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I. Composition of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC)

All voting DPC members must be tenured UHPA Bargaining Unit (BU) 07 members. The final composition of the DPC for any particular review cannot be determined until applicants for tenure and/or promotion have confirmed that they are going to apply. If necessary, the DPC membership shall be supplemented or revised to ensure that every promotion case is considered only by persons at or exceeding the rank for which the applicant is applying.

A. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall consist of ALL tenured faculty members in the Department of Sociology holding ranks higher than the candidate. If applicants are at different ranks, the DPC will be constituted separately to ensure maximum participation by all eligible tenured UHPA Bargaining Unit (BU) 07 members for each candidate's case.

B. In the event that there are not five tenured faculty members eligible to serve, the committee will then be made up of the maximum number eligible. If the resulting number is fewer than five (5), the Dean may constitute a DPC in consultation with the DC. This ad hoc DPC will be made up of all UH Manoa tenured faculty members in the Department who meet the rank requirements and additional tenured faculty from related disciplines.

C. A member may request to be excused from the DPC in cases of physical or mental health impairment, other personal emergency, or appointment to another or higher administrative role or committee that would create a conflict of interest.

D. The duly constituted DPC for the following academic year is composed no later than the end of classes of the prior spring semester, to facilitate the solicitation of external reviewers for tenure and promotion cases. At the first meeting of the new DPC, a chair is elected by the Committee from within its ranks.

Purpose

The purpose of the DPC is to evaluate the overall record of the faculty candidate, including strengths and weaknesses of the applicants for contract renewal for untenured faculty, tenure and promotion for untenured faculty, and promotion for tenured faculty. The DPC will seek to achieve fairness, objectivity, and collegiality in the process of gathering materials and evaluating them against the explicit Department, College, and University criteria established for these

DPC T&P; 9/15/2015
purposes. The DPC assessment and written report must be a carefully crafted, detailed peer review because candidates may rely on the DPC report for professional guidance.

Since faculty typically undergo contract renewal evaluations as untenured faculty leading up to tenure and promotion evaluation, this document first describes the criteria and process for contract renewal, followed by the more extensive procedures used for tenure and/or promotion review.

II. Contract Renewal Criteria and Procedures

A. The Department Chair shall ensure that potential applicants have access to all pertinent Department, College, and University criteria and procedures in a reasonable period prior to the deadlines established by the University for dissemination, and according to the schedule for contract renewal established under the UHPA contract and by the Board of Regents.

B. It is the responsibility of the applicant to submit a complete application for contract renewal by the dates set by the Department, College and University to permit DPC review, recognizing that the College and University have strict deadlines and that the DPC workload may be heavy during the Fall, given the need for DPC review of tenure and/or promotion cases as well. The DPC Chair may set internal committee deadlines that the applicant must meet within the deadlines established by the University.

C. The application for faculty contract renewal consists of a statement of endeavors (not more than three pages in length), current curriculum vitae, and supporting documents. The statement of endeavors should be divided into three sections that focus on teaching, research and service, with emphasis on contributions during the period since the last contract renewal.

a. Teaching: Summarize your contributions in teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and provide the complete raw data and summary results of student evaluations for all courses you have taught, using the standard course evaluation forms provided by the Office of Academic Evaluation through eCafe and containing the Department’s required questions. If you have not taught graduate level courses, discuss any of your work with individual graduate students (directed reading, serving on thesis or dissertation committees, supervising GRAs on projects). You may want to briefly explain your general approach and orientation towards teaching. Also, discuss efforts and plans to involve students in your research.

b. Research: Summarize your ongoing and projected research projects and/or plans. Outline the specific topical areas you are interested in, as well as the research methodology. You may refer to your publications, including any that have been published since your initial hire, as well as any that are in press, under review, or
in preparation. Compile a portfolio of these works. In discussing collaborative research projects, clearly distinguish the extent and nature of your individual role in these projects. Also note your efforts in writing grant proposals and submit copies of completed proposals, along with the status of each (awarded; not awarded; approved, but not awarded).

c. **Service:** Summarize (or list) any service contributions to the Department, College and University (such as work on committees or in developing institutional exchanges), professional organizations (such as serving as officer or convener; organizing conference symposia), and the broader public (such as public lectures, unpaid consultations, service on community boards). The aim of this section is to assess the unpaid, voluntary efforts of the faculty to contribute to the University, profession, and community.

