INTRODUCTION

The general criteria for the award of tenure and advancement in rank of faculty in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs are set forth in the Indiana University Academic Handbook and in the School’s Governance Document. Copies of the relevant sections of these documents are reproduced in Appendix A. In 1985, these criteria were supplemented by a SPEA document entitled “Faculty Professional Guidelines.” This document builds on the criteria set out in the Faculty Handbook and the Governance Document, supersedes the Faculty Professional Guidelines, and is intended to be the operative statement of the standards for tenure and promotion of faculty in the School. The standards are intended to be interpreted in light of the evolving expectations of the Academy, the University and the School. These standards were approved by the SPEA Academic Council on April 30, 1999 and are effective immediately, with the understanding that any faculty member hired prior to the adoption of these standards may choose to be evaluated pursuant to the statement of standards in place when he/she was employed by Indiana University. The standards were revised minimally on December 5, 2008 to account for changes in the School’s structure mandated by the Board of Trustees of Indiana University, effective June 30, 2008. Under the new format, the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses of the School will form a “core campus” with affiliated programs on several regional campuses. The relationship between SPEA and each affiliated program is specified in a separate Memorandum of Understanding between SPEA and the particular regional campus.

The School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA) is a professional school with a faculty drawn from a broad range of disciplines, an international reputation, and high expectations for those associated with it. Organized as a “core” school, SPEA has faculty and programs on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses and affiliated faculty and degree programs on several regional campuses, each of which has a
distinctive operating context and mission. Integral to the School’s mission is an emphasis on the creation and transmittal of knowledge—as well as its application to the problems faced by society. These features, among others, engender some distinctive and important overarching dimensions to the promotion and tenure expectations within the School:

1. Teaching, research, and service, particularly public service, have equal stature in the promotion and tenure process. The School’s strong emphasis on instruction in a professional context means that in some instances faculty carry heavier instructional loads than their disciplinary counterparts elsewhere in the University and the Academy. Concomitantly, the School’s emphasis on the application of knowledge in the context of public service, creates an added dimension to the normal definition of service within the Academy and calls for a heavier commitment of time and effort to this end than is placed on most faculty elsewhere in the University and the Academy.

The expectations concerning teaching, research and service are sensitive to the diversity of the missions and contexts of the core campuses on which the faculty appointments are based.

2. The application of the standards respects and accommodates the diversity of the disciplines represented in the School as well as the scholarly expectations and traditions of those disciplines.

3. Faculty are encouraged to do interdisciplinary work, which often means that work is co-authored and care must be taken to ascertain the contribution to the work by the candidate for promotion or tenure.

4. Faculty are encouraged to do work that realizes synergies between their teaching, research and service, and the tenure and promotion assessment should recognize the value of those synergies and take into account the difficulty in some instances of separating the work neatly into the three
categories for purpose of evaluation. Some work may be recognized as contributing to more than one category.

**GENERAL CRITERIA**

1. For both tenure and promotion to either associate or full professor, a candidate must demonstrate excellence in one or more of the assessment categories (teaching, research and service) and at least a satisfactory record in the remaining categories. In exceptional cases, a candidate may be tenured or promoted based on a presentation of balanced strengths across the three categories that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the School and the University.

2. Tenure is based on the clear promise, evident in the record to date, that the faculty member has or will achieve (1) a national or international reputation as a first-class productive scholar and/or (2) a record of excellence as a teacher and/or (3) excellence in service.

3. Promotion from assistant to associate professor is based on continued improvement in the quality of teaching, research and service during the period as an assistant professor and evidence that the faculty member is (1) achieving a national reputation as a first-class productive scholar and/or (2) developing a record of excellence as a teacher and/or (3) developing a record of excellence in service.

4. Promotion to full professor is based on (1) a national or international reputation as a first-class productive scholar and/or (2) a sustained record of excellence in teaching and/or (3) a sustained record of excellence in service.

**RESEARCH**

A. **Preamble.** The primary evidence of the research record is the faculty member’s published work and the peer assessment of that work. Research published in journal articles and books generally are the most appropriate vehicles for the presentation of a faculty member’s work. Other outlets appropriate for research include chapters in books, papers in conference proceedings, reports, abstracts, pamphlets, and digital/electronic media where a peer-review process similar to that used in the publication of journal
articles or books is part of the decision to publish work in one of these media. Other evidence, as illustrated below, is relevant to the assessment of the faculty member’s standing in the profession and reputation as a scholar.

