

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Policies and Procedures For Faculty Reviews

Bayh College of Education

Approved by the Bayh College of Education Congress
2017

Revised May 2019
Revised Fall 2023

This document, Bayh College of Education Policy and Procedures for Faculty Reviews outlines the College's specific criteria and performance standard framework.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	3
Specific Guidelines	4
Appointment	4
Instructors	4
Reappointment of Instructors.....	4
Promotion to Senior Instructor.....	5
Tenure Track Faculty	5
Reappointment of Tenure Track Faculty	5
Comprehensive Probationary Review	7
Tenure and Promotion.....	8
Criteria for Academic Rank	8
Standards for Faculty Ranks	8
Instructor	9
Senior Instructor.....	9
Assistant Professor.....	9
Associate Professor	9
Professor	9
Faculty Performance Evaluations (Triennial Reviews)	9
BCOE Criteria for the Evaluation of Professional Activities	11
Departmental Criteria.....	11
BCOE Criteria for the Professional Relevance of Faculty Activities	11
Criteria for the Significance and Quality of Faculty Activities	12
Activities Categories and Documentation.....	13
Directions to Documentation	13
Teaching.....	15
Documentation of Teaching.....	16
Scholarship.....	16
Documentation of Scholarship.....	17
Service.....	18
Documentation of Service.....	18
Policies and Procedures of the BCOE Faculty Review Committee.....	19
Committee Composition and Selection.....	19
Independence of Decisions	19
BCOE Faculty Review Committee Procedures	19
Appendix A.....	19
Teaching.....	22
Activities	22
Possible Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness.....	23
Scholarship.....	24
Activities	24
Possible Indicators of Scholarship Effectiveness.....	25
Service.....	27
Activities	27
Possible Indicators of Service Effectiveness.....	28

OVERVIEW

The Bayh College of Education (BCOE) is a learning community with a mission to prepare, promote, and advance educational and human service professionals for a diverse and ever-changing world. The College seeks to foster the scholarly development of its faculty and to encourage their interaction with students and with their respective professional and disciplinary communities. As members of this learning community, faculty are expected to contribute to their departments, the College, and the University through the activities of teaching; research, scholarship, and creative activity (hereafter called scholarship); and service. Faculty are expected to evidence continuing growth and superior achievement in these areas throughout their careers. They bear responsibility to promote through engagement the values of knowledge acquisition, inquiry, and lifelong learning among students, colleagues, the community, and the profession.

Basic regulations concerning reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions are contained in the *University Handbook* and may be found at <https://www.indstate.edu/handbook>. Similar policies and procedures regarding faculty performance evaluations (biennial reviews) can be found at: <https://www.indstate.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-resources/faculty-evaluation> or <http://www.indstate.edu/services/facsenate/documents/senate-approved>. In the University faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure policies, and in the faculty performance evaluation policies published for all faculty, colleges and departments/schools are charged with identifying the specific evaluative criteria and performance standards for use in reviewing faculty. College and departmental/school policies and procedures are required to comply with the minimum standards in the University's guidelines and may be more exacting.

Departmental guidelines require approval by the department faculty, the department chair, the College Faculty Review Committee and by the College Dean. College guidelines require approval by the regular faculty of the College, the College Dean, the University Promotions and Tenure Oversight Committee, and the Provost. This document, Bayh College of Education Policy and Procedures for Faculty Reviews, outlines the College's specific criteria and performance standard framework.

The evaluation of an individual faculty member's performance and decisions about continuing employment and advancement involve multiple independent, although related, decisions. Annual reappointment decisions at the college level are the shared responsibility of the department faculty, the department chair, and the Dean. Mid-term comprehensive reappointment decisions and promotion and tenure decisions at the college level are the shared responsibility of the department faculty, the department chair, the BCOE Faculty Review Committee, and the Dean. Positive evaluations are required for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Regular reappointment does not guarantee tenure or promotion, nor does tenure guarantee promotion beyond the level of Associate Professor.

Faculty performance evaluation decisions at the college level are the shared responsibility of the department faculty, the department chair, the BCOE Faculty Review Committee, and the Dean. Faculty performance evaluation decisions are unrelated to promotion and tenure decisions.

The evaluation of faculty performance at all levels must be based on evidence and follow published criteria and standards. Evaluations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion and faculty performance evaluations are based on teaching activity; scholarship; and service activity. Evidence supporting faculty activity and achievement should include evaluative input from individuals or groups who are the recipients of the faculty member's teaching; scholarship; or service (e.g., students, departmental colleagues, departments, schools, agencies, etc.) and/or disciplinary peers both inside and beyond Indiana State University.

Significance and quality are the primary considerations in assessing faculty achievements in all three areas of faculty performance—teaching, scholarship, and service—and in decisions regarding reappointment, promotion, and tenure, as well as faculty performance evaluation decisions. Quantity of faculty achievements, while not to be ignored, is not to be considered as important as significance and quality.

SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

Appointment

The appointment letter for new faculty identifies the expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service. This letter also includes any years of previous service that have been awarded toward tenure and the faculty member's dates of eligibility for promotion and tenure.

Instructors

Reappointment of Instructors. Instructors are appointed for a term of three academic years, and will be reviewed annually for the first six years of consecutive appointment. At the time of annual reviews, probationary faculty members submit to their department materials documenting annual performance goals including achievement in teaching; and any other assigned activities during the specified period of service. Copies of the initial letter of appointment with any change or renegotiation, and annual evaluation reports must be included in the documentation. The department's chairperson and personnel committee review the materials independently and each makes a separate recommendation on the candidate's evaluation form. The candidate is notified of these recommendations and their rationales through a meeting with the department chairperson. The faculty member's materials and recommendations from the chair and personnel committee is forwarded to the Dean, who reviews them and then makes an independent recommendation. The Dean then meets with the candidate to discuss the outcomes of the reviews and the recommendations, and to provide the faculty member with copies of the departmental and Dean's comments and recommendations. The candidate signs the review form to acknowledge the meeting and discussion have been held.

The faculty member has three working days to submit a rebuttal to the Dean. The Dean then forwards the recommendation and any faculty rebuttal to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Annual reviews will result in a recommendation for reappointment, conditional reappointment, or non-reappointment. Conditional reappointments are only permissible in years 1, 2, 4, and 5 of consecutive contracts. Faculty members are notified of their reappointment or non-reappointment by written statement from the President or the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, no later than the dates specified in the *University Handbook*.

