

PEER COMMITTEE GUIDELINES

AND

**GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY MEMBER EVALUATION, PROMOTION,
AND/OR TENURE**

SCHOOL OF FOREST RESOURCES

University of Maine

Orono, ME

January 1, 2021

Approved: Aaron Weiskittel, Peer Committee Chair

Date: December 17, 2020

Approved: John C. Volin, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Date: December 17, 2020

Effective: September 1, 2021

Guidelines to be reviewed again no later than five years from this date.

I. Peer Committee Membership

A. Membership and Voting

Peer evaluations shall be conducted using a two-tiered committee structure. The Voting Peer Committee, which consists all tenured faculty, shall vote on promotion and/or tenure decisions and the Administrative Peer Committee, which consists of an elected five-member subset of the Voting Committee plus one untenured faculty, which shall solicit evaluation documents from the faculty member under review, schedule necessary meetings, record voting outcomes, and write evaluation letters. All faculty within SFR are invited to attend and participate at Peer Committee meetings, but no member of the Voting Peer Committee shall be present during evaluation of that member's spouse, partner, or other family member or someone with explicit conflict of interest. In addition, no member of the Administrative Peer Committee may write a letter for a promotion and/or tenure decision involving that member's spouse, partner or other family member. These conflict of interest guidelines will also apply to all other Peer Committee actions on personnel as no member of the Peer Committee shall vote on a promotion and/or tenure decision involving that member's spouse, partner or other family member, or where another type of conflict of interest may exist. Only tenured faculty members may vote on promotion and/or tenure decisions, while only those with the rank of Professor may vote on promotions to the rank of Professor.

The Administrative Peer Committee of the School of Forest Resources (SFR) shall consist of six elected faculty members in the School and representative of all SFR programs, one of which will be untenured. Members of the Administrative Peer Committee will be elected to three-year terms by the faculty, of no more than two successive terms. Terms will be staggered to distribute the turnover over time. The School Director or Acting Director shall be an *ex officio* committee member who does not participate in peer evaluations, but whose role shall be to provide the committee with the information they deem necessary.

Faculty having formal joint appointments with other units of the University of Maine (academic, research, other) will have a peer committee comprised of members from each unit, and the Peer Committee Chair for each unit will serve on said committee. The size of the committee shall be agreed upon with input from the SFR Director and other unit leaders as well as the Peer Committee Chairs from each program, unless an MOU with review procedures has been established; then the process set forth in the MOU supersedes this document.

A quorum of two-thirds of the voting members of the SFR Peer Committee is required for decisions on annual evaluations, promotion and/or tenure, sabbatical leave, or any other Peer Committee matters requiring a vote of its membership.

B. Peer Committee Chair and Vice Chair

The Administrative Peer Committee Chair's responsibilities include scheduling Peer Committee meetings with input from the SFR Administrative Support Specialist as needed, convening the meetings, and making sure all agenda items are covered. Voting Peer Committee members shall receive ample notice for Peer Committee meetings at which decisions on annual evaluations,

promotion and/or tenure shall occur. For other Peer Committee meetings, the Administrative Peer Committee Chair will strive to give all faculty members at least a one-week notice.

The Chair of the Administrative Peer Committee, with input from the SFR Administrative Support Specialist, is responsible for making certain that evaluation, reappointment, and promotion letters are properly prepared, reviewed, and signed by the Voting Peer Committee. The Administrative Peer Committee Chair is also responsible for submitting the letter and any documentation to the SFR Director prior to required deadlines. All Voting Peer Committee members, as well as the faculty member being evaluated, shall receive a copy of the evaluation letter.

