

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY**

Approved by the Faculty: April 25, 1997
Revised, October, 1998, January 22, 1999,
February 13, 2009

Department Chair/Head

Date

Dean

Date

Provost

Date

FOREWORD

The General Guidelines for Faculty Development and Performance have been established jointly by the Personal Advisory Committee and the Chair/Head of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and approved by the Dean and Provost. The Guidelines present the criteria that are used in annual performance evaluations, and reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. Three major areas are covered: (1) The annual evaluation of all faculty, (2) Tenure, promotion, reappointment and post-tenure review¹, and (3) Performance criteria and standards. A major objective of the Guidelines is to clarify and supplement the general policies set forth in the Clemson University Faculty Manual.

¹ Administrative procedures and responsibilities of department personnel (the Department Chair/Head, the individual faculty member, and the TPR Committee) are addressed in Appendix A.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

The following principles undergird the development of these Guidelines:

- 1) Scholarship is defined broadly. It includes activities that support the instructional and applied missions of the department, as well as the publication of basic and applied research within the discipline. Scholarship may also include the development of theory and the synthesis of existing knowledge to form new perspectives, regardless of discipline.
- 2) Research is broadly construed in the context of a multidisciplinary department. The base definition of research must include the methodical gathering or use of data *and* the analysis and interpretation of evidence *and* a presentation of findings. Research may be performed in various formats, including but not limited to experimental, quasi-experimental, observational and case study formats.
- 3) Research is an organized yet adaptable undertaking that requires planning, literature reviews of past research and relevant theory, possible collaboration, the determination of which questions compel answering, other intrinsic activities, and the writing process that brings fruit to the previous endeavors. The Department understands the rhythms of inquiry and the time entailed by the complete process of research.
- 4) Department faculty expects colleagues to make contributions to teaching, research, and university and professional service. Faculty contributions in these areas can result from a variety of activities including funded and unfunded research, teaching, professional writing (e.g., journal articles, books, magazine articles), service or Extension activity, and approved consulting.
- 5) Professorial ranks are earned on the basis of meritorious performance that can be objectively discovered and analyzed, and then measured relative to existing standards. TPR evaluations require due diligence and the process cannot be superficial. Only then can intelligent, subjective evaluation be applied to give life and character to the findings.
- 6) Department faculty expects colleagues to participate in activities related to the governance of the department, the college and university, and program development. These activities include department, college and university meetings, graduation ceremonies, and the fulfillment of committee assignments.
- 7) Faculty members have different interests and strengths, and there is no single model of excellence in teaching, scholarship and service accomplishments.
- 8) Faculty activities are diverse, and any system based on a listing of performance indicators will be incomplete. Consequently, individual faculty may include for consideration any accomplishment or set of accomplishments outside of those listed in the Guidelines. Faculty members may also provide evidence that unique circumstances exist for a particular accomplishment or set of accomplishments to be categorized differently or at a higher level than listed. Final determination, however, relies with the department Chair/Head and the

Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment Committee.

- 9) Conversely, the department Chair/Head and/or TPR Committee may believe that a particular accomplishment or set of accomplishments ought to be categorized differently or at a lower level than listed. In such cases it is incumbent on the Chair/Head and/or TPR Committee to provide a written rationale for its different categorization.
- 10) Extraordinary circumstances such as disciplinary actions, personal or family crises that significantly affect teaching, service and/or research trajectories or leaves of absence will be incorporated into the performance evaluation system on a case-by-case basis at the discretion of the Department Chair/Head. The Department Chair/Head must consult with the Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Committee when extraordinary circumstances affect reappointment, promotion, or tenure decisions.
- 11) Performance standards for annual evaluations, reappointment, promotion and tenure may increase or otherwise change in accordance with the university and college missions. Personnel decisions made in a given year with reference to a given candidate are not necessarily precedents for decisions made in subsequent years for that candidate or any other candidate.