D. The DPC will separate its review process into three distinct phases. All review processes of the DPC for contract renewal are confidential and are not to be shared nor discussed outside the committee with anyone other than the Department Chair or candidate according to the conditions described in these procedures.

a. **Information Gathering**
   The DPC will review the application materials and DPC members will identify any questions for which additional information from the candidate is required. If the DPC decides that additional information is required, the DPC Chair will contact the candidate to collaborate in developing additional written materials or to attempt to resolve factual questions with other data. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide relevant information to the DPC in a timely fashion. If questions remain that the candidate may be able to answer, he or she must be given an opportunity by the DPC to answer them in some mutually agreeable form.

b. **Assessment**
   The DPC will meet and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s record against the personnel criteria of the Department of Sociology and will write a draft of their evaluation report. Since the operative criteria and standards for promotion and tenure are spelled out in the College of Social Sciences documents (appended to this document), the Sociology Department uses these same criteria and standards for its own evaluations, in addition to the general criteria described below. Untenured faculty on tenure track positions are evaluated for contract renewal in terms of the progress they are making toward meeting the Department, College, and University tenure and promotion standards. These assessments should provide guidance to the candidate about the Department's expectations for subsequent performance. The record of past contract evaluations may be taken into consideration in the tenure and promotion evaluation.
c. **Recommendation**

For deliberation and voting, all DPC members must be tenured UHPA Bargaining Unit 07 members at or above the rank sought by the person being evaluated. After the final assessment report has been written, the DPC takes a vote by secret ballot and reports the results of the vote with its assessment.

The final DPC report and the recommendation vote will be forwarded to the Department Chair at least one week prior to the Department Chair’s action date for submission to the College as established by the University. The DPC Chair on behalf of the DPC shall complete the annual evaluation/contract renewal recommendation form in accordance with Article XII.A. and C. of the UHPA/BOR-UH Agreement. After receipt of the DPC’s assessment of the candidate, the Chair shall conduct an independent review of the contract renewal application, including a written assessment and shall also complete the annual evaluation/contract renewal recommendation form. “The Department Chair must show the Annual Evaluations and Contract Renewal Recommendations document to the faculty member in person before it is forwarded to the Dean/Director. The Department Chair/Director should ensure that the faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing page 2.” (From Probationary Faculty: Annual Evaluation/Contract Renewal Recommendation, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Attachment A).

**III. General Criteria for Tenure:**

Recommendation for tenure is based on an overall assessment that the candidate is and will continue to be a productive member of the Department. The criteria for this assessment relate to teaching, research, service, the present and future value to the Department, and relationships with faculty and students. Tenure for an Assistant Professor must include promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, so the candidate must also meet the Department, College, and University criteria for promotion to Associate Professor. A person who is already an Associate Professor or Full Professor shall be evaluated for tenure using the criteria for the present rank, since promotion to the next rank is not required for tenure in such cases.

1. **Teaching:**

   There is a general expectation of effective teaching, recognizing that different types and styles of teaching exist and that special fields may require different pedagogical skills. To aid in the process of evaluating teaching accomplishments, it is incumbent upon the candidate to provide the DPC with as much evidence as possible on the quality of his or her teaching, addressing the following points:

   a. Provide the raw data and summary results of student evaluations for all courses taught since hire or the last promotion, using the standard course evaluation forms provided by...
the Office of Academic Evaluation through eCafe and containing the Department’s required questions. Center for Teaching Excellence in-session course reviews and any other evaluative information may also be submitted.

b. Copies of syllabi, examinations, reading lists, and assignments from the candidate’s courses.

c. A statement of the candidate’s aims and procedures in teaching is recommended as an overview of the teaching section. Indications, where applicable, of efforts to develop new and important courses or to improve the quality of instruction in existing courses should also be included. The candidate’s involvement with student consultation and mentorship, the extent and nature of such consultation is also relevant. The applicant should address his/her willingness to meet Department needs for instructional coverage of the Department’s curricula, as well as his or her own individual preferences in the courses taught. The willingness of the candidate, in his/her area of competence, to serve as chair or member of student committees (honors, MA or PhD), and to provide directed reading and research assistance for individual students should be included in the dossier.

