



Loyola University Chicago  
School of Education

## **Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The Loyola University Chicago School of Education is a multidisciplinary unit with program (i.e., Affinity Group) emphases in Teaching and Learning, Cultural and Educational Policy Studies, Educational Leadership, Counseling Psychology, and Research and Psychology in the Schools. In addition, within and among these fields, faculty members have expertise in diverse research methodologies. Such expertise provides a common basis for shared experiences that serve as a connecting link across diverse areas and opens opportunities for multidisciplinary investigation.

While there is “unity within diversity,” there is a concern of equitably evaluating faculty members from such diverse disciplines when tenure and/or promotion recommendations are made. This document was developed to be consistent with the School of Education’s commitment to fairness in evaluating its faculty. It is also consistent with the guidelines and criteria found in the University’s 2009 Faculty Handbook.

The remainder of this document more specifically discusses criteria for tenure and promotion and outlines the responsibilities of the candidate, School of Education Faculty Evaluation Committee, and Dean of the School of Education. Appendix A contains a checklist for preparing tenure and/or promotion documents.

### **CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Decisions regarding tenure and promotion are based on a careful examination of the candidate’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. All of these areas are considered important, but demonstrated competence in teaching and research is a necessary condition for tenure and promotion. In addition, it is important to note that in the Faculty Handbook a distinction is made between promotion from rank of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor in contrast to promotion to rank of full Professor. The latter promotion requires the application of more stringent criteria and requires a higher standard for research, teaching, and service. Promotion to Associate Professor is based on evidence that the candidate has (1) developed an area of research specialization that has resulted in publications and presentations at professional meetings, (2) demonstrated competence in the classroom and in other important teaching and advising activities, and (3) established a reasonable record of service to the University and profession. Promotion to the rank of Professor requires not only evidence that the candidate has developed a record of sustained scholarship, teaching competence, and acceptable service, but also that the candidate has attained visibility in his or

her profession beyond the University. Leadership roles in professional organizations, success in obtaining extramural funding, and exceptional service to the University and/or professional organizations would be viewed positively in the decision for promotion to Professor, but cannot substitute for sustained teaching competence and noteworthy scholarship. It is expected that the letters from outside evaluators will attend to the merits and potential of the scholarship of a candidate being considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The letters from outside evaluators for candidates for promotion to full Professor should additionally comment on the impact of the candidate's scholarship to the discipline or field and the recognition it has received from the professional community.

## **Teaching**

The School of Education places a major emphasis on teaching, which includes all activities that lead to the development of students, both graduate and undergraduate. It is expected that teaching will be conducted at a high level of competence by a candidate for tenure and/or promotion.

### **1. Classroom Teaching**

The normal teaching load for tenure-track faculty in the School of Education is five courses per academic year. Thus, all tenure-track faculty members are expected to maintain a normal teaching load after their third year of employment as tenure-track faculty in the School of Education of Loyola University Chicago. Faculty members with grant "buy-outs" or who have been designated as "Research Exceptional" may teach fewer than five courses per year. The Dean of the School of Education may also grant a faculty member a reduced teaching load for significant administrative responsibilities. Additional classroom teaching expectations include (1) regular class attendance, (2) currency of knowledge, (3) objective evaluation of student performance, (4) prompt return of examinations and other course assignments, (5) a reasonable availability to students for consultation, and (6) creating a respectful learning environment as measured by positive course and teacher evaluations.

### **2. Dissertation and Thesis Supervision**

Direction of graduate student research is also a highly important aspect of teaching. Guidance of graduate students to the successful completion of a doctoral degree is especially important for a positive recommendation for promotion to full Professor.

### **3. Fieldwork Supervision**

Supervision of the fieldwork experiences of undergraduate and graduate students is an important teaching responsibility for faculty in such professional schools as the School of Education. The quality of the candidate's supervision is important and should be carefully documented.

### **4. Development of Teaching and Instructional Materials**

Innovative contributions to teaching and instructional design are also valued contributions to teaching (e.g., innovative uses of multimedia learning products).

### **5. Other Evidence for Teaching Effectiveness**

Other important factors to be considered for tenure and promotion might include internal and external recognition for excellence in teaching, development of new courses, significant revision of courses, and directing teaching clinics or workshops.