ANNUAL EVALUATION

Clemson University's Faculty Manual requires that Department Chairs/Heads conduct an annual evaluation of all faculty, regardless of rank or tenure status. For tenure-track faculty this evaluation requires that the Faculty Activity System (FAS) goals and accomplishments sections and the "Evaluation of Academic Personnel ("Form 3") be completed based on dates determined by the Provost's Office.

In general, the evaluation will focus on the research, teaching, and service goals agreed upon during the first part of the academic year and documented in the Faculty Activity System. The Department Chair/Head may consider information not furnished by the faculty member in the annual evaluation when it is considered relevant to the faculty member's performance. Any use of information not provided by the faculty member will be disclosed fully to the faculty member. This performance review will also include a discussion relating the faculty member's activities during the evaluation period to his or her reappointment, promotion, and tenure goals, and the goals of the Department and College.

The Department Chair/Head will provide each faculty member with a Summary Evaluation based on the faculty member's accomplishments and contributions to the department's mission during the one-year evaluation period (Form 3). Consistent with the Clemson University Faculty Manual, this rating will serve as the basis for merit pay adjustments. In the event of fluctuations in salary funding levels over time, the Department Chair/Head reserves the right to consider faculty performance spanning multiple years in the determination of discretionary pay increases.

Assistant professors are expected to establish and achieve goals and engage in activities that will result in positive tenure, promotion, and reappointment recommendations as discussed in the following section *Tenure, Promotion, Reappointment, and Post-Tenure Review*.

Associate professors are expected to establish and achieve goals and engage in activities that will result in positive tenure, promotion and reappointment recommendations.

Full professors are expected to assume a greater responsibility than other faculty members for service to the department, University, and respective profession. In addition, full professors are expected to exhibit leadership through the development of junior faculty and conspicuous success in all assigned areas of responsibility.

Lecturers, instructors, and other non-tenure track faculty are expected to establish and achieve goals and engage in activities that result in a high-quality educational experience for Clemson University students. Additional documentation may be required of non-tenure-track faculty for whom there is a shared intention between the faculty member and the department that he or she will at some point enter tenure track.

TENURE, PROMOTION, REAPPOINTMENT, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

The Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment (“TPR”) Committee, The Post-tenure Review Committee, and the Department Chair/Head are responsible for making independent Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment and post-tenure recommendations in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Clemson University Faculty Manual. For tenure-track faculty, specific documentation requirements for a Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment or post-tenure review requests will be determined by the Department Chair/Head in conjunction with the Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee, or Post-tenure Review Committee consistent with requirements of the Dean and Provost. For non-tenure-track faculty, the only documentation required for reappointment requests are teaching portfolios, including student evaluations.

Annual Renewal of Appointment

Non-tenured faculty members are evaluated annually by the Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment Committee and the Department Chair/Head in accordance with the Clemson University Faculty Manual in order to make their recommendations to the Dean as to the renewal of the faculty member’s appointment (“reappointment”). A second major purpose of these annual reappointment evaluations is to provide career counseling to faculty members as they prepare to obtain tenure. In general, as a faculty member’s career progresses, it is expected that he or she will engage in an increasing proportion of activities listed as indicators of excellence in the *Performance Criteria and Standards* section of the Guidelines.

For non-tenure-track faculty requesting reappointment, the primary consideration will be their contributions to the overall academic environment at Clemson University and the quality of the educational experience provided to their students. Teaching portfolios and student evaluations are the only required documentation for these reappointment requests.