2. Research:

Each faculty member is expected to contribute knowledge through empirical research and/or scholarly analysis (scholarship of discovery). In general, assessment of research activity will be in response to the question, “How has the research been received by specialists in sociology, by members of the sociological discipline, by members in cognate fields?” If there are published reviews of the candidate’s scholarship, these shall be submitted. The DPC will take into consideration evaluations from confidential external reviewers that the Department has solicited as part of the review process, including reviewers nominated by the candidate.

The following kinds of material, especially the first, would be appropriate for evaluation of research and scholarly activity. For all such materials the applicant must indicate the proportion of their personal contribution to any joint or collective work and the nature of that contribution. The department recognizes both single-authored and co-authored publications, as long as the percentage contribution and basis for the ordering of authors are stated for all co-authored or multi-authored publications. However, more weight is given to publications in which the candidate is either the sole author or the lead author.

a. Publications (books, chapters, monographs, peer-reviewed articles, etc.). Appropriate forms of publication in sociology include the following: peer reviewed scholarly books, book chapters, monographs, journal articles, and/or editorship of peer-reviewed journal issues and books. Candidates for tenure are expected to present publications in one or more of these genres. Other publications, such as policy papers, evaluation reports, and essays in popular or literary publications will be considered but are not themselves considered sufficient for tenure and/or promotion. Citation counts and impact factors are relevant for some subfields and not others. They are not required, nor should their...
absence be counted against the candidate when they are not appropriate for the
candidate’s area of research. It is the responsibility of the candidate and the committee to
state how such material is regarded in the candidate’s subfield of sociology, so that
reviewers from other disciplines at higher levels can evaluate the candidate according to
criteria appropriate for his or her area of research.

b. Other research activities. In addition to the candidate’ publications, the DPC will also
evaluate the following as evidence of the candidate’s research activity, future
productivity, and potential:
1) Papers delivered at professional meetings and at departmental or inter-departmental
   seminars and colloquia, public lectures, etc.
2) Works in progress.

c. Grants received (purpose, source, review process, amount, and whether awarded or
   approved but not awarded)
Grants are not required for tenure and promotion, but will be considered as part of the
candidate’s research productivity. Sociologists may receive different types of grants and
contracts from local, national, and international public and private agencies, depending on the
field in which they conduct research. The scale of research support varies accordingly, as does
the number of investigators involved in a project. The candidate’s grant record will be evaluated
with due consideration to the nature of the research and what types of funding are typically
available for such research. It is the responsibility of the candidate and the committee to clarify
the appropriateness of the grants to the candidate’s area of research so that the DPC, external
reviewers, and reviewers from other disciplines at higher levels can evaluate the candidate
according to appropriate criteria.

The candidate shall indicate the funding source of each grant received indicating whether it is
intramural or extramural, the candidate’s status on the grant (e.g. principal investigator, co-
investigator, advisor or consultant, etc.), the time period of the grant and the amount received. If
the candidate is not the sole recipient of the grant or the principal investigator, an explanation of
the candidate’s role in the project should be provided.

3. Community Service:

There is a general expectation of substantial community service (scholarship of
application) for a positive recommendation. This is interpreted broadly to include:

a. Within the Department, the chairing of or membership on standing committees, and
   informed participation in all Department affairs.

b. Service on committees of the faculty at the College and campus levels; special
   committee assignments initiated by the Dean or the Chancellor; or collective bargaining
   activities.
c. Service to non-university groups in the community, e.g., as member, unpaid consultant, public speaker, etc.

d. Participation in professional associations at the local, state, national, or international levels, e.g., membership on committees, session organizer for annual meetings, journal referee, nomination or election to office, etc.

Here again it is incumbent upon the candidate to provide as much evidence as possible on these points to the DPC, including obtaining statements from colleagues on campus and from representatives of organizations as to the quality of the service provided by the candidate.