B. **Indicators of Research Quality.** The indicators on which the assessment of the quality of the research record will be based include:

1. *The quality of the published work.* Considerations include: the rigor of the peer review involved in the publication; the appropriateness and status or reputation of the journal or publisher; the commentary from outside reviewers on the importance and impact of the published work; the reputation of those outside reviewers; and indications that the work is cited by others and/or has had an impact on the field.

2. *The quantity of the published research.* Considerations include: whether the number of publications—considering the discipline, the campus and the nature of the work—is appropriate to the rank; and whether the record demonstrates a generally sustained flow of work (after due consideration for the nature of the work and review/publication timetables). The quality of the work is more important than quantity, but the amount of the research product is to be considered in context with the quality/value of the work.

3. *Independence of research output.* Considerations include: whether the faculty member has moved beyond the simple extension of his/her thesis or post-doctoral work and established an independent research agenda; and, whether the faculty member has authored publications without his/her thesis or post-doctoral advisor, or a single senior colleague, as a co-author. Co-authorship with collaborators should follow the norms of the field, but in each case an assessment should be made of the faculty member’s independent contribution to the published research.

4. *Professional reputation of the faculty member.* Among the indicators of the standing of the faculty member—and the extent to which the individual has obtained a regional, national or international reputation—are:

   a. Presentations at regional, national and international meetings.
b. Invitations to lecture at other universities and at regional, national or international meetings.

c. Invitations to organize symposia or panels at meetings.

d. Grants or contracts. The expectations vary, depending on the norms of the discipline or the campus.

e. Awards by regional, national or international organizations.

f. Memberships on journal editorial boards.

g. Editorships of journals or books.

h. Leadership positions in scholarly societies.

In assessing these indicators, the reputation of the organizations, journals, scholarly societies, and grant making/contracting agencies, as well as the nature/rigor of any peer review process involved, are relevant considerations.

It should be noted that some of these indicators of reputation also constitute service activities that are considered in evaluating the faculty member’s service.

C. Criteria for Assessment of Research.

1. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor.

A. Excellence. The evidence establishes that the faculty member is beginning to establish a national reputation as an original contributor through research and shows high promise of continued development as a research scholar. The faculty member’s work should suggest that there is an independent research agenda and a well-defined domain of inquiry being established with continuity and connection between individual projects. There should be evidence that the candidate is contributing to an area in at least one of the following ways:

1. Methodological originality—developing research methods that break new ground or offer new solutions to problems encountered in the field.
2. Substantive illumination--adding new critical insights to a subject so that others working in the field now view the subject with greater clarity or with new perspectives.

3. Integration and synthesis--placing large amounts of information or empirical data or technique in a new, usually more comprehensive, framework so as to clarify how pieces of knowledge may relate.

4. Conceptual and theoretical innovation--generating new ways of thinking about existing topics or problems through new concepts, uses of logic or schemata.

The faculty member should have established a record of high quality work, with a number of published works--appropriate to the campus and discipline--in high quality journals and/or with high quality publishers. Where appropriate to the discipline, the faculty member has demonstrated the ability to compete favorably for grant and/or contract support for the research. Outside reviewers are generally very positive about the quality of the research.

B. Satisfactory. The evidence establishes that the faculty member is developing a program of research in a specific field and is contributing to that field either some original inquiry or unique interpretations or syntheses that are contributions to the dissemination of new knowledge. Progress beyond the doctoral dissertation should be evident.

The faculty member should have established a record of quality work, with a number of published works--appropriate to the discipline and the campus--in good quality journals and/or with good quality publishers. The faculty member should have a clearly established independent research agenda and should show promise of continued development as a scholar. Where appropriate to the discipline, the potential to compete for grant and/or contract support for research has been demonstrated. Outside reviewers generally are positive about the quality of the research.

C. Unsatisfactory. The evidence fails to establish that the faculty member, through the publication of good quality work-- in amounts appropriate to the discipline and campus and in appropriate outlets -- has established an independent research agenda and shows promise of
continued development as a scholar. An unsatisfactory research record typically would be characterized by one, or more, of the following:

1. Little or no indication of an independent research agenda.
2. Research work that in the judgment of reviewers is of poor quality.
3. Research work that is published in poor quality journals or by poor quality book publishers.
4. Too little—as appropriate to the discipline and campus—work of quality in appropriate outlets.
5. Failure to demonstrate promise—where appropriate to the discipline—of the potential to compete for grant and/or contract support for research.
6. Failure to demonstrate promise of continued development as a research scholar.