For tenure-track faculty, reappointment recommendations will be based on the relationship between a faculty member’s cumulative performance and the current standards for promotion and tenure. A formal reappointment recommendation will be provided, along with an assessment of overall performance, scholarship, teaching, and service performance, and progress toward promotion and tenure. Positive recommendations for reappointment will be made if the Department Chair/Head and/or the Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Committee believe that the faculty member has the potential to earn promotion and/or tenure. However, in the case of untenured, tenure-track faculty, *continued reappointment should not be construed to mean that tenure will necessarily be granted*. The tenure decision takes place in the candidate’s penultimate year and, although based partly on annual reappointment recommendations, is a separate decision. This is an unavoidable consequence of the unusually extensive and long-range evaluation that is an integral part of the tenure review. While reviews for reappointment to the fourth year and beyond will become especially extensive, they fulfill a purpose that is distinct from, and subordinate to, the tenure review.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Assistant professors desiring tenure and promotion should establish a productive pattern of scholarly research, successful teaching, and generous service. Tenure and promotion to associate professor will require clear evidence of the candidate's consistent effectiveness in and commitment to all three areas. Performance expectations rise with each year of service.

Standards for Promotion

Candidates for promotion are expected to demonstrate that their work has relevance for other scholars working in their discipline, practitioners, and others in their wider professional communities. The specific materials used to prove evidence of this impact will vary on the basis of the candidate's academic area, methodological approach, and research foci. A record of peer-reviewed scholarship, citation counts and external review letters are typically considered the "gold standard" for documenting evidence that one's work is used by practitioners working in the candidate's area of expertise.

For consideration toward promotion, faculty will typically achieve a summary rating of Very Good or Excellent for the previous relevant review period for tenure or promotion (i.e., the time since their last promotion). The candidate who has not achieved a minimum of a Very Good summary rating by the TPR committee in the year prior to the decision will be unlikely to be competitive for promotion.

Standards for Tenure

Tenure signifies the continuation of a productive career that brings further promotions and rewards. It is granted for exemplary research, teaching, and service over the period of review, during which significant future potential for growth and advancement is demonstrated. Candidates seeking tenure should hold a Ph.D. in sociology, anthropology, criminology, criminal justice, social work, or other appropriate field, and should have at least six years total experience in a baccalaureate institution, at least four of which must be in a tenure-track position.

Tenure decisions are separate from reappointment and promotion determinations. When considering a candidate for tenure, the appropriately composed TPR committee examines the record of said candidate for the promise of continued contributions to the department, college, university and field of study. The committee makes its decision in terms of broad and specific scholarly, pedagogical and service activities.

For consideration toward tenure, faculty will typically achieve a summary rating of Very Good or Excellent for the previous relevant review period for tenure. The candidate who has not achieved a minimum of a Very Good summary rating by the TPR committee in the year prior to the tenure decision will be unlikely to be competitive for tenure.

However, independent of the level of cumulative performance, a faculty member must provide convincing evidence that he or she will continue to engage in quality scholarly activities and grow professionally after tenure has been granted. To some extent, this evaluation must be based on the

professional judgment of those making the recommendation. Indicators of future professional growth and scholarship include: 1) a consistent pace of research activities that indicates an increasing quality of scholarship, 2) the development of a research program or agenda that will enable the faculty member to develop a national or international reputation as an expert in an academic specialty area, 3) a demonstrated independence of scholarship, that is, tenured faculty should be scholarly leaders as well as strong research colleagues, 4) a progressive improvement in teaching endeavors and the use of pedagogical innovations, and 5) the establishment of long-term commitments to one's academic, professional group and peers.

The principle source for TPR committee's decision regarding tenure is the candidate's full record of activities as can be known through the official dossier composed by the candidate. This record is examined for the constancy and quality of previous contributions. The dossier is further examined for the trajectory of the candidate's works. Here, "trajectory" refers to any indications of professional growth and maturation in the quality, quantity, or both quality and quantity of the contributions made thus far. Such a trajectory will be taken as a sign of potential for the future. The committee will also attempt to understand in good faith any slumps or lacunae in the candidate's record and trajectory of contributions. The committee will attempt to take any mitigating circumstances into full accounting when arriving at its tenure decision. This being said, there will remain, apart from the objective record in the dossier, a measure of subjective influence in determining a candidate's suitability for tenure. This subjective component includes an assessment of the candidate's collegiality and contribution to the department.