Each year of annual review, faculty members shall sign their evaluation forms to indicate awareness of the comments on the forms. Faculty members will have three working days to make written comments concerning the comments and recommendations. The signed forms and written comments are returned to the chairperson and the Dean to be forwarded. No rebuttals from committees, chairs, or the Dean will be allowed to be included in documentation that moves forward.

In the instance of conditional reappointment, the Dean and department chairperson will jointly prepare a plan for remediation in writing for the candidate. The Dean will present the remediation during the review meeting.

Recommendations of non-reappointment during the probationary period may be appealed to the University Promotions and Tenure Oversight Committee as set forth in the *University Handbook Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*.

Promotion to Senior Instructor. Instructors at the end of their 5th year or beyond consecutive employment are eligible to apply for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor. Procedures for promotion reviews and for appeals are outlined in the *University Handbook*.

Tenure-Track Faculty

Reappointment of tenure-track faculty. New tenure-track faculty members serve a probationary period during which time they are appointed for a specified term, normally one year. The length of the probationary period is dependent upon the new faculty member's previous experience and is specified in the initial appointment letter. Early in the probationary period, reviews of faculty members who are new to the teaching profession usually emphasize teaching performance and departmental service; however, attention to scholarship should not be delayed. The awarding of promotion and tenure requires effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service.

University policy requires that specific performance goals be established during the annual reviews of probationary faculty.

At the time of annual probationary reviews, probationary faculty members submit to their department materials documenting achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service during the specified period of service. Copies of the initial letter of appointment with any change or renegotiation, and annual evaluation reports must be included in the documentation. The

department's chairperson and personnel committee review the materials independently and each makes a separate recommendation on the candidate's evaluation form. The candidate is notified of these recommendations and their rationales through a meeting with the department chairperson. Within 60 calendar days, the faculty member and the department chairperson cooperatively develop annual performance goals. These performance goals are placed in the faculty personnel file and should be included in future review documentation. The faculty member's materials and recommendations from the chair and personnel committee is forwarded to the Dean, who reviews them and makes an independent recommendation. The Dean then meets with the candidate to discuss the outcomes of the reviews and the recommendations and to provide the faculty member with copies of the departmental and Dean's comments and recommendations. The candidate signs the review form to acknowledge the meeting and discussion have been held. The probationary faculty member has three working days to submit a rebuttal to the Dean. The Dean then forwards the recommendation and any faculty rebuttal to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Annual reviews will result in a recommendation for reappointment, conditional reappointment, or non-reappointment. Faculty members are notified of their reappointment or non-reappointment by written statement from the President or the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, no later than the dates specified in the *University Handbook*.

Each year of probationary review, faculty members shall sign their evaluation forms to indicate awareness of the comments on the forms. Faculty members will have three working days to make written comments concerning the comments and recommendations. The signed forms and written comments are returned to the chairperson and the Dean to be forwarded. No rebuttals from committees, chairs, or the Dean will be allowed to be included in documentation that moves forward.

In the instance of conditional reappointment, the Dean and department chairperson will jointly prepare a plan for remediation in writing for the candidate. The Dean will present the remediation plan during the review meeting.

Recommendations of non-reappointment during the probationary period may be appealed to the University Promotions and Tenure Oversight Committee as set forth in the *University Handbook Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*.

Comprehensive Probationary Review. All probationary faculty members will undergo a comprehensive probationary review no later than the third year of service. At the time of comprehensive probationary reviews, probationary faculty members submit to their department materials documenting achievement in teaching; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and service during the specified three-year period of service. Copies of the initial letter of appointment with any change or renegotiation, and annual evaluation reports must be included in the documentation. The department's chairperson and personnel committee review the materials independently and each makes a separate recommendation on the candidate's evaluation form. The candidate is notified of these recommendations and their rationales through a meeting with the department chairperson. At this time, the faculty member and the department chairperson cooperatively develop annual performance goals. These performance goals are placed in the faculty personnel file and should be included in future review documentation. The faculty

member's materials and recommendations from the chair and personnel committee are forwarded to the Dean and the BCOE Faculty Review Committee for their separate reviews and separate recommendations. The Dean then meets with the candidate to discuss the outcomes of the reviews and the recommendations and to provide the faculty member with copies of the departmental, BCOE Faculty Review Committee, and Dean's comments and recommendations. The candidate signs the review form to acknowledge the meeting and discussion have been held. The probationary faculty member has three working days to submit a rebuttal to the Dean. The Dean then forwards the BCOE Faculty Review Committee and Dean recommendation and any faculty rebuttal to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Comprehensive probationary reviews will result in a recommendation for reappointment, conditional reappointment, or non-reappointment. Faculty members are notified of their reappointment or non-reappointment by written statement from the President or the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, no later than the dates specified in the *University Handbook*.

Before evaluations are placed in faculty members' permanent files, they shall be given ample opportunity to append comments or rebuttal to the evaluation forms. In the event a substantive change is made in an evaluation at any point subsequent to the department level, the faculty member will be provided a copy of the revised evaluation and shall be given an opportunity to respond in writing. The response will be given to the Dean to be forwarded to Academic Affairs. No rebuttals from committees, chairs, or the Dean will be allowed to be included in documentation that moves forward.

In the instance of conditional reappointment, the Dean and department chairperson will jointly prepare a plan for remediation in writing for the candidate. The Dean will present the remediation during the review meeting.

Recommendations of non-renewal during the probationary period may be appealed to the University Promotions and Tenure Oversight Committee as set forth in the *University Handbook Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*.

Tenure and promotion. Assistant Professors are considered for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure at the same time. Individuals beginning their probationary period as Assistant Professors become eligible to apply for tenure during the sixth year of continuing regular faculty appointments in accredited institutions, at least four years of which must be served under a regular faculty appointment at ISU. Assistant Professors must be considered for promotion and tenure by the year specified in their letter of appointment. Such individuals are awarded tenure only upon meeting ISU's evaluative criteria and performance standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Individuals beginning their probationary period at the rank of Associate Professor may be given credit for up to three years of faculty achievements at other accredited institutions. Individuals beginning their probationary period at the rank of Professor may be given credit for up to five years of faculty achievements at other accredited institutions. If such credit is granted, individuals may apply for tenure during the year in which the years credited and the years of service at ISU total six. Such individuals are awarded tenure only upon meeting ISU's evaluative criteria and performance standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Associate Professors are considered eligible to apply for promotion to Full Professor in the fourth year of service in their current rank.

