

## **CRITERIA FOR MERIT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION TO ACADEMIC RANKS DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY**

This merit, tenure and promotion criteria document has four purposes: 1) To serve department, college, and university committees which review merit, tenure and promotion materials and evaluate applicants; 2) To provide guidance to faculty members in setting appropriate priorities for their professional activities; 3) To help candidates organize and assemble their dossiers more effectively; 4) To play a major role in defining the character and stature of our department.

### **Advice to the Candidate:**

Pay careful attention to the information set forth in the Faculty Handbook regarding the merit, tenure and promotion review process and the general performance expectations of all university faculty. The advice presented herein is not intended to supplant the Handbook. Rather, it should provide additional guidance. You will be rated in each of three major categories:

- 1) TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS,
- 2) PROFESSIONAL GROWTH,
- 3) SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY,

using the following scale: Outstanding, Superior, Good, or Unacceptable. *You must document achievements in all three categories. NOTE:* The Department of History will evaluate Regular Non-Tenure Track Faculty (RNTT) in the areas of Teaching and Service only. RNTT candidates for merit must achieve a rating of at least Superior in Teaching Effectiveness and Good or above in Service. Use these criteria to plan and prioritize your professional activities in each of the categories. They also will assist you in documenting your achievements in each category when you complete your dossier.

You should be aware that periodic reviews of faculty are required to evaluate progress. A better perspective is that periodic reviews are your right and serve your best interests. Expect these reviews to be comprehensive and to include indications of your progress toward merit, tenure and promotion. Any concerns with your performance will be stated in the periodic reviews along with recommended remedies.

Organize your dossier with sections on each of the three major categories of performance. *Assemble your materials in the exact order of the outline presented below. Include a vita of your entire academic career. Include only evidence of achievement since appointment or promotion to your present rank. Committees and administrators will be closely matching your materials against this outline. Be concise and factual. Briefly explain the importance of items. Do not feel that you must generate great volumes of paper. There is little correlation between the mass of the materials submitted and application success rates. Do not include self ratings in your dossier. Rating in accordance with the criteria is the function of the reviewers.*

Your dossier will be the primary evidence for evaluation of your performance. The Personnel Committee will review and evaluate your dossier. They will also observe and evaluate your classroom teaching, and will have copies of periodic reviews done for tenure or other purposes

as other sources of evidence. The Personnel Committee may also request from, the department chairperson other evidence deemed necessary for your evaluation.

The department Personnel Committee will provide a comprehensive report to the chairperson. The chairperson will conduct an independent review of your materials and will attempt to resolve differences of opinion with the committee before making any recommendation to the Dean of the College. Normally, the chairperson will not recommend for advancement unless agreement is reached with the committee. If, in the opinion of the committee or the chairperson, there is an insufficient case for recommending advancement, you will be informed before materials are forwarded to the Dean of the College. A similar review process takes place at the College level where the advisory committee is made up of one elected faculty member from each department, and then, in the case of promotion, at the University level where the advisory committee includes one faculty member from our college. Again, refer to the Faculty Handbook for official details on the review process at all these levels.

More will be expected of you as you progress through academic ranks and this will be reflected in a greater rigor by committees and administrators in applying and interpreting departmental criteria. *This is important for you to understand!* Our criteria are not a simple checklist, nor is the review process a mere summation of your "scores" in numbers of publications, student evaluations, citizens helped, and so on.

The department gave thorough consideration to developing these criteria. There are some things that you must do to advance and other things that are considered very important. These things are highlighted in the outline of evidence. However, the recommendation for your advancement from the department ultimately will be based on the collective professional judgment of the chairperson and the department committee after a careful consideration of your dossier and other supporting evidence. While this judgment will be firmly grounded in the evidence presented and the criteria, it will be largely qualitative and will seek to answer the question, "Do we think this person has earned advancement and is functioning at the professional level expected for the prospective rank?"

Realize that administrators and committees expect and want you to progress through the academic ranks. This is evidenced by the support provided all faculty for their professional efforts. Rest assured that your reviewers will be diligent in seeking enough strength of documentation in your dossiers and other evidence to advance you.

Thus, it is your task to amass a record of service of sufficient quality and then to present that record in your dossier so that the answer to the question posed above is an unequivocal "Yes!" While this may seem daunting, keep in mind that some variation of this process has been involved in the advancement of all the persons evaluating you. The process worked for them and it will work for you as well.

