

Indiana University School of Informatics and Computing, Bloomington Campus Promotion and Tenure Policies & Guidelines

Section I – Policies and Procedures

The Indiana University School of Informatics and Computing (henceforth, SoIC) is a school with an international reputation and a faculty drawn from a broad range of disciplines. Organized as a “core” school, SoIC has faculty and programs on both Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, each of which has a distinctive operating context and mission. Each has its own policies that extend the IU Academic Handbook and define the responsibilities and expectations of faculty, particularly as they relate to promotion and tenure. This document describes the promotion and tenure guidelines for the SoIC Bloomington Campus.

The SoIC Bloomington Campus is committed to excellent teaching, research, and service in the art, science, and human dimensions of computing and information, their management, and their deployment, and to the fields represented by the faculty of its units, which cover many heterogeneous disciplines. It follows that teaching and research on the SoIC Bloomington Campus is similarly multi-disciplinary. The expectations and criteria for promotion and tenure respect and accommodate the diversity of the disciplines represented in the SoIC Bloomington Campus, as well as the scholarly expectations and traditions of those disciplines. Faculty in interdisciplinary areas are encouraged, if not expected, to do interdisciplinary work. This often means that work is co-authored and care must be taken to ascertain the contribution to the work by the candidate for promotion and tenure.

The tenure and promotion criteria of the SoIC Bloomington Campus further recognize that many sub-disciplines of the school are new, rapidly changing, and linked to others within and outside academia. Therefore, the standards for promotion and tenure must carefully consider contributions manifest in a broad spectrum of ways, including some that might be new or unconventional.

Faculty are encouraged to do work that realizes synergies across 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 contribute to more than one category; however when reported in the promotion or tenure dossier, each work must be counted in only one of the three performance areas. However, candidates are given the freedom to choose to assign specific accomplishments to performance areas according to the case they are making for tenure or promotion.

SOIC UNITS AND FACULTY MEMBER’S HOME UNIT

For faculty affairs purposes, the SoIC Bloomington Campus consists of faculty affairs units which themselves may be either departments or divisions within departments, each of which will have a chair. All faculty in the school are assigned to units. The unit and unit chair are responsible for Promotion and Tenure review.

Each faculty member has a home unit, in which her/his affairs, such as promotion, tenure, and annual review are conducted; the unit determines unit-level procedures and policies to be followed for such processes. To this end, appointment letters for new faculty whose primary appointment is at the SoIC Bloomington Campus must state the faculty member's home unit, i.e., a unit of the SoIC Bloomington Campus.

A candidate's home unit is wholly responsible for managing the unit-level promotion and tenure evaluation of the candidate, but will seek advice and consultation from any other units where the candidate holds a joint (FTE) appointment. In the case of joint appointments with units outside the school, the unit outside the school has the opportunity to file an evaluative review of the candidate's dossier, which is considered by the home unit in its deliberations.

UNIVERSITY AND UNIT-SPECIFIC POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

In addition to this document, there are other documents that govern both the processes and criteria for promotion and tenure on the SoIC Bloomington Campus. These include the Academic Handbook, as well as policies concerning academic appointment classifications and faculty tenure and promotion approved by the Bloomington Faculty Council. These university-level policies take precedence over this document in any areas where they might conflict, and so should be consulted whenever interpreting this document.

In addition (as specified in Indiana University Bloomington Campus Policy E-5, Criteria for Faculty Tenure), each unit should develop documents that further specify and clarify the criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure in the unit. In the case of conflict between this document and the unit specific documentation, this document's requirements take precedence, unless this document conflicts with Indiana University or Bloomington Campus policies, in which case those policies take precedence.

PROCEDURES

Assembly of the tenure dossier is the responsibility of the candidate's chair, but the chair should include all relevant material that the candidate believes should be included. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide relevant requested materials for inclusion in the dossier in a timely manner. The dossier must be constructed in such a fashion as to meet the guidelines in the *IU Academic Handbook*. Tenure cases are considered no later than the sixth year of service toward tenure, not counting various permitted leaves (e.g., medical, parental) or other officially recognized interruptions of research activities. Faculty members may seek an early tenure decision as provided in the *IU Academic Handbook*. Normally, promotion to the Associate rank happens concurrently with the tenure decision. Faculty members, after having been promoted to associate and once tenure has been granted, may nominate themselves for promotion to full rank, or such recommendations may be received from faculty colleagues.