### **Research**

In a School of Education that offers doctorate degrees, it is necessary that faculty commit themselves to a life of scholarly achievement. Doing so normally results in publication of original work in refereed journals or other forms of publication in which knowledge is disseminated to the discipline or field. Clearly both quality and quantity of the research effort are important indications that the candidate for tenure or promotion has established a solid, mature, and creditable research program. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate a consistent and ongoing record of independent scholarship. Candidates for promotion to Professor must demonstrate that their research efforts have received recognition in their disciplines/fields beyond the University.

#### **1. Publications**

All tenure-track faculty members in the School of Education are expected to develop a scholarly agenda that is appropriate to the discipline and that results in publications in refereed journals and books. Although chapters in non-refereed books, presentations at professional conferences, book reviews, evaluation reports, multi-media products, and research-based instructional materials clearly are forms of scholarship, they can supplement, but not substitute for scholarly, refereed publications. It is expected that all tenure-track faculty members will produce four to six publications (in print or in press) in refereed journals or refereed edited volumes over every three year period of employment or publish one scholarly book/monograph every three years. The quality of the publication and its publication outlet will also factor into tenure and promotion decisions. Indices of publication quality can include statements from outside reviewers and the prestige of the journal in the applicant's field. Multi-authored publications are also valued as indices of scholarly collaboration and student mentorship, but the publication record of candidates for tenure and promotion should show evidence of project leadership and independent scholarship via first authorships in some multi-authored publications.

#### **2. Other Evidence of Scholarly Productivity and Impact**

Beyond these minimum requirements, candidates' scholarly productivity and impact will be evaluated on (1) invited presentations (national and international), (2) quantitative indexes of scholarly impact, (3) awards for scholarship, (4) fellow status in professional societies, (5) editorships and editorial board memberships, (6) external grant

funding, and (7) scholarship that adds to the recognition of the University's intellectual mission and the School of Education's social justice mission. The portfolios of candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should show some evidence of scholarly impact according to the above criteria. The portfolios of candidates for promotion to full Professor should show substantially more evidence of scholarly impact.

## **Service**

Service to the profession, Affinity Group, School, University, and community are expected of candidates for tenure and/or promotion. While all faculty members are expected to make service contributions, non-tenured Assistant Professors will be expected to concentrate in the first few years on building a research agenda, preparing courses, and assisting in program development. Therefore, modest activity in this area is to be expected for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. A higher level of service is expected for promotion to full Professor. Exact criteria for evaluating service contributions are difficult to specify, but tenure and promotion decisions should be based on how significantly the activity has benefited the Affinity Group, School, University, community, and/or the profession.

### **1. Service to the Profession**

Service to the profession includes (1) participating on committees or holding offices in professional organizations, (2) serving as an ad hoc reviewer for scholarly journals and presses or as a program proposal reviewer for professional conferences, and (3) reviewing grant proposals for external funding agencies.

### **2. Service to the Institution (Affinity Group, School, and University)**

Accepting and carrying out committee responsibilities within the Affinity Group, School, and University are the most common forms of institutional service. Institutional service may also include additional activities to assist the Affinity Group, School, or University in carrying out their responsibilities. Examples of such activities include writing and contributing to accreditation reports, developing and/or revising curricula and programs, organizing colloquia, advising student groups, participating in University, School, and Affinity Group-sponsored activities, and gaining external funding to advance the institution's work and objectives.

### **3. Service to the Community**

Service to the community may involve such activities as (1) serving on boards and committees of educational and community service organizations, (2) providing consulting services to educational and community service organizations, (3) offering in-service activities to educational and community service organizations, such as workshops, lectures, keynote addresses, or staff development activities, and (4) other service consistent with the University, School, or Affinity Group's mission.

## **DELINEATION OF ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

The School of Education Faculty Evaluation Committee shall normally meet once a year to review, in detail, all information for each candidate under consideration for tenure and/or promotion. Additionally, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will convene in the spring of each year to review candidates in their third year as non-tenured Assistant Professors in the School of Education. .