While a faculty member's entire career record is relevant for tenure and promotion decisions, evidence produced since attainment of current rank are particularly important and should be submitted for review.

Procedures for promotion and tenure reviews and for appeals are outlined in the *University Handbook*.

CRITERIA FOR ACADEMIC RANK

A terminal degree in a field appropriate to the discipline in which the candidate teaches and conducts research, scholarship, or creative activity is required of tenured or tenure-track faculty. An appropriate terminal degree is preferred and a master's degree is required of Instructors and Lecturers. Exceptions at any rank may be made in cases of persons of indisputable national renown. Exceptions at the rank of Lecturer may be made on the grounds of need and special skill, experience, or knowledge. Each department in the Bayh College of Education shall make appropriate determination as to what qualifies as a terminal degree within their academic disciplines.

STANDARDS FOR FACULTY RANKS

The *University Handbook* specifies the following standards of achievement for each faculty rank. These standards serve as the basis for the BCOE Faculty Review Committee's evaluation of candidates and promotion and tenure decisions. Each department will determine the specific standards of performance for each academic rank.

Instructor

Documented evidence of effective teaching is required; documented evidence of adequacy in scholarship and/or of service is required, if such activities were stipulated as expectations of the Instructor. Faculty members are to demonstrate continuous professional growth in teaching and other required areas.

Senior Instructor

Documented evidence of highly effective teaching, evidence of continuous professional growth in teaching are required; documented evidence of achievement in scholarship and/or of service is required, if such activities were expectations of the Instructor.

Assistant Professor

Documented evidence of effective teaching; of potential for achievement in research, scholarship or creative activity; and of service appropriate to the mission of the faculty member's academic unit are required. Faculty members are to demonstrate continuous professional growth in teaching; research, scholarship, or creative activity; and service.

Associate Professor

Documented evidence of highly effective teaching; a record of research, scholarship or creative activity which has earned professional recognition at the national or regional level; and evidence of effective service to the University and to either the community or the profession are required.

Professor

Documented evidence of sustained highly effective teaching; of a record of substantial accomplishment in research, scholarship or creative activity, which has led to professional recognition at the national level; and of active and substantive service to some combination of the University, the community, and the profession are required.

Documentation of experiential learning and/or community engagement activities may be used as evidence of efforts in the appropriate domain(s). For example, a faculty member might present:

- Documented evidence of substantial and effective teaching or librarianship; of a record of substantial accomplishment in research, scholarship, or creativity which has led to professional recognition at the national level; and of active, substantive service to some combination of the University, the community and the profession; or
- Documented evidence of excellence in one domain of faculty work, while also demonstrating substantial and/or sustained performance in the other domains.

FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS (TRIENNIALREVIEWS)

Faculty Performance Evaluations (FPE) are a means by which Indiana State University can assess and acknowledge the work of its faculty. Through the evaluation process, the institution can support faculty in their professional goals and demonstrate to external constituencies on an ongoing basis that ISU faculty meet professional standards of performance in all domains of their work. The faculty performance evaluation model is not a substitute for existing faculty dismissal processes. Neither is it meant to replicate the rigor of tenure/promotion processes and standards. This process is designed to be faculty driven and focused on professional growth.

Toward this end, all regular university faculty shall be evaluated annually and a record of that evaluation placed in their official personnel files. Pre-tenure faculty and instructors subject to annual review and faculty who were promoted effective August of year 3 of the review cycle will not be included in this process. In these, as in all faculty evaluative processes, Indiana State University subscribes to existing AAUP guidelines.

Overview

Each faculty member shall place into the Faculty Activities Database (FAD) evidence of their teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activity, and service activities by September 20 each year for the previous August 1-July 31 period. Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated for each assigned component (teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, and service) annually. The individual categories will be designated *Meets Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations*.

In Years 1 and 2 of the cycle they will be evaluated by their chair and dean, either of whom may trigger a review by the college personnel committee, which may then lead to a full review or not. In year 3, faculty will be evaluated by their department personnel committee and department chair in independent reviews.

Annual Data Entry

Each faculty member shall place into the Faculty Activities Database (FAD) evidence of their teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activity, and service activities by September 20 each year for the previous August 1-July 31 period. Evidence of teaching effectiveness must include, at a minimum, syllabi and the University-wide student course evaluations for any courses taught during the review period*. Faculty may include evidence providing support of effectiveness in other domains, but only the domains in which the faculty member has an assignment shall be considered relevant. Faculty who serve as chairpersons also may submit materials related to their administrative duties in the three faculty domains, as appropriate.

*Exempting those for Spring 2020

(It should be noted that faculty who serve as chairpersons undergo a separate, triennial evaluation of their administrative effectiveness. See Faculty Handbook, Section 350.4). Only that portion of the chairperson's activities related to the faculty-specific domains shall be evaluated within the framework of the Faculty Performance Evaluation as described in this document.

The BCOE has chosen to adopt the University criteria for these reviews. The University document may be found at: <https://www.indstate.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-resources/faculty-evaluation>

BCOE CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Activities

Because of the highly specialized nature of faculty expertise, departments are assigned a major role in assessing the significance and quality of discipline-specific faculty achievements for reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. The *University Handbook* stipulates that each academic department must publish guidelines that stipulate the discipline specific criteria and

performance standards to be used in departmental faculty personnel decisions. Furthermore, it gives departments primary authority and responsibility for assessing discipline specific achievements of faculty for reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions, as well as for faculty performance evaluation decisions. This is not to say that departments have ultimate authority in evaluating all aspects of a candidate's activities. The evaluation of a candidate's total performance is a shared responsibility. On the other hand, the *University Handbook* statements do help differentiate the roles of departmental reviewers and of college-level reviewers in this critical evaluation and provide college-level reviewers with an opportunity to delegate part of their evaluation to the department reviewers.