The dean or executive associate dean will provide, annually, a specific timeline for the assembly of promotion and tenure dossiers and all associated documentation. The dean or executive

associate dean also maintains a guidelines document regarding the processes that occur after the submission of the dossier. The documentation and voting procedures are described below.

In the year prior to the tenure or promotion decision, each candidate will be assigned a tenure or promotion liaison committee of three or more tenured associate or full professors, where the rank of all liaison professors will be at least as high as the position under consideration. The unit chair will appoint this committee, normally, early in the spring semester. The committee shall mentor the candidate and assist the unit chair as requested, in the preparation of dossier material; the liaison committee will present the case and all relevant matters to the faculty members of the candidate's unit, who will then vote on the case. Because the School prefers that the members of the liaison committee participate at the unit level deliberation and vote, this committee shall not make a formal recommendation.

Based on campus requirements the dossier will include at least six external letters, half comes from a list of possibilities prepared by the candidate and half comes from a list prepared by the unit chair. The unit chair will solicit the appropriate number of external letters based on the unit guidelines.

Within the School, the tenure dossier is considered first by the faculty members at rank in the candidate's unit and by the unit's chair. The home unit's faculty will vote on the assessment of research, teaching, and service, and on the recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion. On each tenure and promotion case a unit should submit a faculty report that reflects all significant views on the case, including the vote count. Normally, the liaison committee will draft the faculty report and revise it following the faculty deliberation and vote. This report is then added to the dossier. Then the candidate's primary unit chair will write a "chair's statement." This statement will include a synopsis of the faculty's discussion of the case and report on vote counts for the assessment of research, teaching, and service, and for the unit's recommendation for or against tenure or promotion. The chair will further reflect his or her own view and assessment in the statement. The chair will facilitate subsequent correspondence with the deans and/or university tenure and promotion committees. After the unit chair writes the chair's statement, it is considered by the SoIC Bloomington Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will vote on the assessment of research, teaching, and service, and on the recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure and will make a recommendation to the Dean, who in turn will provide his or her recommendation and pass all recommendations to date, including the voting tallies, to the appropriate campus committee. From this point on, the procedures are governed by campus guidelines as well as the IU Academic Handbook.

FACULTY VOTING PROCEDURES

Eligibility is guided by the principle of rank-appropriateness: only tenured faculty within a unit may vote on tenure cases and only associate/full professors may vote on candidates seeking promotion to associate/full professor. Faculty are eligible to vote only if they have been materially engaged in the review process, as evidenced (for example) by demonstrated familiarity with the dossier and attendance at meetings where the case is discussed. No proxy

voting is allowed. Retired faculty members do not vote. Each unit may extend this procedure and specify further eligibility requirements regarding promotion and tenure votes.

Eligible faculty may vote only once per case. Members of the School of Informatics and Computing Bloomington Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee should normally vote at the school level rather than at the unit level. They will not chair and normally will not serve on the liaison committee. Members of the School of Informatics and Computing Bloomington Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee should normally attend the meetings of their unit at which tenure and promotion cases are discussed. They should try to avoid arguing either side of the case, but they should raise any important facts and/or considerations that might otherwise be overlooked. All eligible faculty must vote on all performance areas using the evaluative assessments listed in this document and also for the overall recommendation for tenure or promotion. Who voted and any absences must be reported in the dossier. Voting is by secret ballot (appropriate, cryptographically secure online voting is acceptable).

Section 2 – Guidelines

GENERAL CRITERIA

1. For both tenure and promotion either to associate or full professor, a candidate must demonstrate excellence in one or more of the performance categories (teaching, research, and service) and at least a satisfactory/effective record in the remaining categories. Normally, promotion and tenure at the SoIC Bloomington Campus is based on excellence in research/creative activity. In exceptional cases, a candidate may be tenured or promoted on the basis of teaching, service, or a presentation of balanced strengths across the three categories that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the school, campus, and university. A decision to pursue promotion and/or tenure on the basis of research, teaching, service, or a balanced case should be made as early as possible.
2. Tenure is based on the clear promise, evident in the record to date, that the faculty member has or will achieve at least national record of excellence, either in teaching or research/creative activity, or has a balanced record of superior performance in all three areas research/creative activity, teaching, and service.
3. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is based on excellence in the quality of teaching, research, or service, and evidence that the faculty member is achieving a national reputation of excellence in at least one of the three areas of performance, or a balanced record of very good performance in all three areas during the period as an Assistant Professor.
4. Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor is based on a sustained record of national or international recognition in research/creative activity, or teaching, or service, or a balanced record of very good performance in all three areas.