The Vice Chair of the Administrative Peer Committee shall be elected by a vote of the Voting Peer Committee members for a one-year term. The Vice Chair automatically advances to the position of Chair the following year and serves for a one-year period in that position. The SFR Director has the responsibility to ask for candidates willing to serve as Administrative Peer Committee Vice Chair and to organize the election for the Vice Chair position. The Administrative Peer Committee Vice Chair is responsible for keeping the notes of meetings and other administrative duties as appropriate

II. Responsibilities of the Peer Committee and the Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion

A. Performance Evaluation

The Voting Peer Committee shall evaluate faculty member performance in accordance with Article 10 of the Association of Faculty at the University of Maine (AFUM) Agreement. The purpose of the evaluation is to critique in a supportive, positive fashion the demonstrated strengths and weaknesses of the individual's performance and to recommend, when needed, how improvement can be instituted. The evaluation goal is to enable each faculty member to become a more effective professional and thus enhance the SFR's productivity so that it might better meet its stated goals. The Voting Peer Committee is responsible for reviewing the progress of each faculty member, and voting on reappointments, promotions, and/or tenure. The Voting Peer Committee should provide an opportunity for an in-person discussion with the faculty member being evaluated during the evaluation process.

Because faculty members have varied responsibilities and academic appointments, performance evaluation criteria should generally be considered on a case-by-case basis with duties mutually agreed upon between the SFR Director and the faculty member. Although faculty appointments differ with respect to the percentage of effort devoted to teaching and research, all tenured or pre-tenured faculty are expected to participate in all areas associated with the University of Maine mission – teaching, research, and service. For tenured or pre-tenured faculty with an appointment other than 50% teaching/50% research, more weight will be given to performance in the area where the greatest percentage of the appointment lies.

Faculty in 'shared' or 'joint' positions present a special case regarding peer evaluations. In such cases, performance evaluations should recognize that the faculty member may have obligations

to the agency beyond those imposed by SFR or even the College. Thus, performance evaluation criteria may be considered on a case-by-case basis, with duties mutually agreed upon between the SFR Director and the faculty member, with input solicited from the agency representative when necessary.

For soft-money faculty (e.g., Assistant Research Professor), performance evaluation should take into consideration their primary responsibility to external grant and contract commitments, and in some cases their status if in a part-time appointment. The Voting Peer Committee should focus on the faculty member's accomplishments relative to their grants and contracts, their contribution to the mission and reputation of the University of Maine, and their efforts where possible to contribute to the University's mission through contributions to classes, graduate students, or service.

The categories for evaluation in teaching, research and service will be 'Above Satisfactory,' 'Satisfactory' or 'Unsatisfactory.' If there are no assigned responsibilities for teaching or research in the faculty member's appointment, that category should be marked as 'N/A,' but any contributions in that category can be noted in the narrative. Written evaluations from the Peer Committee will be provided for all categories for each evaluation year.

B. Evaluation Report Preparation and Evaluation Schedule

Peer evaluation reports completed by each faculty member will describe their activities only for the evaluation period in question; however, in the tenure and/or promotion review year, documentation will include accomplishments over the full pre-tenure period. Faculty members will provide an accurate and complete peer evaluation report for review by the Voting Peer Committee at least two weeks prior to the evaluation date (six weeks for faculty members coming up for promotion and/or tenure). Professionalism, full disclosure, and thoroughness are expected in the written package and oral presentation to the peer committee. Full guidelines for the tenure and promotion timetable and report preparation can be found at the University of Maine System web site: <https://umaine.edu/hr/promotion-and-tenure/>.

Pre-tenure and soft-money faculty are reviewed annually, while tenured faculty are reviewed every four years. The deadline for completion of routine evaluations will fall approximately on November 10 of each year. However, the evaluation deadlines for pre-tenure faculty members and promotion and/or tenure recommendations are established by AFUM contract (Articles 7 and 9) and will be given priority over other evaluation deadlines in the year for promotion or tenure evaluation. The faculty member under review, in the year of a tenure and/or promotion decision, will provide names and contact information of potential evaluators (internal and external to the University) to the SFR Director as outlined in the University of Maine System Tenure and Promotion Format. These names must be provided to the Director at least 6 weeks prior to the evaluation by the Administrative Peer Committee. The Director will communicate with potential evaluators upon receiving the names to assess their willingness to write an evaluation and explain the anticipated timeline. When the faculty member has submitted their application materials to the Administrative Peer Committee, that material will also be forwarded by the Director to the evaluators along with guidance on the development of the evaluations. The Director with input from the Administrative Peer Committee is not restricted to requesting evaluations from the list of names provided by the faculty member under review.