In addition to discipline-specific evaluative criteria and performance standards, departments are encouraged to include the following in their personnel guidelines: departmental mission and goals; procedures for establishing and agreeing upon annual goals; procedures for annual and comprehensive reappointment reviews for probationary tenure-track faculty and Instructors, including guidelines for documenting and presenting professional activities; procedures for tenure and promotion reviews; procedures for faculty performance evaluations; processes for providing candidates with feedback on performance and recommendations for continued progress toward tenure and/or promotion; and explication of the responsibilities of the departmental personnel committee, chair, and candidate.

BCOE Criteria for the Professional Relevance of Faculty Activities

Faculty are members of the University as well as the Bayh College of Education and are responsible for advancing the missions of both. In recognition of these institutional commitments, the Bayh College of Education employs the University's institutional strategic goals and the Bayh College of Education's mission, vision, and values statements as criteria for evaluating the professional relevance of faculty activities in reviews at the college-level.

Activities concordant with the mission, vision, and values of the College and the University are expected of all regular faculty and will be integrated within the three domains of faculty work. The extent to which an individual faculty member's work will emphasize the mission, vision, and values of the University will vary depending on the faculty member's discipline, as well as their teaching assignments, advising and mentoring assignments, and other workload activities.

Faculty are highly encouraged to incorporate mission-based activities (including career readiness, community engagement, experiential learning, undergraduate advising and mentoring, and graduate student advising and mentoring) throughout the three interrelated domains of faculty work to effectively develop an integrated professional identity. These activities do not constitute a separate domain of faculty work, nor may they be considered a basis for retention, promotion, or tenure in their own right.

Community engagement and experiential learning are a central part of the College and University vision and mission statements. Faculty are encouraged to engage in quality community engagement and experiential learning relevant to their professional field. These activities may apply to teaching, scholarship, and/or service as determined by department criteria.

Quality undergraduate student advising/mentoring and graduate student advising/mentoring are also recognized as crucial activities by both the College and the University. Undergraduate student advising falls under the category of teaching. Graduate student advising/mentoring may be categorized as teaching or research/scholarship, based on the nature of the activity.

Criteria for the Significance and Quality of Faculty Activities

Many of the professional activities of faculty members lead to results that can be evaluated by recipients of the activities—such as students and colleagues—and by established peer review procedures. However, much of what faculty are expected to do involves staying up-to-date as teachers, scholars, and professional servants, and learning and refining methods which can increase the likelihood of significant results in their professional efforts. For these reasons, the criteria for evaluating the significance and quality of faculty accomplishments include adequate preparation and the use of appropriate methods as well as the significance of results. Evidence for assessing the significance and quality of a faculty's teaching, scholarship and service comes from three primary sources: recipient assessments, peer review processes, and the academic department.

- Adequate preparation. In teaching, scholarship, and service, the faculty member demonstrates adequate preparation for the work, including clarity of goals and knowledge of the field. This criterion poses the questions: Does the faculty member state basic purposes of the work clearly? Are the defined objectives realistic and achievable? Are the questions important to the field? Does the faculty member show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the faculty member have the necessary skills to do the work? Is the faculty member able to bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?
- Appropriate methods. In teaching, scholarship, and service, the faculty member uses methods appropriate to the stated goals. The criterion poses the questions: Does the faculty member use appropriate methods and are they applied effectively? Are procedures modified in response to changing circumstances?
- Quality of results. In teaching, scholarship, and service, the faculty member achieves goals pursued and is able to effectively communicate the work to appropriate audiences. The criterion poses the questions: Does the faculty member achieve the goals? Does the work add consequentially to the field? Does the work open additional area for further scholarship? Does the faculty member use suitable style and effective organization to present the work? Is it presented with clarity and integrity? Does the faculty member use appropriate forums for communicating the work to intended audiences?

ACTIVITY CATEGORIES AND DOCUMENTATION

A primary part of an application for reappointment, tenure, or promotion and for the faculty performance evaluation process should be a listing of professional activities and achievements, generated by the FAD, providing the detail specified by the categories listed in Appendix A. In general, the candidate should apply the University's, College's, and department's

strategic goals as criteria in deciding which activities and achievements to include.

In addition to an organized listing, certain types of documentation facilitate the review of a reappointment, tenure, or promotion application or a faculty performance evaluation portfolio, and help ensure that the evaluation of the application/portfolio reflects the true merit of the activities and achievements reported. Suggestions for assembling that documentation are presented below in the three categories in which faculty performance is evaluated.

Directions to Documentation

A cumulative record of faculty work is presented for consideration of reappointment, promotion, or tenure. For regular reappointment consideration, accomplishments since the start of the appointment period under review are particularly important. For promotion consideration, accomplishments since appointment to current rank are particularly important. For faculty performance evaluations, **only** accomplishments within the appropriate two-year window should be included.

To ensure that reviewers see documentation supporting the quality of the results or methods of or preparation for a certain activity, the candidate must provide convenient presentation and understandable directions. Failure to do so may lead to a poor evaluation of the candidate's materials. Candidates have the option of submitting a narrative statement with each set of documentation related to a category of faculty performance— teaching, scholarship, and service—and incorporating directions into each narrative. When important activities and achievements are not self-evidently important and the documentation associated with them is not self-explanatory, narratives for the three categories may be suitable and even desirable. Also, narratives are advisable early in a faculty member's career when much work may still be "in process" and when few significant results—that is, trends, clusters, or bodies of accomplishment—can be presented. Similarly, narratives can be helpful for annual or biennial reviews when the accomplishments of only the review period in question may not by themselves demonstrate patterns of performance.

When the candidate is confident that the professional activities and achievements are primarily of a conventional nature, the documentation is easily understood, and their significance is evident, the directions to the documentation can be included in a narrative.

For **reappointment reviews for Instructors**, faculty members submit documentation that includes:

- 1) The appointment letter with any changes that have been renegotiated;
- 2) Copies of the past year's annual evaluation;
- 3) Annual performance goals;
- 4) A descriptive listing of faculty work generated by the FAD that covers the categories outlined in Appendix A that were included in the contract;
- 5) Copies of University-wide student course evaluations for courses taught during the review period;
- 6) Self-assessment or other narrative related to the candidate's work that she/he chooses to submit; and
- 7) Representative documentation of accomplishments in teaching and any other assigned activities.