### **Mid-Tenure Review Procedures**

The mid-tenure review supplements the annual feedback provided by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Dean of the School of Education, and includes written feedback to the candidate about his or her progress toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The faculty member under this mid-tenure review should prepare a portfolio of materials that is similar to that required for a tenure review (see Appendix A), except that no letters from outside evaluators will be required or solicited by the Dean of the School of Education. The portfolio is typically due in the office of the Dean of the School of Education by mid-February of the year in which the mid-tenure review will occur. Candidates for mid-tenure review must also participate in the annual evaluation during the year in which the mid-tenure review will occur. The materials in Appendix A should be consulted by all parties involved in the mid-tenure review process. In those cases where it is judged that the candidate's accomplishments suggest a reasonable likelihood of earning tenure, the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall recommend to the Dean of the School of Education to continue the candidate's probationary period and provide written feedback to the Dean of the School of Education on the candidate's strengths and any deficiencies that need to be remedied for a positive tenure decision. In those cases where it is judged that the candidate's accomplishments make meeting tenure standards and expectations highly unlikely, the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall recommend to the Dean of the School of Education that the contract not be renewed.

### **Timeframe for Tenure and/or Promotion Review**

For tenure-track Assistant Professors with no previous academic experience, the tenure and promotion review is usually conducted during the fall of the sixth year although it can be made earlier for exceptional cases. For tenure-track Assistant Professors with previous academic experience before being hired on the tenure track at Loyola University Chicago, the tenure and promotion review may take place earlier, depending on the terms of the hire. For those hired as Associate Professors or full Professors without tenure, the tenure review is usually made in the fall of the third year although it can be made earlier. There is no specified timeframe for promotion to full Professor. The candidate for promotion to full Professor initiates the review process by informing and consulting with the School of Education Dean by the spring semester of the immediately preceding academic year in which review will take place.

### **Composition and Responsibilities of the School of Education Faculty Evaluation Committee**

The School of Education Faculty Evaluation Committee is composed of three tenured Associate Professors and three tenured Full Professors, elected by the School of Education

faculty. The Committee elects one of its members to serve as chair at the beginning of each academic year. In decisions concerning tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and for mid-tenure reviews, all members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee will be involved in deliberations and voting. In decisions regarding promotion to full Professor, the Committee shall be comprised only of the tenured, full Professors on the Committee. Should the Faculty Evaluation Committee have fewer than three full Professors, the Dean of the School of Education shall appoint a full Professor(s) from the School of Education to serve on the Committee when an application for promotion to full Professor is under consideration. All members have one vote.

Candid and frank deliberations among the Faculty Evaluation Committee members should precede their final tenure and/or promotion recommendation, which is to be accomplished through a closed, secret ballot. A quorum is necessary to proceed with deliberations and voting and consists of a simple majority of Committee members. Decisions shall be by majority vote. In addition, each committee member will rate the candidate, on the secret ballot, on the following 6-point (5 to 0) scale:

- 5 = strongest “yes” and indicates that the candidate is *uniformly excellent* in meeting teaching, research, and service standards.
- 4 = strong “yes” but acknowledges *minor weaknesses* in one or two areas.
- 3 = weak “yes” and indicates that the candidate has met all criteria, but has *appreciable though not disqualifying weakness* in some area.
- 2 = “no” and indicates that the candidate’s record, whatever its strengths in any given area, *is sufficiently weak on one or more of the criteria* to justify denial of tenure or promotion.
- 1 = strong “no” and indicates *serious weakness* in one or more of the three areas.
- 0 = strongest “no” and indicates that there is *little or no merit* in the candidate’s petition.

The tally of ratings (e.g., 5,5,5,5,4,4) will appear on the Committee’s recommendation to the Dean of the School of Education along with the final (yes/no) vote and written comments to support the Committee’s final recommendation.

The Chairperson of the Faculty Evaluation Committee is the Committee’s only communication channel in transmitting the Committee’s recommendation in writing to the School of Education Dean. It should be noted that any Faculty Evaluation Committee member revealing the Committee’s decision or describing the deliberations of the Committee shall be viewed as engaging in unethical behavior and as clearly violating the trust and confidentiality of the other Committee members, which may result in formal disciplinary action.