2. Promotion to Professor.

A. Excellence. The evidence clearly demonstrates that the faculty member has established a national—or international—reputation as a first class scholar and can be expected to maintain that reputation. The faculty member has established and sustained a research agenda and has published a significant amount of high quality research in high quality journals and/or with high quality publishers—beyond the level expected for promotion to associate professor. Where appropriate to the discipline, the faculty member has shown the sustained ability to compete for grant and contract support for his/her research program. Outside reviewers generally are very positive about the quality of the research and the impact it has had on the field, and they confirm the national or international reputation of the faculty member.

B. Satisfactory. The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has grown as a scholar since the promotion to associate professor and has established a national reputation for making sound research contributions through the publication on a sustained basis of good quality research—in amounts appropriate to the campus and the discipline and in good quality journals and/or with good quality publishers—beyond the level expected for promotion to associate professor. Where appropriate to the discipline, the faculty member has shown the ability to compete for grant and
contract support for his/her research programs. Outside reviewers are generally positive about the quality of the research.

C. Unsatisfactory. The evidence is insufficient to establish that the faculty member has grown as a scholar since the promotion to associate professor and/or that the faculty member has established a national reputation for making sound research contributions through the publication of good quality research--in amounts appropriate to the campus and the discipline and in good quality outlets--beyond the level expected for promotion to associate professor. An unsatisfactory research record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following:

1. Little indication of an independent research agenda.
2. Little indication of growth as a scholar since promotion to associate professor.
3. Work that in the judgment of reviewers is of poor quality
4. Too little work--as appropriate to the discipline and campus--in good outlets since promotion to associate professor.
5. Where appropriate, insufficient demonstrated ability to compete for grants and/or contracts to support research.

TEACHING

A. Preamble. Teaching encompasses a wide range of activities related to the instructional mission of the University. There are at least three dimensions to teaching: instruction in the classroom, laboratory, and field setting; mentoring and advising; and contributions to pedagogy.

B. Evidence of Teaching Quality.

1. Instruction. Formal instruction takes place in a variety of settings, including classrooms, laboratories and in the field and may be in the context of a class, workshop, short-course or retreat. It also may involve management of multi-section courses or team-taught courses. The evaluations--and the evaluation instruments-- should be sensitive to the context of the instruction and to what is being assessed--
for example, quality of the instruction provided by the faculty member versus quality of the course organization or management. The size and the nature of the audience--e.g. undergraduates, graduate students, professionals, colleagues, or lay--as well as the subject matter--are also relevant factors in interpreting the evaluations.

The primary evidence of instructional quality includes: (a) student evaluations of teaching (as well as commentary of program administrators putting those evaluations in context); (b) peer observations/evaluations of teaching; (c) letters from students, particularly unsolicited ones; and (d) teaching awards and other recognition for outstanding teaching. Where management of multi-sectioned courses or team-taught courses are involved, the student evaluations should differentiate between the quality of the course organization and the actual instruction provided by a specific faculty member. The relative contributions of the various instructors should be ascertained, and colleague and co-instructor evaluations can be particularly helpful.

In considering student evaluations of teaching, particularly the standard course evaluative instruments, the nature of the instruments and their potential limitations/weaknesses should be kept in mind. Among other things, it will commonly be the case that even the best instructors may receive unfavorable commentary or evaluations from some students and that instructors performing at an unsatisfactory level may be able to point to positive commentary or evaluation from some students.

2. **Mentoring and advising.** This category includes: academic advising and mentoring: supervision of internships, laboratory work, and field work; supervision of independent study; and advising masters and doctoral students concerning their research and theses. The opportunities, as well as the demands, for faculty mentoring and advising varies substantially among academic fields, between different levels of students, and among campuses. While quantitative measures can be informative as to the time and effort the faculty member has invested in these activities, particularly those that are part of being a good academic citizen, it is important, where possible, to develop an assessment of the quality of the advising and mentoring provided by the faculty member. Letters from students as well as observations/evaluations from
peers can be helpful. Where products, such as theses, papers, presentations, joint-publications, and reports, arise out of the interaction with the faculty member, they should be noted and assessed.

