

# IU LILLY FAMILY SCHOOL OF PHILANTHROPY

## PROMOTION AND TENURE STANDARDS

### Introduction

Criteria for promotion and tenure for faculty are outlined in the Indiana University academic Handbook and the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy (LFSOP) governance documents.

The IUPUI Chief academic Officer's Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers is an important reference document for all faculty. This document "Promotion and Tenure Standards" supersedes the 2010 document approved by the Philanthropic Studies Faculty of the same name.

The Lilly Family School of Philanthropy is a professional school with a strong liberal art base with faculty drawn from a broad range of disciplines and fields of study including philanthropic Studies. The School enjoys an international reputation and holds high expectations for its faculty. The faculty is organized as a core faculty at IUPUI with affiliated and adjunct faculty from other IU campuses. It should be noted that the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy's standards for promotion and/or tenure only apply to the "Core" faculty of the LFSOP. The home school for all affiliate and/or adjunct faculty determines their own standards for promotion and tenure independently.

As a new multidisciplinary school with a mission of the creation of and transmittal of

knowledge important for a better society especially through the lens of philanthropy (broadly conceived), these promotion and tenure standards are sensitive to the multiple requirements for faculty commitments. The expectations for teaching, research, and service are articulated to provide clarity where faculty place their work for purposes of evaluation. Some work, such as public scholarship 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. A candidate also may be tenured or promoted based on the “Balanced Case”, which is a presentation of highly satisfactory record across the three categories. That promises the equivalent value overall as would performance of excellence in one category and at least satisfactory in the other two to the School and the University.
2. Tenure is based on evidence that the faculty member is establishing a national and/or international reputation as an original contributor to the field. The faculty member has (1) a record of excellence in research and/or (2) a record of excellence in teaching and/or (3) excellence in service; or (4) highly satisfactory record in all three areas. It is understood that peer-reviewed scholarship is required for achieving a highly-satisfactory rating in each area of performance in a balanced case.
3. Promotion from assistant to associate professor is based on continued improvement in the area of teaching, research and service during the period as an assistant professor and evidence that the faculty member is (1) achieving a national and/or international reputation in research and/or (2) developing a record of excellence in teaching and/or (3) developing a record of excellence in service.

4. Promotion to full professor is based on (1) a sustained record of excellence as a national and/or international scholar in research 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 on:

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 --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 appropriate research agenda. 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.
- 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 and/or international reputation as an original contributor through research and shows high promise of continued development as a research scholar in philanthropic studies. 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 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 several published works -- in high quality journals and/or with high quality publishers. If appropriate, 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. Highly Satisfactory.** The faculty member has established a record of high quality work; with several published works appropriate to the field of philanthropic studies in outlets of varying quality appropriate for his/her work. Importantly, the evidence demonstrates that the candidate is advancing at least one program of research and is contributing either some original inquiry or unique interpretations that are furthering the dissemination of new knowledge. The faculty member shows considerable promise of continued development as a scholar. If appropriate, the ability to compete for grant or contract support for research has been demonstrated. While the evidence demonstrates strong performance on at least some of the dimensions of research, overall, the performance, does not meet criteria for excellence, it will be closer to excellence than to satisfactory.

**C. 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 scholarly works--appropriate to philanthropic studies --in good quality journals and/or with good quality publishers/venues. The faculty member should have a clearly established independent research agenda and should show promise of continued development as a scholar. If appropriate, 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.

**D. Unsatisfactory.** The evidence fails to establish that the faculty member, through the publication of good quality work-- 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 work of quality in appropriate outlets.
5. Failure to demonstrate promise of the potential to compete for grant and/or contract support.
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 and/or international--reputation as a first class scholar and can be expected to maintain that reputation beyond the level expected for promotion to associate professor. Some of the ways in which a faculty member might demonstrate excellence in research would include the following possibilities:

1. 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.
2. The faculty member has shown the sustained ability to compete for grant and contract support for his/her research program. Externally funded research is one indication of external recognition of excellence of research, but is neither necessary nor sufficient for promotion.
3. 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 and/or international reputation of the faculty member.

**B. Highly Satisfactory.** The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has grown as a scholar since the promotion to Associate Professor and has continued to make sound research contributions through the publication, on a sustained basis, of high quality research in amounts appropriate to philanthropic studies and in good quality journals or with good quality publishers. The faculty member has shown the ability to compete for grant and contract support for his or her research programs. Outside reviewers are generally positive about the quality of the research. The evidence is closer to excellence than to satisfactory.

**C. 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--beyond the level expected for promotion to associate professor. As appropriate, 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.

**D. 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 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 in good outlets since promotion to associate professor.
5. 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 multiple dimensions to teaching including: instruction in the classroom, laboratory, and field setting; mentoring and advising; scholarly contributions to pedagogy; and the like.

**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) 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 and between different levels of students. 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. *Scholarly 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 multiple dimensions of teaching: instruction, mentoring and advising, and scholarly 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. 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 to pedagogy recognized beyond the campus such as articles in peer-reviewed interprofessional or discipline-based journals original curricular and assessment products, program assessment and evaluation, innovation in service learning or other models or technologies that integrate

interprofessional practice and educational pedagogy, and qualitative and/or quantitative descriptions or research related to project or program outcomes such as community and/or practice-based interprofessional projects. In the case of pedagogical contributions, peer assessment confirms the excellence of the contributions.

