outside of the University, or provide information related to a nomination for a teaching-related award, e.g. nomination letter(s) and or form(s) that clearly document the faculty member's excellence in teaching. Examples of such awards include but are not limited to the Golden Apple Award, the College of Natural Sciences Outstanding Professor for Teaching Award, the Geological Society of America's Outstanding Earth Science Teacher Award. In addition the publication of a laboratory manual or textbook by a nationally/internationally recognized publishing house (cross-listed with Research) provides evidence of excellence in a teaching related activity.

B. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES

All Department of Geological Sciences faculty members are expected to be active in research. Acceptable scholarship may take a variety of forms and may evolve over the course of a career. Specific examples are explained in the Priority lists below. The Department of Geological Sciences recognizes that the nature of research and scholarly activities conducted by geologists depends on many factors, including the faculty member's expertise, disciplinary and sub-disciplinary frameworks, methods and publication practices. Given this diversity, the Department has not fully quantified criteria for "**meets expectations**" and "**above expectations**". The Department of Geological Sciences expects that faculty will be active in research throughout their careers. The DEC and Chair considers each case on its own merits. To this end the DEC and Chair look not just at the faculty member's number of publications, but also at the faculty member's research productivity in terms of its originality, quality, consistency and the importance of the faculty member's scholarly contribution to his or her field of the geological sciences.

Primary consideration in the evaluation of a faculty member's research efforts is the quality of the research/publications. The guidelines below specify a quantitative range of products and/or activities that are expected at each rank, but within this range, the Department recognizes that a small number of high quality publications may be as valuable as, or more valuable than, a large number of lower quality publications. For publications, the quality of the article is evaluated, regardless of the journal in which it is published. However, peer-reviewed publications receive more weight than non-peer reviewed publications. In cases where the nature of the review process for a particular publication may not be common knowledge (e.g., for field trip guidebooks and

conference proceedings), the faculty member should document not only the publication of the article but also the type of review it underwent. For co-authored articles, the first authorship is counted most heavily, but co-authored publications also count toward the ranges listed below. For all co-authored publications, the faculty member's contribution should be thoroughly described and documented. The Department also places high value on the inclusion of student co-workers in faculty research and for that reason publications with student co-authors are given special consideration in the evaluation process.

As with publications, peer-reviewed research proposals to recognized external agencies/institutions on which the faculty member is the sole or principal investigator are considered important. In addition, the Department recognizes the value of collaborative research, particularly interdisciplinary research, for advancing the science. For cases of collaborative work the faculty member's contribution to the proposal must be fully documented. Additionally, research proposals that provide funding for student research reinforce the faculty member's application for tenure and/or promotion.

The criteria for meeting or being above expectations within the Department of Geological Sciences are dominantly taken from the area termed below as Productivity with additional consideration if substantial activity is evident in Recognition and/or Professional Service. Productivity has been subdivided into three priorities with Priority 1 being the most important in terms of assessing a faculty member's contribution in terms of **meeting expectations** or being **above expectations**. The categories within each priority are not necessarily in order of importance.

PRODUCTIVITY

Priority 1: Items in one or more of the categories below are considered essential in order to meet expectations in year 6 at the rank of assistant professor as well as at all higher ranks.

- Authorship or co-authorship of research articles published in appropriate discipline-specific, widely circulated, blind peer-reviewed journals, published by recognized professional societies or publishing houses.
- Authorship or co-authorship of research articles published in other nationally or internationally-recognized, blind peer-reviewed regular publication series, such as Memoirs, Special Papers, or other multi-author special-focus volumes.
- Authorship or co-authorship of entire volumes of research results, such as Monographs, Memoirs, Special Papers, blind peer-reviewed and professionally edited and published by nationally or internationally recognized professional societies or publishing houses.