The process by which tenure and promotion decisions are made is discussed in more detail in Appendix A.3.

Promotion to Full Professor

Associate professors preparing for promotion should continue to emphasize excellence in teaching and scholarship, especially research and publications. Effectiveness in service is also expected. A total of nine years of relevant experience is required for promotion to the rank of full professor. A necessary but not sufficient condition for promotion to full professor is evidence of substantive scholarly contributions to one's discipline. Prior to promotion to full professor, a faculty member is expected to have established a national and/or international reputation for his/her research and professional expertise and to serve as a role model for junior faculty. In addition to the objective record in the dossier, a measure of subjective influence in determining a candidate's suitability for promotion to full professor includes an assessment of the candidate's collegiality and contribution to the department.

Post Tenure Review

Tenured faculty must undergo post tenure review every five years following the awarding of tenure. Post tenure review recommendations will be based on the relationship between a faculty member's cumulative performance and the current standards for his or her tenure rank.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

The performance criteria and standards set forth in the Guidelines are intended to outline departmental policy with respect to the annual review, as well as tenure, promotion, and reappointment decisions. In addition, the Guidelines provide information that will be useful for faculty career planning and development The primary goal of the Guidelines is to establish a general set of standards that will consistently promote faculty performance and development and enable the department to achieve regional, national and international prominence

Although the Department Chair/Head and the Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Committee make tenure, promotion, and reappointment recommendations primarily using the listed criteria, a certain element of professional judgment is involved. The qualities of a good university professor cannot be reduced to a rigid formula. Factors such as the quality and impact of a faculty member's scholarly activities, citizenship behaviors, departmental and college needs, judgments of a faculty member's future research productivity, teaching effectiveness, and collegiality are all important, but somewhat subjective, factors in personnel decisions. Assessments of the subjective aspects of a faculty member's performance are based on the professional judgments of the Department Chair/Head and the Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Committee.²

Dimensions of Performance:

All performance achievements are divided into three “areas”: instructional achievements (“teaching”), scholarly achievements (“research”), and professional, public, university, college and departmental service achievements (“service”). Performance achievements within each area are divided into three “levels” representing their priority and importance.

Ratings of Performance:

Annual Review Ratings

In all reviews by the TPR Committee, the Post-Tenure review Committee, and the Department Chair/Head, faculty members will be assigned one of 5 ratings (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair

² Specific requirements for Form 2, Annual Report of Accomplishments, may be found in Appendix B: Annual Report of Accomplishments. Specific documentation requirements for a reappointment, promotion, or tenure request are determined by the Department Chair in conjunction with the Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Committee. In both cases, the information requested will be based on the performance criteria presented in these Guidelines. The format requirements are not identical because the documentation provided will support somewhat different purposes, will cover different periods of time, and will be used by different individuals.

and Unsatisfactory) in each of the three areas (research, teaching, service), based on evidence provided of their performance for the period under review

A given rating derives from the combination of accomplishments of various defined levels presented by the faculty member, as described below:

Excellent:

- Strong evidence of Level 1 accomplishments AND
- Evidence of Level 2 and/or Level 3 accomplishments

Very Good:

- Evidence of Level 1 accomplishments OR Strong Evidence of Level 2 accomplishments

Good:

- Evidence of Level 2 accomplishments AND
- Evidence of Level 3 accomplishments

Fair:

- Evidence of Level 3 accomplishments

Unsatisfactory:

- No evidence of professional accomplishments

What materials qualify as “evidence” or as “strong evidence” depends upon the faculty member’s professional experience and the standards of the current department.

For the TPR committee to fairly and properly evaluate a faculty member’s performance, it is important for faculty members to provide all relevant documentation and materials to illustrate their accomplishments to the TPR committee. Faculty members are welcome to additionally supply reasoning that any accomplishment be appropriately categorized as Level 1, 2 or 3, and/or that it represents “evidence” or “strong evidence” of a given level of accomplishment, based on either the quality and/or quantity of the work.

Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Ratings

Criteria for ratings for tenure, promotion, and reappointment will be the same as that for the annual review (above), but based on the previous relevant review period.

For consideration toward tenure or promotion, faculty will typically achieve a summary rating of Very Good for the previous relevant review period for tenure or promotion (i.e., the time since their

last promotion).

Promotion to Full Professor additionally requires at least three years of strong evidence of Level I accomplishments in Research and Teaching since the last promotion.

Post Tenure Review Ratings

Recommendations relative to post tenure review shall be made to the department chair consistent with the university's post tenure review rating system. (See faculty manual.) A rating of satisfactory in the post tenure review will be given an 'excellent,' 'very good,' or 'good' rating in the annual review. A rating of 'unsatisfactory' in post tenure review will be given consistent with the criteria for 'fair' and 'unsatisfactory' in the departmental matrix.

Indicators of continued professional growth and scholarship include those factors elaborated in the Guidelines for Faculty Development and Performance.

Levels of Performance:

- Level I: Accomplishments at this level are of the highest priority and greatest importance. They provide the primary evidence of a commitment to professional success by the faculty member.
- Level II: Accomplishments at this level are considered important to help demonstrate professional competence.
- Level III: Accomplishments at this level are valuable and can be considered as indicators of professional activity.

Indicators of accomplishments listed throughout the Guidelines are illustrative and not exhaustive. Additional indicators may be added to the Guidelines at the request of a faculty member with the agreement of the Department Chair/Head and the Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment Committee. Consistent with Guiding Principle #8, the faculty member also may provide evidence that unique circumstances exist for a particular accomplishment or set of accomplishments, which would allow it to be categorized differently than listed in this document. Faculty members may submit a written inquiry in which they describe a proposed or completed accomplishment and request that the TPR Committee and Chair/Head provide a written opinion as to the expected classification of the specific accomplishment (Level I, II, or III).

Areas of Performance:

Research

Research activities are an integral part of a faculty member's job. These activities advance our basic and applied knowledge, and keep the content of education current, pertinent, and challenging to students. "Consequently, an important requirement for reappointment, promotion and tenure is a serious and continuous commitment to the pursuit and application of knowledge and the demonstrated ability to share successfully that knowledge with a broader community."

Research Achievements. The professional reputation of the department is enhanced primarily through its basic and applied research productivity. Research achievement is imperative. As such, research achievement may also be demonstrated by research that applies scholarly knowledge to work toward the solution of non-academic problems. Both the quality and quantity of research and publications are important. However, quality of contribution to the body of knowledge in a faculty member's area of interest is the major criterion, including a record of peer-reviewed contributions. Collaboration in research and publications is desirable, but faculty members should develop a balanced publication record that also includes single and senior-authored works.

Scholarly Activities in Applied Sociology. . As a further aid in assessing applied work, the following may be considered as documented means to place that work in relation to more traditional academic works: (a) scope - breadth or sweep of the project, sometimes indicated by an applicable constituency ranging from local to international; (b) duration - the amount of time that the project continues or lasts ranging from a few weeks to years; (c) reputational enhancements - the degree to which the project is commonly held to be positive from the view of the public or the community of constituents; (d) complexity - the extent to which the project demands an elaborate interweaving of parts, e.g., difficult or intricate sampling, methodological and/or analogous challenges; (e) time requirements - the proportion of demands on the practitioner's time and energy relative to those demands that might be expected normally; (f) benefits to the department - the scale of tangible improvements or advantages directly gained through the project activity; (g) potential for extension - the reasonable frontiers of the project with respect to analogous applications as well as the use of similar strategies and tactics in the future; and (h) instructional benefits - usefulness of the project in the training of students in applied sociology and anthropology.