4. Present and Future Value to the Department:

While a candidate’s value in the Department is to be seen in large measure in the light of his or her contributions and abilities in the other four areas in this criteria list, an additional area for assessment is based on the candidate’s statement of his or her present and future role in the Department (Tenure Application Form, 1975-76, Part IV, 2.), which may cover the following points:

a. Importance of candidate’s continuous productivity in research and publication.

b. Importance of candidate’s role in teaching courses required for undergraduate majors or for graduate students.

c. Importance of candidate’s role in supervising graduate theses and dissertations.

d. Importance of candidate’s role in obtaining research funds that can utilize student services as research assistants.

e. Importance of candidate’s role in research which has a relationship to the quality level of the department within the discipline, to attracting promising graduate students, and to attracting extramural research or other academic funds.

f. Importance of the candidate’s role in the administration of Department affairs.

g. Importance of the candidate’s role in innovating, developing, establishing new courses or new administrative concepts that are regarded as breakthroughs or as essentials in the operation of the Department.

h. Importance of the candidate’s role in maintaining or raising the level of salutary relationships between the Department and other units of the university and/or units or organizations in the community.
5. Relationships with Faculty and Students:

The primary consideration here is that the candidate is expected to subscribe fully to the concept of the university as an intellectual community. This implies the possession of, and regard for, superior intellectual attainment; a willing subscription to accepted academic ethics in all relationships with colleagues and students; and devotion to a continuing pursuit of knowledge and personal intellectual development. While they are to be taken into account, deficiencies in interpersonal relationships, unless they are of a magnitude to materially impair the functioning of the Department, should be regarded as of secondary importance compared with deficiencies in teaching, research, service, and general value to the Department.

Evaluation on this criterion will be undertaken by the DPC in the following ways:

Relationships with Faculty:
The DPC shall request that the Department Chair solicit signed, non-confidential statements of the candidate’s collegial qualities through a general request to faculty members.

Relationships with Graduate Students:
The DPC shall request that the Department Chair solicit signed, non-confidential statements regarding the candidate’s relations with graduate students through a general request to graduate students.

Relationships with Undergraduate Students:
The DPC shall examine student data for relevant evidence.

These procedures are designed to solicit relevant information in a fair and open manner. Should they result in negative information, the DPC shall give the candidate the opportunity to review these documents and respond to them.

IV. General Criteria for Promotion:

Recommendation for promotion is based on assessment of the kinds and quality of contributions accomplished by the candidate during the period since the initial appointment or the last promotion. Sociology is a multifaceted discipline in which scholarship includes research, teaching, and service. All are valuable contributions to students, the department, the university and the discipline. While not all sociologists will accomplish equally in all areas, the department follows the criteria established for the College of Social Sciences, which specify that each candidate for promotion “must demonstrate excellence in one form of scholarship (i.e., teaching, discovery [research], or application), more than a satisfactory level in another, and at least a satisfactory level in a third. Furthermore, it is expected that the faculty member exhibit at least a satisfactory level of collegiality” as set forth in the document, College Focus, Part Two, Organizational Philosophy and Value-Driven Governance, p. 8 (10/10), guidelines established by the College and to which the Department also adheres.
Teaching, discovery [research], application and collegiality as used in the above statement of criteria are defined in College of Social Sciences, Assessment of Faculty Activities*, Appendix III, Rev. 12/10 to include the following (see Appendix for full statement):

**Teaching**: classroom presentations; advising and counseling students; writing and grading exams, papers or other work produced by students

**Discovery [Research]**: the act of knowledge creation through the publication or dissemination of original or innovative theoretical, empirical, or creative work

**Application**: applying expertise, information, interpretation, or techniques characteristic of one’s discipline to consequential real-life problems

**Collegiality**: speaks to the importance of treating others with respect, civility and professional regard; openness, another important component of collegiality, speaks to relating with others in a receptive and honest manner; cooperation, the third element of collegiality, signifies a willingness to work together. Another core value of the college is excellence, the continuous pursuit to make one's department, program, college, and university more effective and efficient.

1. **Teaching**

There is general expectation of effective classroom teaching, and individual advising and consulting with graduate and undergraduate students, recognizing that different methods, styles and formats of teaching and advising exist and that special fields may require different pedagogical skills. Effective and ongoing innovation both in individual courses and in the organization of graduate and undergraduate education is essential to a strong department and university. The delivery of effective education and training outside of the Department of Sociology, College and University also contributes to the stature of the Department and the candidate. To aid in the process of evaluating teaching accomplishments, it is incumbent on the candidate to provide the DPC with as much evidence as possible on the quality of his/her teaching, using appropriate bases of assessment of his or her teaching. The following materials are examples.