- Authorship or co-authorship of geologic maps, blind peer-reviewed, field checked, and professionally edited and published by nationally or internationally recognized professional societies, organizations, or agencies.
- Authorship or co-authorship of major review articles in blind peer-reviewed series (e.g. Annual Reviews of Earth and Planetary Sciences) that summarize the state of knowledge in the faculty member's discipline.
- Authorship or co-authorship of peer-reviewed textbook(s) in the faculty member's field published by a nationally/internationally recognized publishing house (cross-listed with Teaching under above expectations).

Priority 2: Items in these categories are viewed as positive signs that progress is being made toward the essential items above. They are considered sufficient to meet expectations for retention at years 2 and 4. Activity in one or more of these areas is also considered necessary but normally not sufficient on its own to meet expectations in year 6 at the rank of assistant professor or at higher ranks.

- Principle Investigator or co-Investigator on successful external funding. Additional recognition is given to funding from highly competitive sources (e.g., the National Science Foundation). It is expected that research funding will normally lead to peer-reviewed publications or to other disseminated products, but it is understood that this may take several years depending on the type of research.
- Principle Investigator or co-Investigator on successful external funding from specialized funding sources with less competition, such as the Petroleum Research Fund of the American Chemical Society. This becomes more important if it produces research results that result in major publications and/or significant external funding from more competitive sources.
- Author or co-author of a field trip guide that presents work in progress, and the author derives benefit from feedback from colleagues during the field trip. This becomes more important if the FAR provides evidence that the guide is edited and published by a nationally recognized professional society, and/or that it underwent blind peer-review.
- Authorship or co-authorship of abstracts of research work presented at regional, national, or international professional conferences. Abstracts that involve student co-authors will be given special consideration. It is expected that at least some of the work that is presented in abstract form will eventually lead to peer-reviewed publications.
- Authorship or co-authorship of conference publications. Blind peer-reviewed work carries more weight than those that are not so reviewed.
- Principle Investigator (or PI for the campus on multi-institution proposals) on external funding for non-research grants.

- Supervision of student research (undergraduate and graduate) that leads to presentations and/or publications with students as co-authors

Priority 3: Important for Retention, useful for Promotion and Tenure but not sufficient on their own. Items in this category are sufficient to meet expectations at year 2 at the assistant professor rank. In later years and at higher rank items in these categories demonstrate activity toward meeting expectations but are not in themselves sufficient to meet expectations.

- Principle Investigator or co-Investigator on successful proposals for funding from on-campus sources. This becomes more important if it produces research results that result in major publications and/or significant external funding.
- Principle Investigator or co-Investigator on unsuccessful proposals written to external funding agencies to fund research work.
- Principle Investigator or co-Investigator on unsuccessful proposals written to internal funding agencies to fund research work. Carries less weight than to external agencies.
- Authoring other books, such as general interest treatments of the faculty member's discipline. This becomes more important if published by a recognized publishing house (e.g. Mountain Press).
- Authorship or co-authorship of subsequent editions of textbook(s) in the faculty member's field published by a nationally/internationally recognized publishing house. Documented evidence that the textbook was significantly rewritten, could move this achievement into the corresponding category in Priority 1.

PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION

Important additional material. Not required, but adds strength to an application for Retention, Promotion and/or Tenure. Provides evidence for off-campus recognition of faculty member's research.

- Receipt of an honor or award from a professional society.
- Election to Fellowship in a professional society.
- Being named as a Distinguished Lecturer in a professional society or organization.
- Receipt of an honor or award from professional or educational entities, other than professional societies.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Useful for Retention, Promotion and Tenure but not sufficient on their own.

- Author or co-author of field trip guides of previously published work. This becomes more important if guide is edited and published by a nationally recognized professional society.
- Participation (e.g. departmental representative) in non-research grants (e.g., grants for student scholarships and outreach grants).
- Authoring general interest articles in the faculty member's discipline.
- Proposal and manuscript reviews.
- Serving on proposal review panels.
- Appointment as editor or assistant editor for a discipline-recognized journal or other publication series.
- Service to professional societies (e.g., meeting-planning committees, technical program committees, development work, governance roles).