Indicators of Research Achievement

Level I:

- Publication of refereed article in first tier journal as defined below:
 - First tier discipline specific general or review journal
 - First tier journal within a specific sub-discipline
 - First tier journal in another field provided that the publication reflects a contribution consistent with the academic mission of the department
- Competitive and/or peer-reviewed, external research funding award
- Receipt of professional or university awards, prizes, or fellowships for scholarship activities

- Editor of a first or second tier scholarly journal
- Scholarly book or monograph that is evaluated as a Level 1 accomplishment according to criteria such as:
 - Reputation of publisher
 - Rigor of professional review undergone
 - Inclusion of original research or a significant theoretical contribution to the field
 - Impact on the field of practitioners or academics
- Book chapter that is evaluated as a Level 1 accomplishment according to criteria such as:
 - Reputation of publisher
 - Rigor of professional review undergone
 - Inclusion of original research or a significant theoretical contribution to the field
 - Impact on the field of practitioners or academics
 - The academic reputation of the editor and other authors in the volume

Level II:

- Publication of refereed articles in second tier journals
- Book, monograph, or book chapter that does not meet the criteria for a Level I accomplishment (not self-published)
- Internal and/or non-competitive research funding award
- Successful submission of competitive and/or peer-reviewed, external grant proposal (either unfunded or funding-status pending)
- Scholarly presentations at professional conferences, seminars, workshops, institutes, or special programs
- Published reviews of scholarly books
- Receipt of departmental or college awards, prizes, or fellowships for scholarship activities
- Research resulting in a product or outcome such as a technical report, training materials, data set, instructional videos, etc.
- Nomination for professional or university awards, prizes or fellowships for scholarship activities
- Editing of anthologies or other scholarly works published by commercial or university presses

- Reports to task forces, policy groups and other stakeholder groups

Level III:

- Successful submission of internal and/or non-competitive grant proposal (either unfunded or funding-status pending)
- Submission of a journal article (with the status of rejected, revise and resubmit, or under review)
- Book manuscript or book chapter under review
- Session/paper discussant at professional conference
- Published, scholarly critique or review in national journals or magazines, newspapers, or other communication media (e.g. invited book reviews)
- Self-published book
- Nomination for departmental or college awards or fellowships for scholarship activities

Teaching

Teaching is a fundamental responsibility of the faculty.³ Faculty must be evaluated on the basis of the effectiveness of their contributions to student learning both inside and outside of the classroom and the guidance of graduate and undergraduate research.

Indicators of Teaching Achievement

Level I:

- Excellent overall quality and academic rigor of any teaching activity [Such activities may include classroom teaching, creative inquiry courses, honors contract courses, independent study courses, service learning courses or study abroad courses]

Indicators that may be used to demonstrate / document excellence in an activity include but are not limited to the following:

- Teaching portfolio (including syllabi, reading lists, materials, etc.)
- Student evaluations
- Active student engagement
- Peer evaluations

³ Exceptions to this policy are faculty whose appointments do not include teaching.

- External evaluations
 - Student outcomes
 - Student products
 - Feedback from students, parents, peers
- Successful chairing of master's theses committees ("Successful" is defined as upholding departmental standards and actively participating in order to ensure high quality scholarship)
- Receipt of professional or university teaching awards
- Peer-reviewed, teaching related publications including articles, chapters, and textbooks (If publication involves research, faculty member can make a request for consideration as a scholarship indicator.)
- Successful chairing of an honors thesis committee

Level II:

- Satisfactory overall quality and academic rigor of any teaching activity [Such activities may include classroom teaching, creative inquiry courses, honors contract courses, independent study courses, service learning courses or study abroad courses]

Indicators that may be used to demonstrate / document excellence in an activity include but are not limited to the following:

- Teaching portfolio (including syllabi, reading lists, materials, etc.)
 - Student evaluations
 - Active student engagement
 - Peer evaluations
 - External evaluations
 - Student outcomes
 - Student products
 - Feedback from students, parents, peers
- Active service on a master's thesis or dissertation committee including those in departments other than Sociology
-
- Teaching publications without peer review, including articles, chapters, textbooks, and instructors manuals