**B. Highly Satisfactory** The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has carried a reasonable teaching load (considering the number of courses taught, the size and nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations) and establishes highly satisfactory performance across multiple dimensions of teaching: instruction, mentoring and advising, and scholarly contributions to pedagogy. Student evaluations, in both the quantitative and open-ended responses, support the conclusion that the instructor is above average and students are generally very positive about course organization and teaching effectiveness. Peer evaluations attest to teaching effectiveness. The candidate makes a strong contribution to student advising and demonstrates exceptional mentoring. He/she also has made strong contributions to course and/or curriculum development and to pedagogy recognized beyond the campus such as articles in peer-reviewed interprofessional or discipline-based journals original curricular and assessment products, program assessment and evaluation, innovation in service learning or other models or technologies that integrate interprofessional practice and educational pedagogy, and qualitative and/or quantitative descriptions or research related to project or program outcomes such as community and/or practice-based interprofessional projects. In total, the evidence is closer to excellence than to satisfactory.

**C. 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 design 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.

**D. Unsatisfactory.** The evidence does not demonstrate that the contributions to the instructional mission are at the acceptable level. One or more of the following typically would characterize an unsatisfactory record:

1. The student evaluations generally indicate that the faculty member is not an effective teacher and/or there are significant and persistent/consistent 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 design 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 multiple dimensions of teaching: instruction, mentoring and advising, and scholarly 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. 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 candidate makes a strong contribution to student advising and demonstrates exceptional mentoring. He/she also has made strong contributions to course and/or curriculum development and to pedagogy recognized beyond the campus such as articles in peer-reviewed interprofessional or discipline-based journals original curricular and assessment products, program assessment and evaluation, innovation in service learning or other models or technologies that integrate interprofessional practice and educational pedagogy, and qualitative and/or quantitative descriptions or research related to project or program outcomes such as community and/or practice-based interprofessional projects. The faculty member has a national reputation for pedagogical contributions and peer assessment confirms the excellence of the contributions.

B. Highly Satisfactory The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has carried a reasonable teaching load (considering the number of courses taught, the size and nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations) and establishes highly satisfactory performance across multiple dimensions of teaching: instruction, mentoring and advising, and scholarly contributions to pedagogy. Student evaluations, in both the quantitative and open-ended responses, support the conclusion that the instructor is above average and students are generally very positive about course organization and teaching effectiveness. Peer evaluations attest to teaching effectiveness. The candidate makes a strong contribution to student advising and demonstrates exceptional mentoring. He/she also has made strong contributions to course and/or curriculum

development and to pedagogy recognized beyond the campus such as articles in peer-reviewed interprofessional or discipline-based journals original curricular and assessment products, program assessment and evaluation, innovation in service learning or other models or technologies that integrate interprofessional practice and educational pedagogy, and qualitative and/or quantitative descriptions or research related to project or program outcomes such as community and/or practice-based interprofessional projects. In total, the evidence is closer to excellence than to satisfactory.

**C. 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.

**D. 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**

**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 application of professional skills in service to the School, the University, one's profession, and the public that delineates contributions in the area of service.

### **A. 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. 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. 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.

**B. 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. Highly Satisfactory.** The evidence establishes that the faculty member contributes constructively to the mission of the School and University through his or her service activities. The faculty member serves on a reasonable number of committees, dutifully fulfills the responsibilities involved, and receives favorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his or her contributions. The member has demonstrated the willingness and ability to contribute through his or her persistent service commitments to the community broadly defined to include governmental, nonprofit, and private organizations. The faculty member has a track record of service to the academy including review of journal articles and grant applications; serving on journal editorial boards and academic association boards; organizing and participation in conferences, workshops and symposiums; and some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required. In total, the evidence is closer to excellence than to satisfactory.

**C. 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.

**D. 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.
6. Failure to help create/sustain a collegial work environment for the school's or campus' faculty, staff, and students, or worse yet creating a hostile or non-collegial work environment.

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 including peer refereed presentations and publications. 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. Highly Satisfactory.** The evidence establishes that the faculty member contributes constructively to the mission of the School and University through his or her service activities during time in rank. The faculty member serves on a reasonable number of committees, dutifully fulfills the responsibilities involved, and receives favorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his or her contributions. The member has demonstrated the willingness and ability to contribute through his or her persistent service commitments to the community broadly defined to include governmental, nonprofit, and private organizations. The faculty member has a track record of service to the academy including review of journal articles and grant applications; serving on journal editorial boards and academic association boards; organizing and participation in conferences, workshops and symposiums; and some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required. . In total, the evidence is closer to excellence than to satisfactory.

**C. 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.

**D. 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.
6. Failure to help create/sustain a collegial work environment for the school's or campus' faculty, staff, and students, or worse yet creating a hostile or non-collegial work environment.

Approved by the Philanthropic Studies Faculty on Dec 3, 2010

Revised by the Philanthropic Studies Faculty,xxxx, 2019.