#### Responsibilities of the Dean of the School of Education

The Dean shall provide all faculty members eligible for tenure or promotion with feedback on their progress. This will usually be done at the time of the annual review, but must also occur after the meeting of the Faculty Evaluation Committee for the Mid-Tenure reviews of non-tenured Assistant Professors. The Dean also has the responsibility of advising faculty

members about appropriate times to apply for tenure and/or promotion and for aiding them in the preparation of materials submitted to the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Before the Faculty Evaluation Committee deliberations, the Dean's office shall request in writing letters from a minimum of three (3) outside reviewers, commenting on the candidate's scholarship, from a list of six (6) potential reviewers supplied by the candidate. Reviewers shall be well-respected scholars in the candidate's field who are competent to evaluate the candidate's record of scholarship and whose standing in the candidate's discipline make their evaluations worthy of serious attention. The reviewers must not be current or former colleagues with whom the candidate has worked or published nor the candidate's doctoral advisor/mentor, dissertation chair, or dissertation committee member. If the Dean does not find at least three (3) suitable outside reviewers in the list submitted by the candidate, the Dean shall request additional reviewers from the candidate as well as make suggestions of outside reviewers for the candidate to consider. The Dean, though, may finally select only outside reviewers approved by the candidate, even if this means a less than satisfactory set of outside reviewers. If the Dean must ultimately accept a reviewer or reviewers submitted by the candidate whom the Dean believes to be unsatisfactory, the Dean should convey her/his dissatisfaction to the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Outside reviewers shall receive from the Dean (1) the candidate's current curriculum vita, (2) copies of publications chosen by the candidate to best represent his or her research agenda and skills, (3) a narrative statement of the candidate's research philosophy, programs, and goals, and (4) a cover letter from the Dean that includes instructions for the review process and specific mention that the evaluations are confidential and that they should be returned directly to the Dean of the School of Education. All of the above materials, except for the cover letter from the Dean (4), must be submitted to the Dean's office by June 1 of the academic year in which the candidate is pursuing tenure and promotion.

The Dean is to inform the candidate of the Committee's recommendation and the Dean's recommendation at the time that these recommendations are forwarded to the University Rank and Tenure Committee. In addition, in the case of the Mid-Tenure review for non-tenured Assistant Professors, the Dean shall provide the candidate with a written and oral summary of the recommendations of the Committee in addition to making specific written suggestions for future development.

The Committee's recommendation regarding the candidate's tenure and/or promotion is advisory to the Dean. The Dean of the School of Education shall complete the forms necessary for his or her recommendation of tenure and/or promotion and forward these and the Committee's recommendation to the next level of University review in a timely manner.

### **Responsibilities of the Candidate**

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion must submit to the Dean's office by June 1 all materials that will be reviewed by the outside reviewers. These include (1) an up-to-date curriculum vita, (2) copies of publications chosen by the candidate to best represent his or her research agenda and skills, and (3) a narrative statement of the candidate's research agenda,

programs, and goals. The candidate must also prepare a portfolio documenting his or her activities in the areas of teaching, research, and service that is to be submitted to the Dean's office by September 15 of the year in which the evaluation is to take place. The following paragraphs (summarized in Appendix A) specify the materials that must be included and provide guidelines for other types of materials that can be included in the Candidate's Tenure and Promotion portfolio to document his or her research, teaching, and service contributions.

## **1. Teaching**

Each candidate is responsible for ensuring proper documentation of teaching effectiveness. This documentation must include copies of teacher/course evaluations for all courses that the candidate has taught at Loyola University Chicago (candidates for promotion to full Professor must submit teacher/course evaluations of all courses taught during the five years immediately prior to his or her application for promotion). Other required materials include: (1) a list of courses taught, (2) a quantitative summary (e.g., means and ranges) of ratings received on course evaluation items relevant to assessing the candidate's strength as a teacher (e.g., items relating to library and computer resources are not relevant), (3) a narrative description of teaching philosophy, strengths, and goals for future development as a teacher, (4) a list of all dissertations and theses directed to completion, (5) a list of all dissertation and thesis committees on which the candidate has served, and (6) any other material that the candidate and/or Dean considers to be important. Other material that the candidate might include to document teaching effectiveness could include: (1) course syllabi and related materials, (2) course reading lists, (3) written feedback provided through classroom visits by colleagues, (4) numbers of independent study and independent research courses taught and/or names and numbers of students who have participated in research teams directed by the candidate, and (5) awards received for teaching.

It should be reiterated that teaching effectiveness is broadly defined to include not only performance in the classroom but also other activities related to the education of students, including academic counseling and advising, assistance with research projects, and clinical supervision.