For **third-year probationary reviews**, faculty members submit documentation that includes:

- 1) The appointment letter with any changes that have been renegotiated;
- 2) Copies of the past year's annual evaluation;
- 3) Annual performance goals;
- 4) A descriptive listing of faculty work generated by the FAD that covers the categories outlined in Appendix A;
- 5) Copies of University-wide student course evaluations for courses taught during the review period;
- 6) Self-assessment or other narrative related to the candidate's work that she/he chooses to submit;
- 7) A designation in their narrative of which four (4) samples of research/scholarship they would like the committee to review; and
- 8) Representative documentation of accomplishments in teaching; research, scholarship and creative activities; and service.

For applications for **promotion to Senior Instructor**, faculty members submit documentation that includes:

- 1) The appointment letter with any changes that have been renegotiated;
- 2) Copies of all previous annual evaluations;
- 3) Annual performance goals;
- 4) A descriptive listing of faculty work generated by the FAD that covers the categories outlined in Appendix A;
- 5) Copies of University-wide student course evaluations and aggregated data across semesters;
- 6) Self-assessment or other narrative related to the candidate's work that she/he chooses to submit;
- 7) Representative documentation of accomplishments in teaching; and in research, scholarship and creative activities; and service, if such activities were expectations of the Instructor; and
- 8) If research, scholarship and creative activities were expectations of the Instructor, a designation in their narrative of which four (4) samples of research/scholarship they would like the committee to review.

For applications for **tenure and promotion to Associate Professor**, faculty members submit documentation that includes:

- 1) The appointment letter with any changes that have been renegotiated;
- 2) Copies of all previous annual evaluations;
- 3) Annual performance goals;
- 4) A descriptive listing of faculty work generated by the FAD that covers the categories outlined in Appendix A;
- 5) Copies of University-wide student course evaluations and aggregated data across semesters;
- 6) Self-assessment or other narrative related to the candidate's work that she/he chooses to submit;

- 7) A designation in their narrative of which four (4) samples of research/scholarship they would like the committee to review; and
- 8) Representative documentation of accomplishments in teaching; research, scholarship and creative activities; and service.

For applications for **promotion to Full Professor**, faculty members submit documentation that includes:

- 1) The appointment letter with any changes that have been renegotiated;
- 2) A descriptive listing of faculty work generated by the FAD that covers the categories outlined in Appendix A;
- 3) Copies of University-wide student course evaluations for at least one course per semester during the review period, and aggregated data across semesters;
- 4) Self-assessment or other narrative related to the candidate's work that she/he chooses to submit;
- 5) A designation in their narrative of which six (6) samples of research/scholarship they would like the committee to review; and
- 6) Representative documentation of accomplishments in teaching; research, scholarship and creative activities; and service.

TEACHING

Teaching involves the transmission and transformation of knowledge that promote student learning and skills and attitudes necessary for continuing self-development and lifelong learning. Teaching happens in a variety of settings and involves multiple activities, including but not limited to teaching in traditional classroom and distance venues, supervision, and advising and mentoring. It may also include career readiness, community engagement and/or experiential learning.

The judgment of teaching performance is admittedly difficult. It is also a primary authority of the faculty. Therefore, each department will determine the criteria to be used by that department for evaluating teaching, however, the inclusion of the university-wide student evaluation data are required in faculty performance evaluations. The Bayh College of Education Congress will ensure that each department has a departmentally approved evaluation system in place. The department may decide to include student ratings, evaluations by faculty colleagues, the department chair, and/or others who are in the position to observe and evaluate the candidate's teaching performance that should be given considerable weight in determining the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching. Departmental policies and procedures shall not preclude the submission by individual faculty of additional instruments that evaluate their teaching.

Documentation of Teaching

For any faculty review, documentation should be included regarding the effectiveness of the teaching of scheduled classes and the supervision of students in major practicum. Evidence of the quality of the results of instruction or supervision can be in the form of evaluations by students, evaluations by peers, products and achievements of students, and unsolicited written statements by students and others reflecting the quality of the candidate's teaching or supervision.

The Bayh College of Education requires that every faculty member will evaluate a scheduled class or a major supervisory responsibility each semester. Documentation related to at least one such evaluation for each semester covered by the review must be included. Summaries of responses to candidate-constructed or department-constructed forms are also helpful. With any standard evaluation forms, departments should develop criteria, which instructs faculty members on the way in which the form was administered to students and the procedures by which the completed forms were collected and were submitted for analysis and review. Similar documentation regarding the quality of advisement of students also enhances the teaching section of an application.

Candidate-prepared documents related to courses taught, supervision provided, or advisement given may also be included in an application to demonstrate the preparation for an instructional activity or the methods employed in the activity. Such documents might include reading lists as evidence of preparation for a course, and syllabi, assignment statements, evaluations of students, or advisement handouts as evidence of the quality of instructional, supervisory, or advisement methods. In addition, letters documenting workshop completion might be submitted as evidence of preparation for an instructional activity, and statements by peers might be provided as evidence of the quality of the methods used. In deciding what supplementary documentation to include with the listing of professional activities and achievements, the candidate should recognize that reviewers have limited time to examine applications and that the presence of unessential, marginally impressive documents can divert reviewers from more important or more impressive evidence of faculty performance.

See Appendix A for a more comprehensive list of suggested evidentiary sources for teaching and teaching-related activities.

SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship within the Bayh of Education is broadly conceived as serving the interdependent functions of discovery, integration, application, and teaching (Boyer, 1990) and as leading to publicly acknowledged advancements in the faculty member's discipline or in higher education. The scholarship of *discovery* involves the generation of knowledge through disciplined inquiry. The scholarship of *integration* is the disciplined work that creates new insights or intellectual patterns through the synthesis and interpretation of existing knowledge. The scholarship of *application* refers to the dynamic process of applying theory into practice to solve individual and societal problems. The scholarship of *teaching* refers to inquiry into the art of and expansion of the body of knowledge about teaching.