The last four activities also provide a measure of the faculty member's service to the geological community, and as such are also considered under Service.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS AND ABOVE EXPECTATIONS IN THE AREA OF RESEARCH

Meets Expectations

a. At the rank of Assistant Professor

During years two and three of the probationary period, the MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor must demonstrate the steps toward a viable research program as indicated by items listed under Priority 2.

By year 4, the faculty member must show documented evidence of continued active involvement in, and successful completion of professionally evaluated activities from within Priorities 1 and/or 2.

Under normal circumstances the criteria required to MEET EXPECTATIONS in year 6 at the rank of Assistant Professor should include evidence of all three of the following:

(1) An acceptable number of publications of types listed in Priority 1. An acceptable minimum number of Priority 1 publications should lie between 2 and 3. Faculty with fewer than the minimum Priority 1 publications should have a strong record of Priority 2 activities in order to meet expectations.

(2) One or more publications in Priority 1 or 2 that present work initiated after appointment at CSUSB. If this criterion is met with Priority 2 publication(s) it is expected that some of these results will eventually be published in Priority 1 venues.

(3) Substantial involvement of students (undergraduate and/or graduate) in published research (students as co-authors on abstracts and/or published papers).

Success in obtaining external funding to support a faculty member's research is not required, but it strongly reinforces the faculty member's application, especially if it also

supports student research.

b. At the rank of Associate Professor

The MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor must continue to demonstrate a record of active involvement in, and successful accomplishment of, research or scholarly activities in the geological sciences. Under normal circumstances the criteria to meet expectations at the rank of Associate Professor should include evidence of both of the following:

(1) An acceptable number of publications of types listed in Priority 1, based on work initiated after appointment at CSUSB. An acceptable minimum of number of Priority 1 publications, since promoted to the current rank, should lie between 2 and 4. Faculty with fewer than the minimum Priority 1 publications should have a strong record of Priority 2 activities in order to meet expectations.

(2) Substantial involvement of students (undergraduate and/or graduate) in published research (students as co-authors on abstracts and/or published papers).

Success in obtaining external funding to support a faculty member's research is not required, but it strongly reinforces the faculty member's application, especially if it also supports student research.

c. At the rank of Professor

The MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member at the rank of Professor must demonstrate a continuing record of successful accomplishment and recognition in research or scholarly activities in the field of geological sciences. Under normal circumstances it is expected that a Full Professor will continue to publish Priority 1 papers at a reasonable rate and to maintain a substantial involvement of students (undergraduate and/or graduate) in his or her published research (students as co-authors on abstracts and/or published papers). Success in obtaining external funding to support a faculty member's research is not required, but it strongly reinforces the faculty member's research record, especially if it also supports student research.

Above Expectations

To be considered ABOVE EXPECTATIONS in the area of research or scholarly contributions in the field of geological sciences the faculty member must, as a minimum, have met the requirements set forth above for **meets expectations** appropriate to rank. In addition to this, the faculty member must also have attained recognition beyond the University in research and/or scholarly activity in the field of geological sciences that is clearly documented by, but not limited to, such activities as: 1) publication of an invited article or book chapter in a publication that was blind peer-reviewed and professionally edited and published by a nationally or internationally recognized professional society or publishing house; 2) recognition in the form of an award or honor bestowed on the faculty member for his or her research activity by a recognized geological entity or agency (e.g. the Penrose Medal or the Donath Medal by the Geological Society of America); 3) invited/keynote presentations given by the faculty member on his or her

research at a nationally/internationally recognized meeting, or selection of the faculty member as a distinguished speaker by a society or agency, e.g. IODP Visiting Lecturer, or the Jahns Distinguished Lecturer; 4) a request from a regional/national/international external agency/entity for the faculty member to act as an expert consultant within his or her field of expertise on a geological project; 5) a publication record that exceeds the criteria for meeting expectations at the faculty member's current rank, thus demonstrating the faculty member's significant contribution to, and expertise in, his or her field of geology, 6) a clearly demonstrated record of the faculty member's ability to obtain significant external funding to support his or her research and that of his or her students.