3. **Contributions to pedagogy.** This category includes: course development; curriculum development; and the development of teaching materials and techniques. Assessment of the quality of these activities focuses primarily on those that go beyond the basic level of academic citizenship such as the development of syllabi and notes for teaching assigned courses and routine participation in faculty and committee meetings concerning teaching and curriculum issues. Peer assessment of the contributions to pedagogy, and their impact, is particularly desirable and should be part of any asserted claims of excellence.

In assessing course development, the evaluation should focus on, among other things: the receipt of grants to develop new courses or revise old ones; teaching awards and other recognition attributable to the course preparation; articles in peer-reviewed journals about the new courses or techniques utilized in teaching them; and presentations at conferences about the new courses or techniques utilized in teaching them.

In assessing curriculum development, the evaluation should focus on, among other things: leadership and/or major contributions to the development of new degrees, programs of study, certificates, and areas of study; articles in peer reviewed journals about the curricular development; and presentations at conferences about curricular development.

In assessing the development of teaching materials, the evaluation should focus on, among other things: the quality, innovative nature and impact of textbooks, instructor’s manuals, student guides, web sites and other teaching media; articles in peer-reviewed journals about innovative teaching methods or materials; and presentations at conferences about innovative teaching methods and materials. Having the benefit of peer evaluation (internal and external) of asserted innovative materials and methods is especially desirable.

C. **Criteria for Assessment of Teaching Quality.**

1. **Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor.**
A. **Excellence.** The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has carried a reasonable teaching load (considering the number of courses taught, the size and nature of the classes, and the number of different preparations) and establishes strong performance across the three dimensions of teaching: instruction, mentoring and advising, and contributions to pedagogy. Student evaluations, in both the quantitative and open-ended responses, support the conclusion that the instructor is well above average and students are generally very positive about course organization and teaching effectiveness. Unsolicited student letters, as well as peer evaluations, attest to teaching effectiveness. The candidate makes a strong contribution to student advising and demonstrates exceptional mentoring. He/she also has made exceptional contributions to course and/or curriculum development and/or to pedagogy recognized beyond the campus. In the case of pedagogical contributions, peer assessment confirms the excellence of the contributions.

B. **Satisfactory.** Student evaluations, in both the quantitative and open-ended responses, confirm that the faculty member is performing the instructional responsibilities at a clearly acceptable level. Students generally are comfortable with the organization of courses and with the effectiveness of the teaching. Teaching effectiveness has generally improved over time and, where particular problems have been identified, the faculty member has taken steps to address them and assess the effectiveness of the changes. Peer evaluations also support a conclusion that the instructional effectiveness is at a clearly acceptable level. The faculty member has demonstrated the ability to take on the development of new course preparations and to craft and deliver reasonably acceptable courses. The faculty member willingly contributes his/her share of the advising and makes the normally expected contributions to student mentoring, curriculum and course development, and pedagogy.

C. **Unsatisfactory.** The evidence does not demonstrate that the contributions to the instructional mission are at the acceptable level. An unsatisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following:

1. The student evaluations generally indicate that the faculty member is not an effective teacher and/or there are significant student complaints about course organization, delivery and/or teaching effectiveness.
2. When problems have been identified, the faculty member has been unwilling or unable to craft responses to address the problems and there is a discernable lack of improvement over time and/or an inability to bring the teaching up to a clearly acceptable level on a regular basis.

3. Peer evaluations do not confirm that the faculty member is teaching at a clearly acceptable level.

4. The faculty member does not make the normally expected contributions to student advising, has not demonstrated the ability to be an effective mentor and/or does not make effective contributions to course or curriculum development or pedagogy.

2. **Promotion to Full Professor.**

   A. **Excellence.** The evidence demonstrates that a reasonable teaching load (considering the number of courses, the size and nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations) has been covered and establishes sustained strong performance across the three dimensions of teaching: instruction, mentoring and advising, and contributions to pedagogy. Student evaluations, in both the quantitative and open-ended responses, support the conclusion that the instructor is well above average and students are generally very positive about course organization and teaching effectiveness. Unsolicited student letters as well as peer evaluations attest to teaching effectiveness. Contributions to student advising are strong and exceptional mentoring has been demonstrated. The faculty member has made exceptional contributions to course and/or curriculum development and/or to pedagogy. The faculty member has a national reputation for pedagogical contributions, and peer assessment confirms the excellence of the contributions.