Faculty members submitting applications for tenure and/or promotion must follow the University of Maine System's complete Tenure and Promotion Format guidelines (above). For all other evaluations, this format is also encouraged, which can be found at:

<https://www.maine.edu/students/office-of-the-vice-chancellor-of-academic-affairs/tenure-promotion/>

Evaluation is not required for faculty members whose appointments will cease (due to retirement or resignation) by the end of the current academic/fiscal year.

C. Evaluation and Annual Reappointment of Pre-tenure Faculty members

Following the performance evaluation of each pre-tenure faculty member, the Voting Peer Committee shall advise the SFR Director of its recommendation regarding reappointment or non-reappointment for that faculty member in accordance with Articles 7 and 9 of the AFUM Agreement. The recommendation of the Voting Peer Committee, although not binding on the SFR Director and College Dean, should be a major factor in their decisions to recommend or not recommend reappointment. A simple majority vote in favor will constitute the Committee's recommendation for reappointment to the Director. Lack of a majority in favor constitutes a recommendation not to reappoint. All members of the Voting Peer Committee participating in the report must sign the recommendation, which may include both majority and minority views. A tally of the vote record without specific voter names must be included. Dissenting opinions can also be submitted if signed by dissenting faculty members. The report must include names of the Voting Peer Committee.

To be reappointed, a pre-tenure faculty member should have demonstrated that continual progress towards satisfying the standards for tenure has been achieved. The varied nature of the School's missions and individual faculty member responsibilities preclude rigid and uniform performance standards for reappointment.

The Voting Peer Committee should provide an opportunity for an in-person discussion with the pre-tenure faculty member being evaluated prior to completion of the annual evaluation. Once complete, the Voting Peer Committee's evaluations will be sent to the Dean, along with the School Director's recommendation, concerning annual reappointment. Faculty may request a meeting with the Director to discuss the evaluation. Although this process does not guarantee a positive outcome for the tenure and/or promotion decision, it should allow sufficient time for adjustments to be made prior to the end of the pre-tenure period.

D. Evaluation of Instructors

In accord with Article 8 of the AFUM Agreement, Instructors will be appointed as either tenure track or non-tenure track at the time of appointment. Those with tenure-track appointments will be evaluated in accord with the guidelines for tenure track candidates as described in this document. Instructors without tenure will be evaluated annually using the same criteria as tenured or tenure-track applicants with regard to teaching. Contributions in research and service should be included in activity reporting where applicable, but are not required to fulfill the teaching obligations for Instructor.

E. Evaluation of Research (Soft-Money) Faculty

SFR employs a number of soft-money, non-tenure track faculty who contribute greatly to the mission of the unit. The evaluations of such research faculty (if employed full-time) will follow the procedures outlined in Sections II, A to C, of this document, and will reflect the nature of the faculty member's appointment (e.g., full or part-time; mix of teaching, research and/or service) over the evaluation period. As such, research faculty will be evaluated by the Voting Peer Committee at the Assistant Research Professor level on a yearly basis and after six years will be considered for promotion to Associate Research Professor with just-cause protection, as stipulated by contract.

After promotion to Associate Research Professor, faculty will be reviewed every four years and will be eligible for promotion to Research Professor after six years. Research Faculty are not eligible to receive tenure from the University. The Voting Peer Committee should provide an opportunity for an in-person discussion with the soft-money faculty member being evaluated prior to completion of the evaluation.

F. Tenure and/or Promotion

Granting of tenure to any pre-tenure faculty member will be in accordance with Article 9 of the AFUM Agreement. The tenure decision is the ultimate decision to reappoint. To be reappointed, a pre-tenure faculty member should have demonstrated that progress towards satisfying the standards for tenure has been made. Any concerns about a faculty member or their program noted by the Voting Peer Committee in the years leading up to a tenure and/or promotion decision should have been addressed and rectified prior to making the tenure decision.