C. UNIVERSITY AND/OR COMMUNITY SERVICE

The Department of Geological Sciences follows the criteria for performance review of University and/or Community Service set forth in the University document FAM 300 both in terms of what is deemed to **meet expectations** and to be **above expectations**. Performance in this area includes participation in departmental, college, university and CSU system-wide committee activities. With the exception of the Departmental Evaluation Committee, search committees and the Chair Evaluation Committee, the Department of Geological Sciences does not use specific committees to conduct departmental business. Rather, decisions are made by a committee of the whole. Because there are so few internal departmental committees, a faculty member should explain in the FAR (and document where possible) the role he or she played in departmental matters that were addressed by a committee of the whole (e.g., curricular issues, textbook adoption, self-study report preparation, departmental assessment, etc.). Service expectations also include advising of students (undergraduate and graduate). The Department practices mandatory advising for all undergraduate students. The Department Chair assigns an approximately equal number of student advisees to each faculty member. The Department also values other professional service activities both within and outside of the university system. With reference to service activities in the community outside the University, the Department expects that such service should clearly draw upon the faculty member's professional expertise. Examples of such service could include, but are not limited to, undertaking proposal and manuscript reviews, serving on proposal review panels, appointment as editor or assistant editor for a discipline-recognized journal or other publication series, service to professional societies (e.g., meeting-planning committees, technical program committees, development work, governance roles), giving talks on geology to local schools, community colleges, universities, local professional societies and civic organizations, and interviews with the media. While there is no formal evaluation of service activities, exemplary work (e.g. being elected as committee chair, or serving on

a committee that is exceptionally demanding, or being elected to a position in a national geological organization) is given special consideration by the DEC and Chair. Examples of any exemplary work especially, need to be fully explained and documented.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS AND ABOVE EXPECTATIONS IN THE AREA OF UNIVERSITY AND/OR COMMUNITY SERVICE

Meets Expectations

a. At the rank of Assistant Professor

The MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member should demonstrate a developing level of participation particularly at the departmental and college levels within the area of service. For the purpose of awarding tenure, the MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member must demonstrate significant participation in the area of service. Normally this service begins at the Department level, which is sufficient for retention at years 2 and 4. By year 6 some activity at the College, University, and/or off-campus level is also expected. The faculty member should describe in his or her FAR the workload of the committees on which he or she has served and/or particular contributions to service activities conducted jointly with others. Where assigned time was given for service work, this should be noted in the FAR.

b. At the rank of Associate Professor

The MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member at this rank must demonstrate significant participation in the area of service at the departmental, College, and University level, as well as service off campus where appropriate. The faculty member should describe in his or her FAR the workload of the committees on which he or she has served and/or particular contributions to service activities conducted jointly with others. Where assigned time was given for service work, this should be noted in the FAR. For a faculty member hired at this rank, a MEETS EXPECTATIONS rating may be assigned for demonstrating sufficient progress towards achieving this standard by the third probationary year.

c. At the rank of Professor

In addition to significant participation in service activities, the MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member is expected to provide effective leadership in some of these activities, especially at the departmental, College, and University or system level, as well as service off campus where appropriate. The faculty member should describe in his or her FAR the workload of the committees on which he or she has served and/or particular contributions to service activities conducted jointly with others. Where assigned time was given for service work, this should be noted in the FAR.

Above Expectations

A rating of ABOVE EXPECTATIONS in this area is awarded for exceptional service that has been clearly documented as to quantity and quality.

To be considered ABOVE EXPECTATIONS in the area of service, the faculty member must meet the qualifications set forth above for MEETS EXPECTATIONS appropriate to academic rank. In addition, the faculty member must demonstrate unusual effectiveness or performance as a contributor or leader in the University, the off-campus community, or a combination of both.