*Pay close attention in the following section to the definitions and the explanation of various highlighting used throughout these criteria.*

### **Instructions to Reviewers of Merit, Tenure and Promotion Materials:**

**Ratings required for advancement** - Candidates for Assistant Professor must achieve a rating of at least Superior in TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS and Good or above in the remaining two categories. Candidates for Associate Professor must achieve ratings of Superior or above in TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS and PROFESSIONAL GROWTH and a rating of Good or above in SERVICE. Candidates for Professor and Post-Professor Review must achieve at least one rating of Outstanding in either TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS or PROFESSIONAL GROWTH and ratings of Superior or Outstanding in the remaining two categories. The Department of History evaluates Regular Non-Tenure Track Faculty (RNTT) in the areas of TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS and SERVICE only. RNTT candidates for merit must achieve a rating of at least Superior in TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS and Good or above in SERVICE.

## TENURE

CANDIDATES FOR TENURE ARE EXPECTED TO MEET OR EXCEED THE MINIMUM PERFORMANCE LEVELS SET FORTH FOR THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.

**Candidates for tenure and associate professor rank should not burden themselves with excessive committee assignments above the department level, nor should the department request more than normal committee assignments from them at the department level. The primary effort of the candidate for tenure and associate professor rank should be directed toward the candidate's teaching responsibilities and individual research program.**

**Interpretation of the criteria for ranking performance** - The criteria for evaluation in each of the three major categories requires a collective judgment of each reviewing committee to determine what ranking is merited by the documented performance of the candidate. For a ranking of "Outstanding", there must be "a compelling record of sustained performance" documented. For a ranking of "Superior", there must be "an impressive record of sustained performance" documented. For a ranking of "Good", there must be "a sound record of performance" documented. An understanding of the underlined terms above is necessary to arrive at a valid ranking. It is incumbent upon the candidate to explain how individual cases within the three major categories relate to the criteria. The departmental promotion committee will determine the candidate's performance. Following are definitions of these terms as used in the criteria.

compelling: the quality and quantity of achievements indicate a level beyond impressive showing a thorough and solid performance in meeting the departmental criteria and eliciting the highest level of respect and admiration of one's peers.

impressive: the quality and quantity of achievements indicate a level beyond sound, showing a solid performance in meeting the departmental criteria and eliciting admiration of one's peers.

sound: the quality and quantity of achievements indicate an acceptable and satisfactory meeting of the departmental criteria.

sustained: the record documents a level of performance over a period of time in rank, emphasizing the last four years in rank.

Interpretation of specific categories of evidence - The lists of evidence are intended to provide guidelines to the candidate for the preparation of their materials. They are not an exclusive list, and candidates may include any other evidence they deem pertinent.

**Statements highlighted in bold type (not including headings) are minimum expectations.**

**Statements highlighted by underlining (not including headings) indicate important strengths in which candidates need to achieve rankings higher than Good.**

*Statements highlighted by italics alert the candidate to cautions or potential errors.*

## TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

### Evidence Demonstrating Teaching Effectiveness

The candidate should provide a self evaluation in the area of teaching, including a statement of general teaching philosophy and teaching effectiveness.

I. Teaching Performance - **A recommendation for advancement requires that actual teaching at time of review must be demonstrably acceptable and logically expected to continue so.** Evidence of sustained record requires that evidence of teaching effectiveness be collected over the entire period in rank.

- A. Colleagues' Evaluations - These evaluations should be based primarily on **mandatory classroom, and field course observations of actual teaching.** During the pre-tenure period, the minimum frequency of peer observations will correspond to the frequency of evaluations required by the tenure policy. Examination of other data (such as portfolios, tests, outlines, handouts, formal and informal student evaluations, etc.) can provide important support for peer evaluations. The candidate should document actions and outcomes resulting from colleague evaluations during prior years while in the present rank.
- B. Student Evaluations - **Collection of independently conducted student evaluations is mandatory and may be presented as one of the strongest pieces of evidence for teaching effectiveness. In the absence of student evaluations, candidates must present evidence that demonstrate student learning outcomes.** These must be obtained in each section of each course taught using an instrument sanctioned by the university and department. *Mere collecting of student evaluations is considered to be insufficient evidence.* There must be documentation of how ratings were used to develop teaching competency.
- C. Independent Studies, Student Research, and Thesis - Working one-on-one with a student in these kinds of courses requires special talent and commitment to obtain maximum learning and results. The candidate should provide a list of all such courses he or she has supervised categorized by type and whether undergraduate

or graduate. This list should be annotated with a description of the course, results, and outcomes experienced by the student.