   B. **Satisfactory.** Student evaluations, in both the quantitative and open-ended responses, confirm that the faculty member is performing the instructional responsibilities at a clearly acceptable level. Students generally are comfortable with the organization of courses and with the effectiveness of the teaching. Teaching effectiveness has generally improved over time and where particular problems have been identified, the faculty member has taken steps to address them and assess the effectiveness of the changes. Peer evaluations also support a conclusion that the instructional effectiveness is at a clearly acceptable level. The faculty member has demonstrated the ability to take on the development of a new
course preparation and to craft and deliver a reasonably acceptable course. The faculty member willingly contributes his/her share of the advising and makes the normally expected contributions to student mentoring, curriculum and course development, and pedagogy.

C. Unsatisfactory. The available evidence does not demonstrate that contributions to the instructional mission are at the acceptable level. An unsatisfactory teaching record typically would be characterized by one, or more, of the following:

1. The student evaluations generally indicate that the faculty member is not an effective teacher and/or there are significant student complaints about course organization or delivery and/or teaching effectiveness.

2. When problems have been identified, the faculty member has been unwilling or unable to craft responses to address the problems and there is a discernable lack of improvement over time and/or an inability to bring the teaching up to a clearly acceptable level on a regular basis.

3. Peer evaluations do not confirm that the faculty member’s teaching is at a clearly acceptable level.

4. The faculty member does not make the normally expected contributions to student advising, has not demonstrated the ability to be an effective mentor and/or does not make effective contributions to course or curriculum development or pedagogy.

SERVICE

A. Preface. Service is the effective application by faculty members of knowledge, skills, or expertise developed within their discipline or profession as a scholar, teacher, administrator, or practitioner. A distinction is made between general civic or parenting responsibility and the application of one’s professional skills. It is the latter that delineates contributions in the area of service.

B. Evidence of Service Quality.

1. School and University Service. The overall functioning and self-governance of the university is dependent upon the academic citizenship of its faculty, and institutional service involves activities that help
sustain or lead academic endeavors. Every faculty member is expected to contribute a certain amount of service to the School such as regular attendance at faculty meetings and participation in committee assignments. The nature and level of service may vary according to the particular needs and missions of the campus where the faculty member is resident as well as on the interests and special contributions the faculty member may be able to make. Institutional service includes the following categories:

(1) Committee Service: serving on committees that are essential for the management or functioning of the School or University, such as those involved with curricular policy, student recruitment, admission and placement, accreditation, teaching/learning evaluation, search and screen, promotion and tenure, and task forces dealing with important issues.

(2) Administrative Service: taking a leadership role in the management of the school or university, including directing programs, directing faculties or committees, directing institutes or centers, or serving as an elected representative in faculty governance.

Service to the Profession. Service to the profession involves activities that enhance the quality of disciplinary or professional organizations or activities. This includes the following categories:

(1) Professional Development: service that is essential for development of one’s profession such as reviewing manuscripts for professional journals or proposals for funding agencies, moderating sessions or serving as a discussant at professional conferences, serving on committees, or participating in professional societies or organizations and participation in accreditation or establishing professional or academic standards.

(2) Professional Leadership: assuming a leadership role in advancement of one’s profession through activities such as editing a journal, serving on an editorial board, organizing symposia, conferences or workshops, editing proceedings, or serving as an officer of a professional society

It should be noted that many of these activities can also contribute to the faculty member’s reputation as a scholar and/or are indicators of the extent to which the faculty member is gaining—or has—established a
national reputation as a scholar. Thus, there can be a clear relationship to the assessment of the research area as well.

Public Service. Service to the community involves activities that contribute to the public welfare beyond the academic community and call upon the faculty member’s expertise as a scholar, teacher, administrator or practitioner. Consistent with the school’s public affairs orientation, service activities may be in the public, non-profit and/or private sectors and may either be paid or unpaid. The professional nature of the activity is the critical aspect. It is expected that all faculty members will engage in some public service activity within their areas of expertise as the occasion permits.

The professional engagement involved in public service involves application of specialized professional knowledge or skills in a variety of forums and includes: advising or consulting with private, public and non-profit organizations; providing public policy analysis or technical expertise for local, state, regional, national or international agencies or entities; writing technical reports or other materials prepared specifically in conjunction with service activities; serving as an expert witness or providing legislative testimony; serving on boards, commissions or review panels; evaluating policies, programs, or personnel for agencies; assisting agencies with development activities; and communicating in popular, non-academic publications and other media such as television or radio.