The Administrative Peer Committee must be instructed of any tenure and/or promotion actions by the SFR Director by the date stipulated under the current AFUM agreement (Article 9), and the Voting Peer Committee recommendation must be forwarded to the School Director and faculty member by the subsequent AFUM defined date. These dates will also be found at the University's web site for Tenure and/or Promotion: <http://www.maine.edu/about-the-system/system-office/academic-affairs/tenure-and-promotion/>.

All members of the Voting Peer Committee present during the evaluation must sign the recommendation, which may include both majority and minority views. A tally of the vote record without specific voter names must be included. Dissenting opinions can also be submitted if signed by dissenting faculty members. The report must include names of the Voting Peer Committee.

Faculty members applying for professor or early tenure may withdraw their package at any time during the deliberations.

Prior to submission for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, a pre-tenure faculty member should have demonstrated a high degree of competence, as judged by the Voting Peer Committee, in their professional activities that address the responsibilities of the position and the mission of the School. In addition, the faculty member coming up for tenure is typically expected in the year prior to have received ratings of 'Above Satisfactory' in at least two of the three

categories of teaching, research, and service, including achieving a rating of ‘ Above Satisfactory’ in the dominant area of responsibility for their position (for appointments 50%/50% at least one requires an ‘ Above Satisfactory’ rating). Soft-money faculty members coming up for promotion are typically expected to have received ratings of ‘ Above Satisfactory’ in their primary area of responsibility. An ‘Unsatisfactory’ rating in any category in the year the faculty member is being reviewed for tenure or promotion will result in the faculty member not being considered for tenure or promotion. An ‘N/A’ rating is not ‘Unsatisfactory’, as the faculty member is not expected to perform duties in areas rated ‘N/A’.

To be considered for promotion to Professor, a faculty member should have maintained the above criteria for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor and in addition have consistently demonstrated a continued high degree of competence regarding responsibilities of their position. The faculty member should have peer ratings of ‘Above Satisfactory’ in two of the three categories of teaching, research, and service in the years leading up to their promotion including achieving a rating of ‘Above Satisfactory’ in the dominant area of responsibility for their position (for appointments 50%/50% at least one requires an ‘Above Satisfactory’ rating). In addition, the faculty member should have achieved a regional, national, and, when appropriate, international professional reputation within their discipline where appropriate that enhances the University’s reputation.

For all levels of promotion and/or tenure, faculty members are expected to promote professionalism, diversity, and inclusion in their professional pursuits.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

I. INSTRUCTION

A. Teaching Load

Faculty members with teaching appointments are expected to participate in formal classroom instruction, academic advising and mentoring, and other teaching-related activities. The level of teaching activity is at the Director’s discretion; however, it is expected to reflect the percent teaching appointment of the faculty member. As a guideline, the School expects an academic-year, 100% teaching appointment to average 12 credit hours of teaching per semester. This normally includes 9 credit hours of formal instruction per semester, with additional recognition given for contributions to the academic mission that include advising, recruiting, outcomes assessment, retention activities, and academic committee work in support of the School and/or College. The expected number of credit hours can also vary according to course level, number of students in classes, writing intensive status, availability of TAs, whether the course is new or repeated, and whether a laboratory or field component is offered. Other factors to be considered include the number of undergraduates advised, and the number and level (MF, MS, PhD) of graduate students advised. The School Director is expected to balance advisee loads whenever possible, and a faculty member will not be penalized for having low advisee numbers or lower teaching load when the issue is beyond their control.

B. Broad Goals for Teaching Effectiveness Considered in Evaluations

1. Knowledge in the Field is demonstrated by evidence that the faculty member has kept up with current developments in their area of expertise (e.g., scholarly writing, regularly attending professional meetings, taking part in workshops/symposia, and remaining current in the literature of their discipline) and that course content reflects such activity.

2. Classroom Effectiveness is demonstrated by evidence that the students achieve the learning outcomes of the course as stated in the syllabus. The faculty member under review or the Peer committee may request that a senior faculty member or other external observer provides direct observation followed by a written evaluation of teaching performance. The evaluation will be included with the faculty member's documentation at the discretion of the faculty member.

3. Laboratory Effectiveness is demonstrated by exercises that involve current techniques or software to properly prepare students for the current job market and to solidify students' grasp of theory and encourage further inquiry.