- D. Supervision of Graduate Assistants – Working one-on-one with Graduate Assistants is a special kind of teaching and is an important component of our responsibility to our students.
  - E. Student Performance and Success - *Care must be taken in presenting and interpreting evidence in this category to identify results attributable to the candidate's teaching with clarity.* Where results can be attributed in part to other factors, it is the candidate's responsibility to explain his or her contribution to the results. Possible evidence includes: (1) comparison of results of standardized tests to national norms. Ideally, this would be a test or portion of a test targeting a specific course or the specific field of expertise in which the candidate teaches; (2) pre- and post-tests demonstrating accomplishment of course objectives. *The objectives measured must be shown to be consistent with formal course syllabi and curriculum objectives approved by the department.*
  - F. Successful Efforts to Raise Own Teaching Competency - This can include participation in teaching workshops and related activities with evident outcomes in actual teaching practice. Other potential evidence includes successful results from a mentoring relationship with another teacher. Many other activities may be logically included under this category.
  - G. Student Testimonials - Letters from students commenting specifically upon teaching effectiveness may be included in an appendix. Each letter must be labeled by the candidate to indicate whether it was solicited or unsolicited. If the letter is not self-explanatory, the candidate should include an explanation of the circumstances leading to the letter.
  - H. Additional Teaching Load Consideration – The candidate may include any evidence here of additional teaching activity or responsibilities beyond normal course loads that should be considered, such as conducting portfolio reviews, student teaching field observations, or number of different courses taught.
  - I. Other Evidence - The candidate may include any other evidence he or she believes will support an evaluation of teaching performance.
- II. Curriculum Maintenance and Development - **All faculty are expected to participate in program development in the department and must have maintained his or her courses' syllabi, content, and other components.**
- A. Program Development - **When the department undertakes a revision of part or all of a program curriculum, faculty are expected to contribute to this effort with their specific expertise.** The candidate must describe his or her relevant contributions to any program development and explain the significance

of those contributions. Leadership in program development requires more than course revisions or development. To demonstrate leadership in program development, the candidate must document contributions beyond the expected participation such as having taken an active role in the curriculum committee.

- B. Reorganization and Innovation in Courses for Which the Candidate has Primary Responsibility - All faculty are expected to maintain their courses to acceptable standards. Generally, the fulfilling of this basic expectation will be determined in colleague and student evaluations discussed above, and need not be discussed by the candidate under this heading.

Actions appropriate to this criterion include:

1. Development of a new course.
2. Development of a new course offering under an umbrella syllabus (i.e., Topics in World History).
3. Major revision of an existing course in which a revised formal course syllabus is approved in the regular curricular process.
4. Development of a significant new component for an existing course such as a major revision (e.g., computer applications).

*If past colleague evaluations or student ratings indicated concern with the minimal expectations for course maintenance, then the candidate must describe the situation, the subsequent actions taken to remedy, and the resulting outcomes which indicate resolution.*

- C. Obtaining Support for Improvement of Teaching - Many excellent ideas for enhancing teaching cannot be implemented with departmental resources alone. Faculty are urged to participate in efforts to obtain the resources necessary to enhance teaching effectiveness.

1. Grants - Many opportunities exist for internal and external funding to develop teaching effectiveness and curriculum. Faculty are urged to pursue these opportunities as appropriate to their specific teaching responsibilities. Candidates should describe the basis for all pedagogical proposals and grants so that the appropriateness can be evaluated. As such efforts often involve other faculty, the candidate should describe his or her contribution and leadership role, if any.
2. Donations - The candidate should describe his or her role in securing any donations supportive of his or her teaching or the department's educational mission. Occasionally, a candidate will develop a special relationship with a donor that results in very significant support of the department. The effort required to establish and maintain such a relationship is significant and a strong indicator of leadership in this area. The candidate should be aware of some special cautions in this area. Indiscriminant seeking of donations should not be done. The candidate must indicate the appropriateness and benefits of any donation secured. Furthermore, the University Foundation has special responsibilities with regard to donors and donations. Actions by specific faculty not coordinated with the Foundation can cause problems for donors and jeopardize donations.

- D. Other Evidence - The candidate may include any other evidence he or she believes will support an evaluation of performance in obtaining support for improvement of teaching.

III. Recognition of Teaching Effectiveness by Peers External to the Department - This recognition must come from individuals or groups of individuals whose competency to make a valid judgment is evident. Where this competency may be in doubt, the candidate should explain the competency of the peer(s) to judge his or her teaching effectiveness.