When reviewing this portion of the candidate's documentation, college-level reviewers have a unique challenge in that they may be looking at some rather technical documents that reflect academic discipline-specific faculty achievements that may be difficult for them to evaluate. Evidence to make judgments about some aspects of a candidate's scholarship (i.e., quantity of work, relatedness to College and/or University missions, and judgments about whether it has reached a regional or national audience) should be relatively easy for the reviewers to evaluate, but other aspects might be more difficult (i.e., technical content of articles and the significance of the work vis-a-vis the candidate's national or regional professional recognition). With regard to these latter aspects of a candidate's performance, it is recommended that the

reviewers not substitute their assessments of academic discipline-specific faculty achievements for that of the department's unless the reviewers have strong, well-identified compelling reasons to do so.

Documentation of Scholarship

According to the University's policy statement on promotion, being eligible for the rank of Professor requires "documented evidence of substantial accomplishment in research, scholarship or creativity which has led to professional recognition at the national level." Partly for that reason, it is advisable for faculty members to maintain records and prepare reappointment, promotion, tenure and faculty performance evaluation portfolios with documentation verifying the nature of the recognition that a scholarly activity achieved. The specific suggestions that follow reflect that practice.

For each published article listed in an application, the candidate should include at least copies of the journal page describing the nature of the journal, the page stating the editorial policy of the journal, and the article itself. For a book, the documentation should include at least a link to the publisher's website, the book's cover, title page, table of contents, and a representative chapter of the book.). If the publisher is not likely to be familiar to reviewers, a brief explanation should be included concerning the way in which the manuscript was made known to the publisher and selected for publication. For a chapter in a book, the same documentation should be provided as for an entire book. Original or reprints of all publications must be included in the FAD.

For a conference presentation, the candidate should provide, if available, information about conference acceptance rates, a description of the submission and review process, and copies of the conference program relevant to the candidate's presentation. For invited presentations, the candidate should provide information about the conference and session. Supplemental documentation could include conference evaluation results and copies of presentation materials.

For a publication or presentation, a citation of the scholarly product in a publication by another author can be suitable documentation of recognition of the scholarship. A copy of the page showing the citation and of pages identifying the source of the citation should be included in the application.

For a funded grant or contract, the candidate should include at least a copy of the award letter. A copy of the award letter or the award certificate is also suitable documentation for a research or scholarship award.

For a scholarly product for which evidence of conventional peer review is not available, the candidate should include in the application the entire item so that the faculty members and administrators who review the application can examine it. If such a product is expected to be weighted significantly in the evaluation of the candidate, a written statement by the candidate's department assessing the item should be provided as evidence of the quality of the scholarly product or of the methods employed in producing it.

See Appendix A for a more comprehensive list of suggested evidentiary sources for scholarship activities.

SERVICE

Service is understood by the BCOE as applying knowledge through service to the University, the College, the department, the discipline or profession, and the community. In keeping with University policy, service to the community refers exclusively to “discipline-related activities at the local, regional, national, and international levels.”

Documentation of Service

Unlike teaching, much service is not evaluated in a formal way; and unlike scholarship, service opportunities rarely result from blind review by peers. Therefore, the faculty members and administrators who examine a faculty portfolio need other means of judging the quality of service activities. For this reason, the candidate must be resourceful in identifying evidence of quality in the results of the service, in the methods used, or in the preparation for the service. Some of the possible types of documentation are described in the following paragraph.

A letter of appointment or invitation can verify that the candidate, for instance, served on a committee or performed a responsibility; but even more helpful to reviewers is a letter acknowledging service and thanking the candidate for carrying out certain tasks. This is evidence of the quality of the methods used in the service. An example of evidence of the quality of the results of service is a copy of a page from a committee report acknowledging the candidate’s contributions. If the candidate was the person primarily responsible for a report or other document, a copy of the entire document might be included. A letter of thanks for a good speech made, for good leadership provided, or for other good service rendered is also appropriate documentation of the quality of results or methods. Again, however, the candidate should remember that reviewers have limited time to examine applications and that the presence of unessential, marginally impressive documents can divert reviewers from more important and more impressive evidence of faculty performance.

See Appendix A for a more comprehensive list of suggested evidentiary sources for service activities.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE BCOE FACULTY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Committee Composition and Selection

The BCOE shall annually constitute a Faculty Review Committee composed of (6) tenured representatives, two (2) from each department. Department chairs, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans, and Deans may not serve on the BCOE Faculty Review Committee.

Independence of Decisions

Evaluations of third-year comprehensive reviews of tenure-track faculty; third-year reviews of Instructors, and of promotion and tenure applications require independent evaluations by the candidate’s department committee, department chairperson, the BCOE Faculty Review Committee, and the Dean. This does not mean that each evaluation must be conducted without

knowledge of the decisions of previous reviewers, but that Deans and faculty members shall not participate in more than one recommendation for any given case. In other words, the candidate's department chairs, Dean, and members of the BCOE Faculty Review Committee may not participate in a department committee's consideration of a candidate.

Any discussion of evaluations and recommendations between the Dean and the BCOE Faculty Review Committee will occur only after both parties have made their independent reviews of the faculty members' materials and departmental recommendations. The Dean may call the college committee together for this meeting. After this joint meeting, the Dean and the BCOE Faculty Review Committee may reconsider their recommendations in light of any new information received.

BCOE Faculty Review Committee Procedures

The BCOE Faculty Review Committee shall comply with the following guidelines:

Procedures for promotion and tenure.

1. Order of consideration: Applications for promotion to Senior Instructors shall be considered first. Applications for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall be considered second. Applications for tenure only shall be considered third. Applications for tenure and promotion to Full Professor shall be considered fourth. Applications for promotion to Full Professor only shall be considered last.
2. Evaluation: The BCOE Faculty Review Committee shall apply the recognized evaluative criteria and performance standards of the candidate's department and take into account the precise terms and conditions of the appointment letter and the comments generated during previous annual reviews in its evaluation of the candidate's performance.
3. Voting procedures: Each BCOE Faculty Review Committee member will vote for promotion and/or tenure for each candidate with a simple "yea" or "nay" vote cast by secret ballot. A majority of the committee members must vote "yea" for a positive recommendation. Candidates will not be ranked.
4. Reporting initial vote results: A written rationale will accompany each recommendation. When the committee and the Dean have completed their independent reviews, a meeting between the Dean and the committee may occur to discuss the reviews of the Dean and of the committee.
5. Final report: The Dean will notify each candidate of the committee's and the Dean's recommendations and rationales. If both recommendations are positive, they are forwarded with the candidate's materials to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. If one or both are negative, the candidate may provide a rebuttal to the recommendations to the Dean within three working days which will be forwarded along with the recommendations provided by the academic unit and the Dean to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Procedures for third-year reviews.