4. Exams and Grading should reflect the principles and objectives for the portion of the course material being tested. Generally, graded exams should be returned within one to two weeks.

5. Activities in Support of Academic Programs constitutes the portion of time spent while interacting with students outside of the classroom. The faculty member is expected to demonstrate a respectful attitude in their interactions with students. For student advising, the faculty member is expected to be available for individual consultation and mentoring at announced times and places or when students request appointments. The sessions will provide accurate information on curricular and other University requirements. In addition to advising, the faculty member will interact with the student through activities that maximize intellectual growth, foster professional development, support diversity, foster a stimulating learning environment, and assist with efforts of student retention.

5. Undergraduate Student Research Mentoring constitutes guiding students in independent studies, research-related capstone projects (when not the capstone instructor), REU mentoring, Honors theses advising or committee membership, proposal preparation for research grants, Center for Undergraduate Research (CUGR) activities, and related research-focused activities. Undergraduate mentoring could also take the form of intensive training in field procedures, statistical modelling, coding, or the use of laboratory equipment used in research. Faculty members are encouraged to participate in these mentoring activities as a means of enhancing the undergraduate academic experience.

6. Graduate Student Advising carries unique responsibilities and rewards for a faculty member involved in research and graduate education. As a graduate student advisor, the faculty member is expected to serve as mentor, advocate, teacher, and role model. Graduate student advising is expected to adhere to best practices now widely accepted in the sciences, including regular meetings (lab meetings and/or individual check-ins, typically weekly to bi-weekly), effective mentoring, and development of timelines and benchmarks.

C. Specific Evaluation Criteria for Teaching Evaluations

1. Course load commensurate with teaching appointment, as outlined above.

2. Maintenance of high academic standards for student performance and students achieving desired learning outcomes.
3. Involvement in activities to improve teaching (attending workshops, seminars, or conferences on teaching, etc.).
4. Evidence of keeping up to date with course material, developing new courses, or improving existing courses by taking part in workshops/symposia aimed at improving pedagogy.
5. Development of teaching materials such as textbooks, workbooks, laboratory manuals and/or exercises, etc.
6. Quality and effectiveness of classroom teaching as demonstrated by student evaluations.
7. Quality and effectiveness of classroom teaching as demonstrated by peer evaluations when requested by a faculty member.
8. Demonstrated incorporation of current technology into classroom teaching and student learning situations.
9. Authorship of proposals to obtain grants for teaching-related activities.
10. Successful direction of student's undergraduate research projects, special problems courses, internships, or other scholarly activities.
11. Evidence of effective academic undergraduate advising, with number of advisees commensurate with appointment.
12. Professional involvement with students in other out-of-class settings (clubs, organizations, field trips, etc.)
13. Receipt of teaching awards.
14. Clear evidence of successful advising and mentoring of graduate students. Such evidence includes timely completion of program and, for MS and PhD students, dissemination of thesis results in appropriate outlets.
15. Willingness to deliver guest lectures and laboratories, as requested.
16. Participation in additional activities in support of academic programs, such as program assessment, providing assistance to students on academic probation, and mentoring first-year students.

D. Ratings in Teaching

Above Satisfactory: Faculty member is highly successful in motivating and teaching students as evinced by information presented to the Voting Peer Committee. Faculty member consistently presents appropriately challenging material in an engaging learning environment, is in demand as a graduate advisor, and is a role model for effective teaching practices. Graduate-student advisees are consistently successful in coursework.

Satisfactory: Faculty member is conscientious and effective in teaching and advising based on the criteria outlined above.

Unsatisfactory: Faculty member fails to perform satisfactorily on one or more of the criteria specified above.

II. RESEARCH OR CREATIVE WORKS IN DISCIPLINE

A. Research Load

Faculty members with research appointments are expected to pursue a vigorous research program in their area of expertise and to address the areas of responsibility described in their position description, unless otherwise approved by the School. The level of research activity is expected to reflect the percent research appointment for each faculty member. Responsibilities and the balance between basic and applied research activities vary widely by necessity among School faculty and may reflect the specific discipline of the faculty member, and should thus be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Expectations for faculty members with administrative appointments (e.g., Associate Director for Undergraduate Education) should be reduced proportionately to reflect the nature of the appointment.