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

- A. Preamble. If research or other creative work is the category in which the candidate is claiming excellence, the candidate must have achieved or clearly be developing a position of scholarly leadership. This leadership must be demonstrated through external letters and by other pertinent documentation such as publications, creative pieces and products, or peer reviewed exhibits. If the research or creative activity is interdisciplinary, letters should be sought from researchers and experts in the related field/s, or the other disciplines, and the same interdisciplinary area where possible. The primary evidence of the research record is the faculty member's published work and the peer assessment of that work, although specialized refereed workshop and conference proceedings and the creation and distribution of software and/or hardware artifacts may also be valuable indicators of the quality and significance of a faculty member's research work. Further details on appropriate research outlets may be found in each unit's promotion and tenure guidelines.
- B. A candidate seeking tenure or promotion based on excellence in research must be at least effective in teaching and satisfactory in service.
- C. Indicators of Research Quality. Normally, the indicators on which the assessment of the quality of the research record will be based include:

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

Indications of the quality of research might also include: innovative research methods that offer new solutions to problems encountered in the field; substantive, new critical insights on a subject that enable others to view it with greater clarity or new perspectives; integration and synthesis of large amounts of existing data or information in a new framework that clarifies how different aspects of knowledge relate; and other conceptual and theoretical innovations that generate new ways of thinking about existing topics or problems.

2. ***The quantity of research/creative activity.*** Considerations include: whether the number and length of publications, considering the discipline, the campus, and the nature of the work, is appropriate to the rank; and whether the record demonstrates a regular and sustained flow of peer-reviewed contributions (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 continuity and pace of the research output are to be considered in context with the quality or value of the work.

3. ***Independence of research/creative activity.*** For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, considerations include whether the faculty member has moved beyond the

simple extension of her/his thesis or post-doctoral work and established an independent research agenda. For promotion to Full Professor, considerations include indications of leadership in research. 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.** Indicators of the standing of the faculty member and her/his national or international reputation include: presentations at regional, national, and international meetings; invitations to lecture at other universities and at national or international meetings; invitations to organize symposia or panels at meetings; grants or contracts, as appropriate to the discipline; awards by national or international organizations; memberships on editorial boards; editorships of journals, books, or other scholarly venues; and leadership positions in scholarly societies. In assessing these indicators, the reputation of the organizations, conferences, journals, scholarly societies, and grant making or contracting agencies, as well as the nature and rigor of any peer review process involved, are relevant considerations.

D. Criteria for Assessment of Research.

1. **Excellent:** The faculty member has established a record of high quality work, with quality and number of publications appropriate to the rank sought, as evaluated in the candidate's discipline. For promotions to Full Professor, the faculty member should have a clear research leadership role, and for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a clearly established independent research agenda and promise of continued development as a scholar. 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 very positive about the quality of the research. The researcher is on track to assume or has established him/herself in a position of intellectual leadership in her/his field of scholarship.

2. **Very Good.** The candidate has a record of work that is very good but not excellent; i.e., it lacks one or more attributes for it to be considered "excellent" and it is therefore not sufficient for promotion on the basis of research as the primary area. This level should be considered a halfway point between satisfactory and excellent in research; it is acceptable for balanced cases, for which promotion can be granted only if all three areas of research, teaching, and service are evaluated as "very good."

3. **Satisfactory.** The faculty member has an established record of research or creative activity that shows the faculty member contributes to a specific field — either some original inquiry, unique interpretations, or syntheses that contribute to the dissemination of new knowledge. In a case where some other area (teaching or service) is the area of excellence, the record is sufficient to justify tenure or promotion, but it is not sufficient on its own as an area of excellence, nor as a component of a balanced case.

3. **Unsatisfactory.** The evidence fails to establish that the faculty member has an independent research agenda, and/or shows insufficient accomplishments to expect a

sustained output of scholarly research or creative activity in the future. An unsatisfactory research record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following: little or no indication of an independent research agenda; work judged as poor quality by independent reviewers; work that is published in poor quality journals, conferences, or by poor quality book publishers; too little work of quality in appropriate outlets as evaluated by the faculty member's discipline; failure to demonstrate promise, where appropriate to the discipline, of the potential to compete for grant and/or contract support for research; failure to demonstrate promise of continued development as a research scholar.