- Receipt of departmental or college teaching award
- Nomination for professional or university teaching award
- Discipline-related mentoring of individual student or group work on publications, research presentations, or other projects / competitions. This refers to mentoring that is not related to a specific course
- Generating grants or donations of materials or equipment that support the instructional goals of the department
- Expansion of teaching competencies through activities such as teaching, developing or implementing a new course
- Participation in an international faculty exchange program

Level III:

- Self-published texts or other curriculum to be used in the classroom
- Member of a master's or dissertation thesis committee
- Member of honors thesis committee
- Collaborative teaching
- Attending teaching-related training courses
- Nomination for departmental or college teaching award

Service

The department serves a number of constituencies including its students, the academic professions, the University, the College, the Department/School, and the private and public sectors. As part of their scholarly activities, faculty members are expected to contribute in the service area consistent with their type and level of appointment and consistent with the mission of their Department/School and the College. Therefore, service activities are to be encouraged and should be important in reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. Moreover service activities should take on more significance for senior faculty members who have attained tenure and professor status. Non-tenure track appointments may include specific service responsibilities which are to be considered in the evaluation of performance and reappointment processes.

Indicators of Service Achievement

Level I:

- Superior service to the department, college or university

- Superior service to our students
- Receipt of significant professional or university service awards.
- Serving as a reviewer for first tier discipline-related journal articles
- Active participation in significant committee service at the college or university level.
- Grant proposal reviewer: panel member for federal, national or international agency or foundation
- Service and/or leadership position in university faculty governance.
- University administrative assignments.
- Training and policy implementation for practitioners or government agencies that directly utilizes the professional expertise of the faculty member and represents a significant contribution of time and effort.

Level II:

- Serving as a reviewer for second tier discipline-related journal articles
- Grant proposal reviewer: Single review or panel member for a state or local agency or foundation
- Organizational contributions at professional conferences, seminars, institutes, or special programs.
- Unpaid consultant to a public endeavor or enterprise
- Active participation in significant departmental committee service
- Receipt of departmental or college service award or other professional or university service award
- Nomination for professional or university service award
- Taking action for the purpose of enhancing the image of the department or assessing the marketability of the discipline.
- Assistance and/or responsibility in the governance and continuation of student activities including honorary societies and service or disciplinary interest clubs.
- Coordinating or providing significant service to a faculty development program.
- Providing contacts, liaison, or consulting that lead to internships, research opportunities or placements for Sociology and Anthropology students.

- Reviews, evaluations, or critiques written with respect to the professional works of others.
- Textbook review for publishing company that entails consultation prior to final publication: consultant for entire book, panel member, or developmental review (with or without remuneration)
- Training and policy implementation for practitioners or government agencies that utilizes general knowledge and represents a relatively limited and brief encounter.
- Service on committees or boards of professional societies and organizations.
- Service on the editorial board of a professional journal or newsletter.
- Unpaid expert witness in a judicial or regulatory dispute.

Level III:

- Textbook review for publishing company that is an end review or review of select chapters (with or without remuneration)
- Development of and/or responsibility for maintaining an electronic publishing enterprise
- Paid consultant to a public or private enterprise
- Acting as resource person for media contacts or external agencies and visits to schools for student recruitment
- Development of and/or responsibility for maintaining receptions for graduating students, parents, and friends
- Paid expert witness in a judicial or regulatory dispute
- Speaking as a guest for meetings or conducting a town meeting devoted to the general public
- Contract funding awards for training purposes
- Teaching an extension-like short course or conducting a workshop for which no academic credit is awarded.
- Awards or commendations for service and awards garnered by students or student organizations whose service activities are a result of faculty guidance
- Letters of recommendation written for students
- Nomination for departmental or college service award

Because quality of service is more difficult to assess than instruction or scholarship, under some circumstances a combination of Level II indicators may be considered to be a Level I

accomplishment.