B. Broad Goals for Research Impact Considered in Evaluations

1. Knowledge in Field requires a thorough understanding of both basic and applied principles as well as current, state-of-the-art techniques and methodology in the field of expertise and their application to the field while maintaining high methodological and ethical standards.

2. Program Development pertains to an individual faculty member's ability to organize a coordinated research program with well-defined foci. Planning and organization of a program includes identifying a problem, anticipating the requirements necessary for its solution, acquiring funding, and disseminating the results through appropriate channels. Faculty members with Maine Agricultural and Forest Experiment Station (MAFES) appointments are expected to seek research grants that support the objectives of their approved MAFES projects. However, time commitments and grant-writing efforts related to MAFES research should reflect the percentage breakdown stated in these approved projects. Release time may be included in grant requests where the research for the grant does not build upon the faculty member's current MAFES project(s) objectives. Regular communications through meetings and correspondence with colleagues working on similar problems, as well as communications with stakeholders, is encouraged.

3. Publications and Creative Works and Communications in the Discipline. Publications and creative works can be judged as a pattern of achievement over time. Accordingly, the quality and number of publications a faculty member could reasonably be expected to produce depends on the nature of the research and the appointment. Quality of performance is evaluated by factors such as (a) the reputation of the journals in which papers are published, (b) the significance of individual contributions to a scientific field, and (c) the reputation of meetings or symposia where papers are presented. Faculty members are expected to exceed the minimum guidelines listed below in order to receive an 'Above Satisfactory' rating. Promotion and/or tenure are not based solely on publication number; faculty members are expected to regularly engage in communications other than publications in refereed journals. Pre-tenured faculty are strongly encouraged to seek input from their mentors regarding measures of research productivity.

C. Specific Evaluation Criteria for Research Evaluations

1. Regular publication of original research results in professional outlets. Authorship (or editorship, if applicable) may include peer-reviewed journal articles, published scholarly books (including textbooks), book chapters, patents, computer software, peer-reviewed technical reports, or peer-reviewed technical manuals. A faculty member with a 100% research appointment should average at least two or more peer-reviewed publications per year for a 'Satisfactory' rating. The order of authorship is important, and priority is given to the faculty member or their graduate student or post-doc being first author, unless a disciplinary norm dictates an alternative ranking. Applied research publications in technical outlets should be recognized as acceptable but do not carry the same level of recognition as refereed journal publications. Such outlets may include MAFES publications, research reports, newsletters or other media outlets, appropriate social media or web sites, and participation in state and federal initiatives.
2. Regular authorship (principal or co-investigator) of proposals to fund research-related activities with demonstrated evidence of successfully securing grants.
3. Regular presentation of research results at professional meetings or conferences. This may include presentations given, session development, active participation in committees, meeting planning, etc., as opposed to attendance at a meeting.
4. Evidence of regional or national recognition in research and scholarly activity.
5. Consulting or similar professional work with businesses, associations or governmental agencies that leads to identification and/or solution of real-world problems. Written documentation (external, whenever possible) of the nature, scope, and professional significance of the work must be provided.
6. Involvement in faculty development activities to improve research skills or competencies (attendance at workshop, seminars, or conferences on research; acquiring knowledge of new research techniques, training on analytical equipment, etc.)

7. Evidence of successful progress in long-term research projects and programs which may include single or multiple foci.
8. Maintenance of successful research collaborations with colleagues internal or external to the University.
9. Receipt of awards and honors for scholarship.
10. Complying with high quality and ethical research standards.

D. Ratings in Research

Above Satisfactory: Faculty member is recognized as a leader and innovator in their field as evinced by recent and regular high-quality publications in refereed journals or books, a sustained research program, success in extramural funding, stakeholder recognition, and invited and contributed presentations at local, national or international meetings, conferences, and symposia.

Satisfactory: Faculty member presents evidence of sustained effort in scholarly research activity normally resulting in publications and presentations at professional meetings.