TEACHING

A. Preamble. Teaching encompasses a wide range of activities related to the instructional mission of the school, campus, and university. The many dimensions to teaching include instruction in the classroom, laboratory, and field setting; mentoring and advising; and contributions to pedagogy. If the category of excellence is teaching, the candidate's teaching should be comparable to that of the most effective teachers at this institution. The faculty member must have demonstrated a superior ability and interest in stimulating in students at all levels a genuine desire for study and creative work. The candidate should also provide evidence of leadership in pedagogical and curricular development within the school's fields of study. This leadership should be evident both inside and outside Indiana University.

B. A candidate seeking tenure or promotion based on excellence in teaching must be at least satisfactory in research and service.

C. Evidence of Teaching Quality.

1. **Instruction.** Formal instruction takes place in a variety of settings, including classrooms, laboratories, and in the field. It may be in the context of a class, workshop, one-on-one consultation, short-course or retreat, or through online or distance education programs. It also may involve management of multi-section courses or team-taught courses. The evaluations and evaluation instruments should be sensitive to the context of the instruction and to what is being assessed. For example, assessment tools should differentiate the quality of the instruction provided by the faculty member versus the quality of the course organization or management. The size and the nature of the audience – undergraduates, graduate students, professionals, colleagues, or the lay public – 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 and 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 is 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; colleague and co-instructor evaluations can be particularly helpful. Evidence of outstanding teaching

might also include indications of the success of students in later coursework, advanced degrees, honors, awards, and career achievements.

In considering student evaluations of teaching, particularly the standard course evaluative instruments, the nature of the instruments and their potential limitations and 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 ineffective level may be able to point to positive commentary or evaluation from some students. The expected difference in teaching evaluations between, e.g., a large required undergraduate course and a small elective graduate seminar, should also be considered during review. Finally, the special demands of online teaching, where relevant, should be taken into account when reviewing teaching evaluations.

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 master's and doctoral students concerning their research and theses. The opportunity, as well as the demand, for faculty mentoring and advising can vary substantially between academic fields, and between different levels of students. Although 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 and 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 by the larger pedagogical community 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 consider, among other things: the receipt of grants to develop new courses or revise old ones; teaching awards and other recognition attributable to course preparation; articles in peer-reviewed venues about new courses or teaching techniques; and presentations at conferences about the new courses or teaching techniques used in them.

In assessing curriculum development, the evaluation should consider, 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 venues about curricular development; and presentations at conferences about curricular development. It

could also include participation in organizations devoted to teaching and educational assessment.

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 venues about innovative teaching methods or materials; and presentations at conferences about innovative teaching methods and materials. Peer evaluation of materials and methods claimed to be innovative is especially desirable.

D. Criteria for Assessment of Teaching Quality.

1. **Excellent.** The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has established excellent performance across the three dimensions of teaching: instruction, mentoring, and advising, and contributions to pedagogy. 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 IU Bloomington campus. The candidate's record suggests a trajectory that will lead to a position of pedagogical leadership nationally or even globally.
2. **Very Good.** The candidate has a record of teaching that very good but not excellent; i.e. it lacks one or more attributes that would allow it to be considered "excellent" and it is therefore not sufficient for promotion on the basis of teaching as the primary area. This level should be considered a halfway point between satisfactory and excellent in teaching; it is critical for balanced cases: promotion can be granted only if all three areas, research, teaching and service, are evaluated as "very good."
3. **Effective.** Students generally are comfortable with the organization of courses and with the effectiveness of the teaching. As needed, 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 her/his share of the advising and makes the normally expected contributions to student mentoring, curriculum and course development, and pedagogy.
4. **Ineffective.** 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: 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; when problems have been identified, the faculty member has been unwilling or unable to craft

responses to address the problems and there is a discernible lack of improvement over time and/or an inability to bring the teaching up to a clearly acceptable level on a regular basis; peer evaluations confirm that the faculty member is not teaching at a clearly acceptable level; 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. Preamble. Service is the effective application by faculty members of knowledge, skills, or expertise developed within their disciplines or profession as scholars, teachers, administrators, or practitioners. Service is considered in three different areas: service to the university, through its departmental, school-level, campus-level and other structures; service to the community, through various forms of public engagement; and service to the profession, through associations, conferences, and journals. Generally, contributions in a single area of service are not sufficient to claim satisfactory service, but a balance must be struck across different types of service in a way that engages the faculty member's professional skills. If service is the category of excellence, the documentation should demonstrate the impact of this service to the broader field of the faculty member's area of interest, SoIC and/or Indiana University, as well as to the wider community.