1. Order of consideration: The BCOE Faculty Review Committee shall consider Instructors first and then Assistant Professors.
2. Evaluation: The BCOE Faculty Review committee shall apply the recognized evaluative criteria and performance standards of the candidate's department and take into account the precise terms and conditions of the appointment letter and the comments generated during previous annual reviews in its evaluation of the candidate's performance.
3. Voting procedure: Each BCOE Faculty Review Committee member will vote for a recommendation of reappointment, conditional reappointment (only for Assistant Professors), or non-reappointment for each candidate with a simple "yea" or "nay" vote cast by secret ballot. A majority of the committee members must vote "yea" for one of the options for it to become the recommendation of the committee.
4. Reporting: A summary of the BCOE Faculty Review Committee's evaluation of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service and progress toward tenure and/or promotion will be completed and accompany the recommendation. The written evaluation and committee vote (recommendation) will be forwarded to the Dean.

Procedures for faculty performance evaluations (biennial reviews).

The results of the biennial review will be an overall designation of "Meets expectations" or "Does not meet expectations" for each faculty member.

1. When the department has completed its biennial review, all evaluations will be forwarded to the Dean for review. The Dean is expected to examine each faculty member's file.
2. Departmental evaluations will also be forwarded to the BCOE Faculty Review Committee when there is an overall designation of "Does not meet expectations," or when the departmental review committee and department chairperson are unable to reconcile divergent recommendations.
 - a. It is the responsibility of the BCOE Faculty Review Committee and Dean, working together, to determine the overall designation when a faculty member may not be meeting expectations based on the departmental review.
 - b. No faculty member may be designated as "Does not meet expectations" without the consent of both the BCOE Faculty Review Committee and Dean. If the BCOE Faculty Review Committee and Dean disagree and cannot reconcile their recommendations, the faculty member's designation will be "Meets expectations." In this case, the Dean may choose to place a letter of concern in the faculty member's personnel file.
3. The review process must be completed no later than November 15 after the end of year 2.
4. At the end of the review cycle, a Dean who has concerns that a department is not maintaining college standards may ask the BCOE Faculty Review Committee to conduct a review of departmental evaluation guidelines and process. If the Provost has concerns that

a college is not maintaining University standards, he or she may ask for the University FAC to conduct a review of college and department evaluation guidelines and process.

APPENDIX A

The following sections list the activities that fall under each of the three areas of faculty performance—teaching, scholarship, and service. This is not meant to be an exclusive and exhaustive list, but to provide guidance to faculty in terms of categorizing their professional activities. In addition, suggested indicators of effectiveness are included in each section.

TEACHING

The candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must provide the BCOE Faculty Review Committee all student evaluations and records of observations of classroom teaching. Candidates for promotion to Full Professor need only provide student course evaluations for at least one course per semester during the review period. While classroom observations are encouraged, they are not required.

Activities

- A. Scheduled and arranged classes taught (including course name, prefix and number; credit hours; contact hours; semester/session offered; and number of students enrolled)
- B. Independent study enrollments completed (including course name, prefix, and number; number of students; and date of course completion for each item)
- C. Dissertation, Educational Specialist, and Master's thesis committees served on or chaired (including name of student, name of degree, position on committee, and dates of committee formation and final document approval for each item)
- D. Number of undergraduates advised or mentored during each year of the review (including the semester involved)
- E. Number of graduate students advised or mentored (including the semester involved)
- F. Number of students supervised, beyond course-based supervision
- G. Teaching awards received (including title of award, sponsor, and date for each item)
- H. Courses developed (including course name, prefix, and number and date of University approval for each item)
- I. Courses transformed for distance delivery (including course name, prefix, and number and date first ready for delivery for each item)
- J. Professional development activities completed to enhance teaching

including for-credit courses and degree programs completed (including course or degree name, credit hours, institution, and date of completion for each item) and seminars, workshops, and conferences attended (including title, sponsor, location, and dates for each item)

- K. Mission-based activities (experiential learning, community engagement, career readiness) incorporated into courses

Possible Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

The following is a limited sample of indicators that might serve to document effective teaching:

- A. Insightful statements reflecting self-evaluation, self-reflection, and goal-oriented plans with regard to teaching and supervision
- B. Documents indicating that the instruction/supervision that the candidate provides to students is considered to be effective when rated by department faculty colleagues, chair, and/or current students
- C. Student evaluation reports and alternative assessment instruments, when available, indicating that students have rated the overall quality of the candidate's instruction/supervision as being effective
- D. Reports from colleagues, chair, students, and/or others provide evidence of effectiveness in such areas of instruction/supervision as:
 - 1) Course organization and/or planning
 - 2) Classroom communication
 - 3) Faculty/student interaction
 - 4) Assignments, exams, and/or grading
 - 5) Supplemental instructional methods
- E. Documentation provides evidence that the candidate keeps abreast of new material, e.g., attendance at continuing education workshops, reading, updating, and/or developing new materials
- F. Award(s) for outstanding teaching/supervision
- G. Course syllabi, exams, and/or assignment sheets reflect revision and currency of information presented to students and/or instructional/supervision methods used in interacting with students
- H. Documents indicate commitment to teaching through such activities as participation on dissertation committees, independent studies and/or arranged courses, and/or other "other than traditional" course delivery venues
- I. Evidence of collaborative projects completed with students as part of

teaching/supervision assignments (e.g., projects, reports, articles, presentations)

- J. Evidence of presentations that arise from work with students in class, practicum, and/or related academic activities
- K. Evidence of participation as guest lecturer in others' classes
- L. Evidence of appropriate teaching/supervision load given other goals and university assignments
- M. Evidence of participation in and effectiveness of student academic advising, if applicable
- N. Participation in professional development activities, workshops, and/or conferences designed to improve teaching/supervision
- O. Evidence related to the development of new courses, programs, or delivery modalities, including attention to career readiness, experiential learning or community engagement