Unsatisfactory: Faculty member fails to perform satisfactorily on one or more of the criteria specified above.

III. SERVICE

A. Service Load

All tenured and pre-tenure School faculty members are expected to participate in service activities, even though there is often no explicit allocation in their contract. Soft-money faculty and instructors will have limited expectations for service, but will be recognized for service contributions as part of their Peer evaluation process. Each tenured and pre-tenure faculty member is expected to dedicate their professional expertise and some portion of their time to serve the needs of the School, College, or University, as well as a variety of stakeholders, including professional organizations, K-12 education, and/or the public, especially the Maine public.

The service activities of faculty members will vary widely depending on the nature of the position. Pre-tenure faculty members should be especially careful in providing service, however, so that service responsibilities do not overwhelm their primary responsibilities in research and instruction. Service should be in the areas of the faculty member's expertise.

B. Broad Goals for Service Performance Evaluations

1. University Service: Faculty members are expected to contribute willingly to the activities of the School. These contributions may include coordination of any of its various programs (e.g., graduate program, special seminar series), undergraduate/graduate student recruiting activities, committee involvement (e.g., ad hoc, Peer, Multicultural), representation of the School in larger units (e.g., search committees, curriculum committees or governance boards), or mentoring of pre-tenure or soft-money faculty. Faculty members are also expected to serve on University and College committees. Evaluation of these activities will be based on information provided by the faculty member and, where necessary, verifiable opinions of associated faculty and administrators.

2. Professional Service: includes membership in such groups, presenting papers on non-research topics, and promoting the group's effectiveness through activities such as membership recruitment, planning of meetings, serving as an officer, or chairing meeting sessions. It is also demonstrated through activities such as editorial work on non-research publications, notes, and replies in professional journals.

3. Public Service: Public service activities of the School vary widely in nature and extent depending on the appointment and job description of the individual and on their area of research expertise. Public Service can be demonstrated by documentation of professional involvement with non-university groups as a representative of the University. The research of some faculty members is immediately applicable to local industries and agencies. It is appropriate for them to engage in more activities that are designed to assist in the dissemination of their knowledge to the lay public than it would be for other faculty members. Some faculty members are able to contribute to community, state, or regional organizations and agencies with interests in their activities and expertise, for example by educational outreach.

All faculty members are expected to respond in a professional manner to individual inquiries within their area of expertise. Public Service could be considered as involvement in non-appointed extension activities for those faculty members lacking a formal Cooperative Extension appointment. This public service activity may involve assisting in problem solving on a case by case basis, and differs from a Cooperative Extension appointment in that it is not considered an on-going educational activity.

Paid consulting may be considered public service for the purposes of SFR Peer Committee reviews. However, paid consulting cannot be pursued when it limits the ability of the faculty to meet their normal SFR responsibilities including teaching, research and, especially, other public service activities expected. If the paid consulting results in scholarly publication or presentations, it can be listed under Research.

C. Specific Evaluation Criteria for Service Evaluations

1. Involvement with University, College, or School committees or task forces. Leadership in such activities is generally valued more than participation or membership alone.

2. Involvement with community organizations, boards, or activity groups.
3. Providing public talks, interviews, professional advice, or other resources, to government agencies, NGOs, schools, or citizen groups.
4. Documented contributions to University or community betterment made by the faculty member as an individual.
5. Assumption of leadership roles in service activities.
6. Receipt of awards and honors for service activities.
7. Regular reviews of journal articles, books, manuscripts, or grant proposals for external agencies.
8. Service as a teaching mentor to colleagues (conducting teaching workshops, presenting teaching-related seminars, mentoring new faculty members, etc.)
9. Active involvement in professional organizations and societies related to the faculty member's area of expertise.
10. Demonstrated effectiveness in mentoring pre-tenure or soft-money faculty.

D. Ratings in Service

Above Satisfactory: Faculty member demonstrates leadership and extensive contributions in the areas of university, public or professional service.

Satisfactory: Faculty member participates willingly and effectively in university, public or professional service.

Unsatisfactory: Faculty member fails to perform satisfactorily on one or more of the criteria specified above.