- A. Publication of Pedagogical Papers in Refereed Journals - The candidate should provide information about the nature of peer review to which a paper is subjected before acceptance and publication. Papers accepted and "in press" are considered equivalent to publications (indicate "in press" in document). *Papers "in review" or "under contract" are not "in press"*. Copies of all papers cited as evidence must also be included in an appendix. Reviewing committees will make their own assessment of the quality and significance of papers, so the candidate may wish to provide additional commentary on why these works are important.
- B. Winning of Pedagogical Grants from Peer Reviewed Programs - Most competitive grant programs in history include peer reviews by several peers. The competency of the reviewing peers is assured by the peer reviewer selection process of the granting agency. The candidate may use the winning of a peer-reviewed pedagogical grant as straightforward evidence of peer recognition of teaching effectiveness. In many cases individual peer reviews are provided to the author and include quite specific evaluations of the pedagogical merit of the proposal. The candidate may use these specific evaluations as evidence. This may be particularly useful where a proposal receives good reviews but is not funded.
- C. External Recognition - This includes any recognition of the candidate's teaching effectiveness supported by external peer review such as a national, state, University, College or other award.
- D. Other Evidence - The candidate may include any other evidence he or she believes indicates external peer recognition of teaching effectiveness, including non-departmental peer evaluations.

## PERFORMANCE LEVELS FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

### OUTSTANDING:

An evaluation of OUTSTANDING requires a compelling record of sustained, very high quality teaching and leadership in curriculum affairs. The record should demonstrate achievements in I and II. Although achievement in III is not required, any effort in this category will strengthen the candidate's credentials.

## SUPERIOR:

An evaluation of SUPERIOR requires an impressive record of sustained, high quality teaching and significant involvement in curriculum affairs. The record should demonstrate achievements in I and II. Although achievement in III is not required, any effort in this category will strengthen the candidate's credentials.

## GOOD:

An evaluation of GOOD requires a sound record of quality teaching and involvement in curriculum affairs. The record should demonstrate satisfactory performance in categories I and II. Although achievement in III is not required, any effort in this category will strengthen the candidate's credentials.

## UNACCEPTABLE:

An evaluation of UNACCEPTABLE results when there is insufficient evidence of quality teaching or involvement in curriculum affairs.

## PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

### Evidence Demonstrating Professional Growth

The candidate should provide a self evaluation in the area of Professional Growth, including a statement of general professional growth and scholarly effectiveness.

I. Advancement of Knowledge - Advancement of knowledge has two aspects. First, **a competent faculty member must keep abreast of the developments in his or her own specialty.** And second, **a faculty member is expected to pursue research in his or her specialty resulting in the development of new knowledge.** A recommendation for advancement requires that the candidate must be an active scholar in his or her avowed specialty as evidenced by a sustained record of achievements in research.

A. Professional Publication - Professional publication is the culmination of the process of historical research, and as such is the strongest evidence in this category. *Professional publications are those intended to be read by peers.* Papers accepted and "in press" are considered equivalent to publications (indicate "in press" in document). *Papers "in review" or "under contract" are not "in press".* The candidate should recognize that a recommendation for advancement requires publication. Achieving a ranking of Outstanding in professional growth requires a compelling record of professional publication. Publications are of differing types and qualities. The following list gives the general order of importance of each type. The final evaluation of the quality and significance of publications will be done by committees. Length, complexity, peer review, and significance of conclusions are some factors that will be considered. Candidates should include copies and explain the significance of publications in their materials.

1. Publication of a book authored. *Books that have not had the benefit of rigorous peer review are not appropriate to this category.*
2. Articles in journals and chapters in books. *Articles and chapters that have not had the benefit of rigorous peer review are not appropriate to this category.*
  - a. Articles and chapters resulting from the process of historical research.
  - b. Articles and chapters resulting from scholarship consistent with the teacher-scholar model embraced by the university, including articles on teaching, service, outreach and/or historic preservation/public history.

*Candidates should be cautioned that although we embrace a broad definition of scholarship consistent with the teacher-scholar model and assert that scholarship in keeping with this model will be recognized and rewarded, a recommendation for advancement will not normally be made in the absence of publication resulting from research using the historical method, category A2a listed above.*
3. Editorship of a book or journal. *Books or journals that have not had the benefit of rigorous peer review are not appropriate to this category.*
4. Preparation of a National Register of Historic Places Nomination approved at the federal level.
5. Non-refereed book.
6. Non-refereed article.
7. Editorship of non-refereed book or journal.
8. Preparation of a major report.
9. Creative activities, e.g., development and/or location of exhibitions, computer adaptations, and popular works.
10. Publication of Encyclopedia and Dictionary entries.
11. Publication of book reviews.