SCHOLARSHIP

Activities

- A. Books and monographs published (including complete bibliographic information — author(s) in published order, title, place of publication, publisher, date of publication, and number of pages—for each item)
- B. Chapters published (including complete bibliographic information—author(s) in published order, title, book editor(s) or author(s), book title, place of publication, publisher, date of publication, and pages of chapter—for each item)
- C. Articles published (including complete bibliographic information—author(s) in published order, title, journal, volume, issue number, month, year, and pages of article — for each item)
- D. Electronic media materials published (including author(s) in published order, title, place of publication, publisher, and date of publication for each item)
- E. Conference presentations made (including presenter(s) in published order, title of presentation, organization, location, and date for each item)

- F. Creative works published, performed professionally, or awarded professional recognition (including title of work, complete bibliographic information as indicated above or name of performing group and location and date of performance or name of prize and sponsor for each item)
- G. Books and journals edited (including, for each item, editor(s) in published order and complete bibliographic information as indicated above)
- H. Reviews published (including complete bibliographic information—author(s) in published order, title, journal, volume, issue number, date, and pages of review — for each item)
- I. Other contributions to published works (including complete bibliographic information as indicated above and a brief description of the contribution for each item)
- J. Scholarship awards received (including title of award, sponsor, and date for each item)
- K. Extramural grants and contracts awarded (including project director(s), other project participants, project title, amount of award, sponsoring agency, and date of award for each item)
- L. Extramural grant and contract proposals submitted but not yet funded (including project director(s), project title, receiving agency, and date of submission for each item)
- M. Intramural grants awarded (including project director(s), project title, amount of award, and sponsor for each item)
- N. Professional development activities completed to enhance research or scholarship including for-credit courses and degree programs completed (including course or degree name, credit hours, institution, and date of completion for each item) and seminars, workshops, and conferences attended (including title, sponsor, location, and dates for each item)

Possible Indicators of Scholarship Effectiveness

The following is a limited sample of indicators that might serve to document the quality and/or quantity of a candidate's scholarship.

- A. Insightful statements reflecting self-evaluation, self-reflection, and goal-oriented plans with regard to the scope, quality, and direction of the candidate's scholarship
- B. Copies of publication(s) in international, national, or regional journal(s)
- C. Publication(s) of a nature recognized by the candidate's professional peers as

being a significant contribution to the field

- D. Artifacts (e.g., program announcements, acceptance letters, evaluations, printed copies of presentations) associated with presentations of papers at international, national, or regional professional meetings
- E. Evidence of authorship of media for marketing or distribution along with evidence that the materials have been judged and accepted by a publisher or professional review board
- F. Publication of a book, book chapter, or other major written work
- G. Evidence of writing a book, book chapter, or other major written work not yet published
- H. Evidence of successful funding of an authored external grant
- I. Evidence of writing an external grant, even if it was not funded
- J. Evidence of successful funding of an authored internal grant
- K. Evidence of writing an internal grant, even if it was not funded
- L. Evidence of professional development efforts including courses taken for credit and workshops, seminars, and conferences attended
- M. Evidence of research and/or publications in progress
- N. Classroom artifacts (e.g., syllabi, handouts, exams, rubrics) reflecting the scholarly basis for instruction
- O. Evidence of serving as an editor or on the editorial board of scholarly professionally related journal
- P. Evidence of serving as a reviewer for referred journal or grant committee
- Q. Award(s) for scholarly activity

SERVICE

Activities

Professional off-campus service.

- A. Organizational offices held (including title of office, professional organization, and dates of service for each item)
- B. Committee memberships and offices held (including name of committee, professional organization, office, and dates of service for each item)
- C. Committees served on for discipline-related agencies (including name of committee, name of agency, and dates of service for each item)
- D. Special responsibilities performed for discipline-related agencies (including nature of responsibility, name of agency, and dates of service for each item)
- E. Accreditation team memberships and leadership roles (including name of the accrediting body; name of college, college, or university visited; leadership role; and dates of service for each item)
- F. Special organizational responsibilities performed, such as contributing, managing, or section editorships, or juror duties in a competition (including nature of responsibility, professional organization, and dates of service for each item)
- G. Conference responsibilities performed (including nature of responsibility, professional organization, location, and dates for each item)
- H. Speeches and workshops given (including title of presentation, sponsor, location, and date for each item)
- I. Consultant and other professional services performed (including purpose or nature of service, organization, location, and date(s) for each item)
- J. Professional service awards received (including title of award, sponsor, and date for each item)

On campus service.

- K. Governing body memberships and offices held (including name of body, office, and dates of service for each item)
- L. University, college, and departmental standing committee, administrative committee, and ad hoc committee memberships and offices held (including name of committee, parent body, office, and dates of service for each item)

- M. Special responsibilities performed, such as administrative assignments (including title or nature of responsibility and dates of service for each item)
- N. Speeches and workshops given (including title of presentation, sponsor, location, and dates for each item)
- O. Student organizations sponsored (including name of organization and date of service for each item).
- P. Service awards received (including title of award, sponsor, and date for each item)
- Q. Professional development activities completed to enhance professional service including for-credit courses and degree programs completed (including course or degree name, credit hours, institution, and date of completion for each item) and seminars, workshops, and conferences attended (including title, sponsor, location, and dates for each item)

Possible Indicators of Professional Service

The following is a limited sample of indicators that might serve to document the quality and/or quantity of a candidate's service.

- A. Insightful statements reflecting self-evaluation, self-reflection, and goal-oriented plans with regard to the scope, quality, and direction of the candidate's service
- B. Evidence of professional leadership in local, state and/or national professional associations directly related to areas of expertise and/or the good of the profession
- C. Evidence of professional involvement in local, state and/or national professional associations directly related to areas of expertise and/or the good of the profession
- D. Evidence of active participation or leadership on university, college, and departmental committees
- E. Evidence of active participation or leadership on university, college, and departmental governance
- F. Evidence of commitment to the delivery of professional services as functions of the department, e.g., clinic, workshops, conferences, public-college related activities
- G. Award(s) for outstanding service to the University or professional association

- H. Evidence of involvement with student organizations
- I. Evidence of professional development efforts related to service including courses taken for credit and workshops, seminars, and conferences attended