## **2. Research**

Each candidate must submit a complete and up-to-date curriculum vita that provides (1) references to all (in print, in press, under review, and in preparation) articles, books, book chapters, reviews, presentations, and grant proposals (funded and unfunded), (2) editorships and editorial board memberships, and (d) other information on scholarly productivity and impact (e.g., awards for scholarship, quantitative indexes of scholarly impact). Each candidate must also provide a narrative description of his or her research agenda, programs, and future goals; copies of all publications (in print, in press, and under review); and any other material the Dean or the candidate considers important. The curriculum vita and narrative statement should be the same as the ones that were submitted to the outside reviewers, except that the vita and narrative statement submitted for Faculty Evaluation Committee review can include citations of publications and other notes on productivity that transpired between the submissions for external and internal review.

It should also be reiterated that evaluation of the candidate's scholarship focuses primarily on the quality of his or her work and on evidence of sustained research activity. Promotion to full Professor additionally requires evidence related to the impact of the candidate's scholarly work and the visibility it has attained in his or her discipline or field.

### **3. Service**

Each candidate should explain in writing how his or her service activities fit with the mission of the University and the School of Education, and provide a list of: (1) offices held, and memberships on, Affinity Group, School, University, and professional committees; (2) journals or presses on which he or she has had reviewing responsibilities (journal editorship and editorial board memberships should be included with research documentation), (3) complete references to workshops or in-service training activities that he or she has provided and consultantships he or she has held, (4) Affinity Group, School, and University-sponsored activities in which he or she has participated, and (5) other material that the candidate or Dean considers as appropriate. The candidate should, whenever possible, include documents (e.g., journal mastheads, letters from presses requesting a review or thanking the candidate for a received review) that support the listed service activities.

In addition, candidates can submit any other information that they feel is pertinent to a fair evaluation of their service activities.

## **GOALS OF THE TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICIES**

The requirements and procedures outlined in this document have been developed to provide maximum equity for all faculty members in the School of Education and to allay some of the anxiety that arises when procedures are unclear. These procedures should insure, as much as possible, impartial, objective, and candid evaluation. When coupled with the required frequent (i.e., annual) feedback that allows faculty to adjust their performance to be congruent with tenure and promotion standards, the outcome of the tenure and/or promotion review should be a recommendation that surprises neither the candidate nor the School.

In the event, however, that grievances should arise, they should be adjudicated by policies outlined in Loyola University Chicago's 2009 Faculty Handbook.

It should be finally noted that the School of Education policies specified in this document are advisory to the University Rank and Tenure Committee and the Provost. Furthermore, these guidelines are subject to the provision of Loyola University Chicago's 2009 Faculty Handbook, which will supersede the former in cases of apparent conflict. All revisions of these guidelines, through procedures outlined in the next section of this document, must be formally approved by the School of Education Academic Council, Appropriate Deans, the University Rank and Tenure Committee, and the Provost.

## **REVISION OF SCHOOL OF EDUCATION TENURE AND PROMOTION**

## GUIDELINES

These Tenure and Promotion Guidelines are subject to revision by the following procedures.

a. Any tenure-track faculty member of the School of Education may initiate a general review or a specific revision of the School of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines.

b. The suggested review or revision should be submitted to the Dean or the Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee who will then forward the recommendation to all Faculty Evaluation Committee members to conduct a review and/or study of the suggested revision. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will then bring a recommendation to the School of Education Academic Council for consideration.

c. Such recommendation will then be submitted to the Dean of the School of Education for formal distribution to the School of Education tenure-track faculty for a vote at an official School of Education meeting. If a majority vote favors a revision of the guidelines, the revised guidelines will be submitted through the proper channels for approval.

d. All School of Education faculty will receive a copy of this document and any subsequent revisions.

## Appendix A

### Checklist for Tenure and Promotion Portfolio

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion must prepare a portfolio of information outlining teaching, research, and service activities and accomplishments. The information to be included in the portfolio is described below; however, the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Dean of the School of Education reserves the right to request additional information of a candidate. The candidate will be informed of the nature and reason for such requests.

The contents of the portfolio are confidential, as are the deliberations of the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

The portfolio will be submitted, with the recommendation of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, to the Dean of the School of Education. The Dean of the School of Education will then prepare a recommendation and is then responsible for ensuring that the portfolio with all recommendations (including those of the School of Education Faculty Evaluation Committee) is forwarded to all other parties and committees involved in the decision making process, including the Dean of the Graduate School and the University Rank and Tenure Committee.