a. Provide the raw data and summary results of student evaluations for all courses taught since hire or the last promotion, using the standard course evaluation forms provided by the Office of Academic Evaluation through eCafe and containing the Department’s required questions. In activities for which standard evaluations are not appropriate, e.g., small seminars or individual instruction, equivalent documentation of quality may be provided.

b. Copies of syllabi, examinations, reading lists, assignments, exercises, videotapes, instructor prepared documents, computer programs or any documented examples of materials used in the education of students.
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c. A statement of the candidate’s aims and procedures in teaching, including efforts to
develop new and important courses or to improve the quality of instruction in existing
courses in the Department. The statement should include the extent to which teaching
activities, broadly defined, are impacted by or impact upon research and service.

d. A statement of the candidate’s organizational and/or research role in developing new
courses and educational experiences in the Department, College, University and the
community.

e. A documented statement of the number, extent, and impact of advising and individual
instruction (both formal and informal) of undergraduate and graduate students in and
outside the Department of Sociology.

f. A documented statement of the number of MA and Ph.D. committee memberships and
committees chaired and an assessment of their relationship to research and service.

g. A statement by the Department Chair(s) over a significant number of years on the extent
to which the candidate has been willing to meet Departmental instructional needs in
course assignment.

h. A portfolio including a self-assessment of teaching strengths and weaknesses on a
significant sample of recently taught courses and other educational activities.

i. A statement from other faculty who have observed or co-taught courses with the
candidate on the style and impact of the candidate’s teaching.

2. Research

Each faculty member is expected to contribute to knowledge through research and/or
scholarly analysis. The style, method, and audience of this research can vary widely. In
general, assessment of quality will be in response to the question “how has the research been
received by specialists in the appropriate sub-field of sociology, in related disciplines and in
the case of applied research, those who use the results?”

For published work, published reviews or critiques of the candidate’s research, where
available, should be submitted by the candidate. The DPC will take into consideration the
confidential external evaluations that the department has solicited as part of the review
process. For research that is not presented in the form of publications in refereed sociological
journals or books, the candidate is responsible for informing the DPC on the appropriate
experts from whom to seek an unbiased assessment of the quality of the research. For the
portion of the candidate’s scholarly work which the candidate designates as practice, policy,
evaluation, clinical or applied scholarship, the candidate must provide credible independent
descriptions of its quality and impact, as well as unbiased sources of expertise that the DPC can use to make independent assessments. As in all areas of assessment, the burden rests with the candidate to demonstrate to the DPC the quality of his or her contribution.

If there are published reviews of the candidate’s scholarship, these shall be submitted. The DPC will take into consideration evaluations from confidential external reviewers that the Department has solicited as part of the review process, including reviewers nominated by the candidate.

The following kinds of material, especially the first, would be appropriate for evaluation of research and scholarly activity. For all such materials the applicant must indicate the proportion of their personal contribution to any joint or collective work and the nature of that contribution. The department recognizes both single-authored and co-authored publications, as long as the percentage contribution and basis for the ordering of authors are stated for all co-authored or multi-authored publications. However, more weight is given to publications in which the candidate is either the sole author or the lead author.

a. Publications (books, chapters, monographs, peer-reviewed articles, etc.). Appropriate forms of publication in sociology include the following: peer reviewed scholarly books, book chapters, monographs, journal articles, and/or editorship of peer-reviewed journal issues and books. Candidates for tenure are expected to present publications in one or more of these genres. Other publications, such as policy papers, evaluation reports, and essays in popular or literary publications will be considered but are not themselves considered sufficient for tenure and/or promotion. Citation counts and impact factors are relevant for some subfields and not others. They are not required, nor should their absence be counted against the candidate when they are not appropriate for the candidate’s area of research. It is the responsibility of the candidate and the committee to state how such material is regarded in the candidate’s subfield of sociology, so that reviewers from other disciplines at higher levels can evaluate the candidate according to criteria appropriate for his or her area of research.

b. Other research activities. In addition to the candidate’s publications, the DPC will also evaluate the following as evidence of the candidate’s research activity, future productivity, and potential:

1) Papers delivered at professional meetings and at departmental or inter-departmental seminars and colloquia, public lectures, etc.
2) Works in progress.

c. Grants received (purpose, source, review process, amount, determination (awarded, approved but not awarded).