The indicators on which the assessment of the quality of the service record will be based include:

1. The quantity of service. Considerations include: the number and range of the activities; the nature of the faculty member’s involvement in each activity; the commitment of time required; and, whether the faculty member participated regularly. Documentation of the involvement in minutes and reports sometimes can be useful.

2. The quality of the service. As with research, it is particularly important to ascertain the quality and impact of the service. Considerations include: the evaluations of colleagues, committee chairs and other administrators as to the quality of institutional service; evaluations by professional colleagues as to the quality of professional service; and evaluations by colleagues, clients, stakeholders and peer
reviewers (internal and external) as to the quality of public service; indications that the faculty member has been asked to continue the service or has been sought out by others as a result of the service; and receipt of competitive grants, awards, honors or other recognition for the service activity.

3. Outcomes and impacts of the service. Another important indicator in assessing service activities is tangible evidence of the significance of the service and its effectiveness/impact, including evidence of outcomes such as letters of accreditation, reports and technical documents, changes in policies, implementation of new programs or measures, and statements from stakeholders.

4. Leadership. Demonstration of leadership is particularly important to an assertion of excellence in service. The evidence includes appointments, nominations or elections to leadership positions as well as an evaluation of the leadership by colleagues, peers or, as appropriate, clients, and stakeholders.

C. Criteria for Assessment of Service.

1. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

   A. Excellence. The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member is making an outstanding contribution to the mission of the School through his/her service activities (including particularly his/her public service), provides effective leadership on significant activities and has made a significant impact in highly visible or important areas. Colleagues and other knowledgeable observers/evaluators of the service activities assess the service in highly favorable terms and confirm its impact. The faculty member has received external awards, honors or other recognition for some of the service. Where appropriate the faculty member has demonstrated the ability to obtain grant or contract support--or to develop other support for service activities. The faculty member's activities contribute beyond the norm to the reputation of the School and University. Typically, service excellence must be premised on more than outstanding service to the School, University and profession and must include significant public service.
B. Satisfactory. The evidence establishes that the faculty member is a good academic citizen and contributes constructively to the mission of the School and University through his/her service activities. The faculty member serves on a reasonable number of committees, dutifully fulfills the responsibilities involved, and receives generally favorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his/her contributions. The faculty member is an active participant in professional activities and has demonstrated the willingness and ability to contribute to the public service mission of the School.

C. Unsatisfactory. The evidence fails to establish that the faculty member is a good academic citizen who contributes constructively to the mission of the School and University through his/her service activities. An unsatisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following:

1. Failure to provide a reasonable amount of service to the School or University;
2. Failure to demonstrate more than minimal contributions to the public service mission of the School;
3. Irresponsible service, including the failure to complete assignments or attend meetings;
4. Failure to participate in disciplinary conferences or meetings;
5. Generally unfavorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his/her contributions.

2. Promotion to Professor.

A. Excellence. The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member is making an outstanding contribution to the mission of the School through his/her service activities (including particularly his/her public service), provides effective leadership on significant activities, and has made a significant impact in highly visible or important areas. Colleagues and other knowledgeable observers/evaluators of the service activities assess the service in highly favorable terms and corroborate its beneficial impact. The faculty member has received external awards, honors or other recognition for some of the service. Where appropriate the faculty member has demonstrated the ability to obtain grant or contract support—or to develop other support for service activities. The faculty member’s service activities contribute well beyond the norm to the reputation of the School and University. Typically, service excellence must be premised on
more than outstanding service to the School, University and profession and must include significant public service.

**B. Satisfactory.** The evidence establishes that the faculty member is a good academic citizen and contributes effectively and beyond the minimum expected for an associate professor to the mission of the School and University through his/her service activities. The faculty member serves on a reasonable number of committees, dutifully fulfills the responsibilities involved, and receives generally favorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his/her contributions. The faculty member is an active participant in professional activities and has demonstrated the willingness and ability to contribute to the public service mission of the School.

**C. Unsatisfactory.** The evidence fails to establish that the faculty member is a good academic citizen who contributes well beyond the minimum and effectively to the mission of the School and University through his/her service activities. An unsatisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following:

1. Failure to provide a reasonable amount of service to the School or University;
2. Failure to demonstrate the willingness or ability to contribute to the public service mission of the School;
3. Irresponsible service, including the failure to complete assignments or attend meetings;
4. Failure to participate in disciplinary conferences or meetings;
5. Generally unfavorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his/her contributions or collegiality.