The purposes of this checklist are to provide: (a) candidates for tenure and/or promotion with guidance in developing a case for advancement, and (b) members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee with information that they need for an informed and fair process.

#### **A. Documentation of Teaching:**

1. A list of courses, both undergraduate and graduate, taught
2. Evidence on teaching effectiveness, including:
  - a. A narrative description of the candidate ' s teaching philosophy, strengths and weaknesses as a teacher/supervisor, and goals for teaching improvement.
  - b. Copies of course evaluations for all courses taught at Loyola University Chicago (candidates for promotion to full Professor should submit course evaluations for all courses taught during the five years immediately prior to application for promotion). Student responses to open-ended questions should also be included.
  - c. A quantitative summary of ratings (i.e., means and ranges) on items relevant to assessing the candidate ' s strength as a teacher (ratings received on items pertaining to library and computer resources, for example, do not have to be summarized).
3. A list of all dissertations and theses directed to completion as well as a list of those in progress.
4. A list of dissertation and thesis committees on which the candidate served.
5. A list of students who completed independent study and independent research courses with the candidate.
6. Additional information relevant to teaching that the candidate wants to submit, such as course syllabi, reading lists, student projects, written feedback provided through

classroom visits by colleagues, list of students who have participated on research teams directed by the candidate, awards, fellowships, and/or other honors related to teaching (nominated for or received).

7. Other material that the Faculty Evaluation Committee or dean considers necessary.

## **B. Documentation of Scholarship:**

1. A narrative description of the candidate's research agenda, scholarly contributions, and future research goals.
2. A list of references to all articles, book chapters, books, reviews, multimedia products, research-based curriculum materials, and other published materials (in print and in press). These should be presented in standard reference format and order of authorship must be specified in all multi-authored publications.
3. A list of references to all manuscripts under editorial review, using standard reference format, that indicates the journal or press to which the manuscript has been submitted and the order of authorship for all multi-authored manuscripts.
4. A list of references to all manuscripts in preparation, using standard reference format that indicates the order of authorships for all multi-authored manuscripts.
5. A list of references to presentations (i.e., papers, symposia, posters, etc.) using standard reference format that indicates where the paper was presented and the order of authorship of all multi-authored presentations. Please also note which presentations were invited.
6. A list of submitted research-oriented grant proposals, both funded and unfunded.
7. A list of all editorships and editorial board memberships held, including their duration.
8. One copy of all publications (in print, in press, and under review).
9. Additionally, the candidate should supply to the Dean, three copies each of however many publications the candidate considers indicative of the quality and direction of his or her scholarly work. These should be given to the Dean, along with three copies of a current curriculum vita and three copies of the narrative research statement (see B1 above), which will be sent by the Dean to the external reviewers. These are due in the Dean's office by June 1 of the academic year in which the candidate will be evaluated for tenure and/or promotion.
10. Additional material relevant to scholarly activity that the candidate wishes to submit, such as published reviews of the candidate's scholarship, references to publications that have been reprinted in other sources, citation counts or other indices of scholarly impact, and a list of awards, fellowships, and/or other honors for scholarly work (nominated for or received).
11. Other material that the Faculty Evaluation Committee or Dean considers necessary.

## **C. Documentation of Service**

1. A narrative description of how the candidate's service activities fit within the missions of the University, School of Education, and the Candidate's Affinity Group
2. A list of memberships and, if applicable, offices held in Affinity Group, School, and/or University Committees and their duration.
3. A list describing participation in Affinity Group, School, and/or University activities.
4. A list of memberships in professional associations, office held, and/or committee memberships, including their duration.
5. A list of all submitted service-oriented grant proposals, both funded and unfunded
6. A list of editorial responsibilities not included to document research accomplishments (e.g., ad hoc reviews, grant review panels, conference presentation review panels) and their duration.
7. A list of community service activities and their duration.
8. A list of all workshops and in-service training activities (with dates and topics) provided by the candidate.
9. A list of consultantships and/or clinical service activities, whether paid or pro bono.
10. Additional information relevant to service activities that the candidate wishes to submit, such as a list of professional certifications, and professional or community service recognition awards (nominated for or received).
11. Other material that the Faculty Evaluation Committee or Dean considers necessary.

Revised December, 2010

Adopted by School of Education Faculty, January 11, 2011