Grants are not required for promotion, but will be considered as part of the candidate’s research productivity. Sociologists may receive different types of grants and contracts from local, national, and international public and private agencies, depending on the field in which they conduct research. The scale of research support varies accordingly, as does the number of investigators involved in a project. The candidate’s grant record will be evaluated with due
consideration to the nature of the research and what types of funding are typically available for such research. It is the responsibility of the candidate and the committee to clarify the appropriateness of the grants to the candidate's area of research so that the DPC, external reviewers, and reviewers from other disciplines at higher levels can evaluate the candidate according to appropriate criteria.

The candidate shall indicate the funding source of each grant received indicating whether it is intramural or extramural, the candidate's status on the grant (e.g. principal investigator, co-investigator, advisor or consultant, etc.), the time period of the grant and the amount received. If the candidate is not the sole recipient of the grant or the principal investigator, an explanation of the candidate's role in the project should be provided.

d. Citations in the work of others, and invitations to provide expert information and consultation

With the assistance of independent experts, the DPC will assess the significance and quality of the research/scholarship presented for assessment. Whatever version or mixture of research is presented for evaluation, the DPC must satisfy itself that high standards of quality are attained. The DPC must satisfy itself that the candidate has met the minimum expectations for publications. Some mixture of a book published by a university or other academic press, articles in peer-reviewed scholarly journals and chapters in peer-reviewed books, and editorship of journal issues or books is required. Other publications, such as policy papers, evaluation reports, policy papers and essays in popular or literary publications will be considered but are not themselves considered sufficient for promotion. These will be assessed on their merits with the appropriate criteria.

3. Community Service

There is a general expectation of substantial community service for a positive recommendation. Sociology is a discipline in which there is a long history and ample opportunity for service. Service outside the University can inform and stimulate both teaching and research, and reflect positively on the stature and relevance of the Department, College, University and the discipline. Service is interpreted broadly to include:

a. Within the Department, the chairing of or membership on standing or ad hoc committees and informed participation in all Departmental affairs.

b. Service on committees of the faculty and the College and campus levels, and special committee assignments initiated by the Dean or other administrators or the Faculty Senate.

c. Service to non-university groups, individuals and organizations in the community, or with university groups which offer service to the community, as a paid or unpaid consultant, public speaker, volunteer or paid researcher, trainer, organizational developer,
or any other role in which expertise in sociology is a significant portion of the service role.

d. Participation in professional associations at the local, state, national or international levels, e.g., membership on committees, session organizer for annual meetings, service as a referee, evaluator or other professional role within sociology or related fields, nomination and election to office, etc.

The DPC will assess the quality, consistency, impact and integration of service with teaching and research. Here again it is incumbent upon the candidate to provide as much credible and independent evidence as possible on these points to the DPC. Failure to provide such evidence is not prejudicial to the candidate, but the DPC may seek additional information on these matters from the candidate and make independent inquiries. The DPC may also undertake to obtain statements from colleagues on campus and from representatives of organizations as to the quality of the service provided by the candidate.

V. Specific Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion to Full Professor:

Having established the criteria for promotion, it is necessary to further distinguish their application in the separate cases of promotion to Associate and to Full Professor. While both involve the candidate’s accomplishments during their time in rank, the scale of expected accomplishments differs. Candidates in the case of promotion to Associate and to Full Professor “must demonstrate excellence in one form of scholarship (i.e., teaching, discovery [research], or application), more than a satisfactory level in another, and at least a satisfactory level in a third. Furthermore, it is expected that the faculty member exhibit at least a satisfactory level of collegiality” as set forth in the document, College Focus, Part Two, Organizational Philosophy and Value-Driven Governance, p. 8 (10/10), guidelines established by the College and to which the Department also adheres.

*Teaching, discovery [research], application and collegiality* as used in the above statement of criteria are defined in College of Social Sciences, Assessment of Faculty Activities*, Appendix III, Rev. 12/10 to include the following (see Appendix for full statement):

*Teaching*: classroom presentations; advising and counseling students; writing and grading exams, papers or other work produced by students

*Discovery [Research]*: the act of knowledge creation through the publication or dissemination of original or innovative theoretical, empirical, or creative work

*Application*: applying expertise, information, interpretation, or techniques characteristic of one’s discipline to consequential real-life problems

*Collegiality*: speaks to the importance of treating others with respect, civility and professional
regard; openness, another important component of collegiality, speaks to relating with others in a receptive and honest manner; cooperation, the third element of collegiality, signifies a willingness to work together. Another core value of the college is excellence, the continuous pursuit to make one's department, program, college, and university more effective and efficient.