- B. Professional Presentation and Other Scholarly Endeavor - **All faculty are expected to make regular professional presentations.** *Professional presentations are those given to peer groups.* Publication is a lengthy process, and, especially for Assistant Professors, may not demonstrate fully the sustained nature of the research program. Opportunities for professional presentations are more frequent and they require a much shorter lead time to accomplish. An active program of professional presentations indicates that a candidate has a sustained program of research. As with publications, presentations are of varying quality and significance. An active program of grant acquisition, external and internal, is another indication that a candidate has a sustained research program. The following list is in general order of significance, but the Personnel Committee will be the final judge. The candidate should explain the importance of each presentation or scholarly endeavor in the supporting materials.
1. Refereed papers presented at national or international conferences.
  2. Participation in externally-funded, operated and directed advanced professional study in seminars, institutes, forums and workshops that are competitive and peer reviewed.

3. Refereed papers presented at regional or state conferences.
4. Development, acquisition, and effective use of research grants.
5. Presentation of a non-refereed paper.
6. Review of manuscripts for publication or review of articles for scholarly journals.
7. Advanced non-peer reviewed professional study through participation in seminars, forums, institutes, and workshops.
8. Engage in unpublished research and writing to maintain professional proficiency and growth.
9. Other scholarly activity.

- C. Ongoing Research - The candidate should describe ongoing research projects. *Evidence presented in only this section will be insufficient to document acceptable achievement in the advancement of knowledge.*

II. Recognition of Peers - The recognition of peers both within and external to the university is strong evidence of Professional Growth. To receive a rating of Outstanding in professional growth, a candidate must demonstrate that peers external to the university at the national level recognize the value and importance of his or her research achievements.

- A. External Peers - Both solicited and unsolicited evidence is permissible. The candidate seeking an evaluation of Outstanding must include at least one letter from a colleague who can and will speak frankly about the quality and significance of the candidate's research. Much of the applicable evidence in this category will already be cited earlier in this section when discussing publications and presentations and may be cross-referenced here. Under this category, the candidate should elaborate on the significance of these peer reviews where not previously explained. For example, peer evaluation reports of papers or proposals could be included as evidence. Other strong evidence includes major research awards from professional societies, and best paper awards.
- B. Peers within the University - This includes a wide variety of evidence, both solicited and unsolicited by the candidate. Solicited evidence can include letters from colleagues who are knowledgeable about the candidate's research. The strongest evidence in this category is an award of a research sabbatical.

III. Service to the Profession - **A minimum expectation of any faculty member is to be active in appropriate professional organizations as evidenced by membership.** Establishing a reputation among peers generally requires more active participation in the activities of these organizations. Performance ratings better than GOOD requires more than simple membership in professional organizations. For example:

- A. Serving as editor of a journal, conference proceedings, or newsletter.
- B. Holding office, chairing a committee or taskforce, or serving on same.

- C. Serving as discussant or commentator at a professional meeting.
- D. Chairing sessions at professional meetings.
- E. Attendance at professional meetings.
- F. Other service which should be described fully by the candidate.

## PERFORMANCE LEVELS FOR PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

### OUTSTANDING:

An evaluation of OUTSTANDING requires a compelling record of sustained, very high quality research resulting in professional publications and presentations. The record should demonstrate achievements in I through III. There must be compelling evidence of recognition of the candidate's research at the national level by peers.

### SUPERIOR:

An evaluation of SUPERIOR requires an impressive record of sustained high quality research resulting in professional publications and presentations. The record should demonstrate achievement in I and significant efforts in II and III.

### GOOD:

An evaluation of GOOD requires a sound record of quality research resulting in publication, professional presentations, and participation in professional organizations.

### UNACCEPTABLE:

An evaluation of UNACCEPTABLE results when there is insufficient evidence of quality research with an expectation of continued professional growth.

## SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY

### Evidence Demonstrating Service to the University

The candidate should provide a self evaluation in the area of Service, including a statement of general professional outreach philosophy and outreach effectiveness. Service to the department is expected of all members.

- I. Contributions to Student Activities - Faculty have responsibilities regarding students beyond the teaching mission.
  - A. Student Advising or Mentoring- **Advising or mentoring of department majors is expected of all faculty.** To demonstrate more than this minimum expectation, the candidate should present evidence regarding the quality of his or her

mentoring, for example, surveys of students demonstrating satisfaction or data showing above average retention of majors.