B. A candidate seeking tenure or promotion based on excellence in service must be at least effective in teaching and satisfactory in research.

C. Evidence of Service Quality.

1. ***School, Campus and University Service.*** The overall functioning and self-governance of the university depends upon the academic citizenship of its faculty; 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 SoIC Bloomington Campus, such as regular attendance at faculty meetings and participation in committee assignments. The nature and level of service may vary according to the interests and special contributions the faculty member may be able to make. Institutional service includes committee service and administrative service. Committee service is service on committees that are essential for the management or functioning of the school, campus, or university, such as those involved with curricular policy; student recruitment, admission and placement; accreditation; teaching evaluation; search and screen; promotion and tenure; and task forces dealing with other important issues. Administrative service is service in a prominent role in the management of the school, campus, or university, including directing programs, directing faculties or committees, directing institutes or centers, or serving as an elected representative in faculty governance.
2. ***Service to the Profession.*** Service to the profession involves activities that enhance the quality of the disciplinary or professional organizations or activities, such as service in and leadership of professional organizations. Professional organization service includes 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 establishment of professional or academic standards. Professional organization leadership means 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 in a professional society.

3. **Community & Social Service.** Service to the community at the local, state, national, or international level involves activities that contribute to the public and global welfare beyond the academic setting and calls upon the faculty member's expertise as a scholar, teacher, administrator, or practitioner. Consistent with the School's practical, real-world orientation, service activities may be in the public, non-profit and/or private sectors and may be either paid or unpaid. The professional nature of the activity is the critical aspect. It is hoped that faculty members will have the opportunity to engage in some professional service activity within their areas of expertise in order to see the application of their knowledge in real-world situations.

Professional 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 of 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, 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 or 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.

D. Criteria for Assessment of Service.

1. **Excellent.** The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member makes an outstanding contribution to the mission of the School through her/his service activities, provides effective leadership and has made a significant impact in highly visible or important areas. Colleagues and other knowledgeable evaluators 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 has developed other financial or community support for service activities. The faculty member's activities contribute beyond the norm to the reputation of the school, campus, and university. Typically, excellence in service must be premised on more than outstanding service to the school, campus, university, and professional organizations and must include significant professional service for external constituencies.
2. **Very Good.** The candidate has a record of service that very good but not excellent; i.e., it lacks one or more attributes that would allow it to be considered "excellent" and it is therefore not sufficient for promotion on the basis of service as the primary area. This level should be considered a halfway point between satisfactory and excellent in service; it is criterial for balanced cases: promotion can be granted only if all three areas, research, teaching and service, are evaluated as "very good."
3. **Satisfactory.** The evidence establishes that the faculty member is not only a good academic citizen by contributing constructively to the mission of the school, campus, and university through her/his 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 her/his contributions. The faculty member is an active participant in professional organization activities and has demonstrated the willingness and ability to contribute to the professional service mission of the school by continuing to develop an active program of professional service.
4. **Unsatisfactory.** The evidence fails to establish that the faculty member is a good academic citizen who contributes constructively to the mission of the school, campus,

and university through her/his service activities. An unsatisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following: failure to provide a reasonable amount of service to the school, campus, or university; failure to demonstrate more than minimal contributions to the professional service mission of the school; irresponsible service, including the failure to complete assignments or attend meetings; failure to participate in conferences or meetings; generally unfavorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for her/his contributions.

BALANCED CASE

In a balanced case, the candidate's overall achievements and contributions must be shown to be comparable in excellence to that of a candidate with a single declared area of excellence. It is expected in a balanced case that a faculty member would be ranked "very good" in the assessment of research, teaching, and service.

The decision to pursue a dossier based on a balanced case should be made early in the career and the balanced case should not be seen as a fallback position for a candidate whose ability to achieve excellence in at least one of the areas is in question.