A. Associate Professor: Assuming satisfactory fulfillment of teaching, particularly at the undergraduate level, service and research performance at the rank of assistant professor, which are expected routinely, promotion to the Associate Professor rank requires documentation of ongoing scholarly, teaching and service activity. Candidates for promotion “must demonstrate excellence in one form of scholarship (i.e., teaching, discovery [research], or application), more than a satisfactory level in another, and at least a satisfactory level in a third. Furthermore, it is expected that the faculty member exhibit at least a satisfactory level of collegiality” as set forth in the document, College Focus, Part Two, Organizational Philosophy and Value-Driven Governance, p. 8 (10/10), guidelines established by the College and to which the Department also adheres.

B. Full Professor: Assuming satisfactory fulfillment of both graduate and undergraduate teaching, service and research performance at the rank of Associate Professor, promotion to this rank requires definitive evidence of independent, mature and substantial contribution in the discipline and demonstrated “excellence in one form of scholarship (i.e., teaching, discovery [research], or application), more than a satisfactory level in another, and at least a satisfactory level in a third. Furthermore, it is expected that the faculty member exhibit at least a satisfactory level of collegiality” as set forth in the document, College Focus, Part Two, Organizational Philosophy and Value-Driven Governance, p. 8 (10/10), guidelines established by the College and to which the Department also adheres.

There must be significant continuing contribution in the form of research and publication (as mentioned above) during the period of holding the rank of associate professor. Accomplishments prior to that period or work in progress are not sufficient. In addition, the University standards for promotion to full professor include the expectation that the faculty member has achieved a national or international reputation in his or her field.

During the entire review process, the candidate for promotion may volunteer any additional information relating to these criteria or to other matters he or she deems pertinent for reaching a fair decision.

VI. Tenure and Promotion Procedures

A. It is the responsibility of the applicant to submit a complete application for promotion or tenure to the DPC by the dates set by the Department, College and University to permit DPC review, recognizing that the College and University have strict deadlines and that the DPC workload may be heavy during the Fall. The DPC Chair may set internal committee deadlines that the applicant must meet within the deadlines established by the University.
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B. The DPC will separate its processes into three distinct phases. All review processes of the DPC regarding tenure and promotion are confidential and are not to be shared nor discussed with anyone outside the DPC other than the Department Chair or the candidate according to the conditions described in these procedures.

1. Information Gathering
   i. For both tenure and promotion, the department solicits external reviews of the candidate’s publications according to the following procedures.

   ii. The candidate submits a list of 5-8 names and addresses of respected scholars in related fields who are not employed at the University of Hawaii to serve as potential external referees. These names should be submitted as soon as he or she has decided to apply for tenure or promotion, to allow the maximum amount of time for the DPC and Department Chair to solicit external reviews. An evaluator should be at or above the rank aspired to by the applicant, and must not include anyone who may not be able to submit an objective evaluation due to her/his relationship with the applicant (such as thesis/dissertation chair, project collaborator, etc.). Unless there are mitigating circumstances, the external evaluators should be at peer research universities. An explanation of the mitigating circumstances should be included in the DPC recommendation. External evaluators should be professionally capable to assess the applicant’s work objectively and comment on its significance in sociology. Applicants should not directly contact possible external evaluators.

   iii. The DPC selects five or more names from the candidate’s list and adds five or more of its own external referees, and may rank order additional names to ensure that sufficient outside reviews are obtained. The candidate selects copies of his or her major publications for the external review. The Department Chair solicits external referees from the lists and sends these publications and the candidate’s CV to the external referees, with a deadline for receipt of their external review letters. The Manoa criteria now require that equal numbers of reviews be submitted from the candidate’s list and the DPC’s list, so additional reviews may need to be requested in order to achieve the necessary volume and balance.

   iv. The formal letter requesting the review follows a standard UH format to ensure the confidentiality of the review within legal limits, including instructions about where to place personally identifiable information in the event that the candidate is later permitted to see parts of the letters.

   v. If an insufficient number of persons from the original list agree to review the candidate’s materials to produce at least six external reviews, the Department Chair works with the DPC and the candidate to solicit reviews from additional
persons, maintaining a balance between names provided by the candidate and names provided independently by the DPC.