- B. Recruitment of Students - **All faculty are expected to provide interested students with pertinent information about our departments degree programs.** Active recruitment by faculty in introductory courses, at university recruiting functions, and at other opportunities is necessary to sustain our programs. The candidate should present a record of recruitment activities.
- C. Placement of Graduates - **All faculty are expected to provide essential support to students seeking jobs and graduate school opportunities by providing requested information about careers and graduate schools, and by writing appropriate reference letters (or refusing to do so, when appropriate).** The candidate should document placement successes. To demonstrate more than this minimum expectation, the candidate should document special efforts to assist students in employment or graduate school placement.
- D. Support of Extracurricular Professional Activities - **All faculty are expected to assist students in extracurricular activities.** Beyond this, there is a broad range of opportunities, for example:
1. Serving as advisor to a student professional organization.
  2. Leading extra-curricular field trips.
  3. Presenting programs in areas of specialization to faculty and student groups.
- E. Other Evidence - The candidate may include any other evidence he or she believes will support an evaluation of performance in contributions to student activities.

## II. Service to Internal Functioning of the University

- A. Service on Committees and Councils - Our university's collegial governance system relies on faculty participation through committee service. **All faculty are expected to participate in department committees, faculty meetings, and other governance functions of the department.** Ratings better than Good in service will require some service on committees and councils above the department level. Following are opportunities for committee service ranked in decreasing order of significance. The candidate should briefly describe the functions of the committee, if needed, and his or her contributions.
1. Chairperson of faculty senate, or university or college committees.
  2. Department Chair, Director or Assistant Director of a Center, Director or Assistant Director of University Museum, Coordinator of Historic Preservation Program, BA Advisor, Social Studies Advisor, or Graduate Coordinator.
  3. Member of faculty senate, academic council, graduate council, university studies council, or college council.

4. Member of a university committee or college committee.
  5. Chair of departmental committee.
  6. Member of departmental committee.
- B. Other Service to Internal Functioning of the University - Faculty may also perform service outside the regular governance structure. Examples include the following.
1. Completing university, college, or departmental assignments and voluntary actions not handled by committee, e.g., department Library Liaison; History Day Coordinator.
  2. Serving as an advisor to campus-wide non-programmatic student organizations.
- C. Other Evidence - The candidate may include any other evidence he or she believes will support an evaluation of service to the internal functioning of the university.

III. Service to the Public - There is potential for confusion by the candidate in submitting evidence *on public service*. *Only public service activities which the candidate performs his or her capacity as an historian are appropriately included herein as evidence*. Many admirable service activities are not appropriate for inclusion, i.e., Boy Scout leader, public office, church activities, Rotary, and so on. Public service in a professional capacity which enhances the reputations of the faculty member, department, and university, is desirable and pertinent to evaluation rankings better than Good. Following are some examples of activities.

- A. Professional Service – To serve as consultants to area historical societies, museums, government agencies, schools and other organizations requiring the expertise of history, social studies, and historic preservation faculty.
- B. Professional Presentations – To present public programs in areas of professional specialization. These are intended for lay audiences.
- C. Service to Schools – **All faculty are expected to provide occasional service to area schools when requested.** This often consists of programs presented to classes either at the school, on campus, or in the field. Another common service to schools is to participate as officials, judges, etc., in organized education activities (e.g. History Day, Mock U.N.) relating to fields of specialization.
- D. Service and/or Outreach Grants – To apply for grants and other forms of outside funding for professional programs and activities.
- E. Other Evidence – The candidate may include any other evidence he or she believes will support an evaluation of performance in service to the public

## **PERFORMANCE LEVELS FOR SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY**

### **OUTSTANDING:**

An evaluation of OUTSTANDING requires a compelling record of sustained, very high quality service. The record must demonstrate achievement in I through III. There must be demonstrated effort in I, and significant participation in the university governance structure above the department level in II.

### **SUPERIOR:**

An evaluation of SUPERIOR requires an impressive record of sustained high quality service. The record must demonstrate achievement in I and either II or III. There must be participation in the university governance structure above the department level included under II.

### **GOOD:**

An evaluation of GOOD requires a sound record of quality service to the department. The record should demonstrate achievement in I, and acceptable service within the department under II. Any service to the public must have been positive in both benefit and public perception.

### **UNACCEPTABLE:**

An evaluation of UNACCEPTABLE results when there is insufficient evidence of quality service.