vi. When the letters are received, they are marked "CONFIDENTIAL" as soon as it arrives. Make seven copies of each letter and assemble 8 sets of confidential letters (1 original + 7 copies), with each set placed in one of eight separate envelopes marked "CONFIDENTIAL." Include in each envelope a listing of the reviewers, their institutional and disciplinary affiliations and whether they came from the candidate’s or the DPC’s list. Also include a copy of the letter sent to the external reviewers. One set of confidential letters is included with each copy of the dossier.

vii. The CONFIDENTIAL envelopes containing the review letters are then attached to every copy of the completed applicant dossier that is forwarded from the department to the next level of review. The candidate is not permitted to see these confidential external reviews at the departmental level and may not request them from either the DPC or the Chair. Also, other members of the Department who do not serve on the DPC are not allowed to see these external review letters. If at a later stage in the process the candidate is afforded the opportunity to see these letters, only redacted versions will be shown that preserve the confidentiality of the reviewer/s and the reviewer’s relationship to the candidate.

viii. Brief comments or quotes from the review letters with no names included may be incorporated into the DPC report of the candidate.

ix. The DPC will review the application and DPC members will identify any questions for which additional information from the candidate is required. If the DPC decides that additional information is required, a designated member of the DPC will contact the candidate to collaborate in developing additional written materials or to attempt to resolve factual questions with other data. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide relevant information to the DPC in a timely fashion.

x. The DPC will review the revised application and any additional information that has been submitted by the candidate. If members still have questions for which additional information is needed, the DPC Chair will decide what procedure will be used to acquire the information, including asking the candidate to appear before the committee to answer questions. If questions remain that the candidate may be able to answer, he or she must be given an opportunity by the DPC to answer them in some mutually agreeable form.
xi. Relations with faculty: the DPC shall request that the Department Chair solicit signed, non-confidential statements of the candidate’s collegial qualities through a general request to department faculty members.

xii. Relations with graduate students: the DPC shall request that the Department Chair solicit signed, non-confidential statements regarding the candidate’s relations with graduate students through a general request to graduate students in the department.

xiii. Relations with undergraduate students: the DPC shall examine student data for relevant evidence.

xiv. These procedures (xi, xii, and xiii) are designed to solicit relevant information in a fair and open manner. Should they result in negative information, the DPC shall give the candidate the opportunity to review these documents and respond to them. The primary consideration here is that the candidate is expected to subscribe fully to the concept of the university as an intellectual community. This implies the possession of, and regard for, superior intellectual attainment; a willing subscription to accepted academic ethics in all relationships with colleagues and students; and devotion to a continuing pursuit of knowledge and personal intellectual development. While they are to be taken into account, deficiencies in interpersonal relationships, unless they are of a magnitude to materially impair the functioning of the Department, should be regarded as of secondary importance compared with deficiencies in teaching, research, service, and general value to the Department.

2. Assessment

i. The DPC will meet and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s record against the criteria of the Department of Sociology, the College and University, and will write a draft of their evaluation report.

ii. When this report has been approved by the DPC, it will be given to the candidate for written comment. If this report contains references to information apart from that provided in the candidate’s application, which damages an applicant’s case for promotion or tenure, the applicant may request and must receive this information. If the information is contained in a solicited external review, the DPC Chair will determine the form of this disclosure, which may be through a summary or excerpt, and will endeavor to protect the identity of sources of confidential information to the extent permitted by law.

iii. The DPC will review the candidate’s comments and may or may not revise the assessment. The DPC will provide this draft to the candidate, even if there
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are no changes. Thereafter, the DPC is not obliged to provide the candidate any draft of the final assessment, although it may choose to do so.

iv. The DPC will not use any anonymous information in its assessment.

v. The DPC will evaluate the candidate’s performance using the College standards as set forth in the College guidelines: “It is expected that for tenure and promotion, the faculty member must demonstrate excellence in one form of scholarship (i.e., teaching, research, or application), more than a satisfactory level in another, and at least a satisfactory level in a third.”

3. Recommendation

i. After the final assessment report has been written, the DPC takes a vote of its members by secret ballot. It incorporates its vote into the document and reports its assessment to the Department Chair one week prior to the date that the Department Chair must submit the dossier to the College. The DPC may include its recommendation in the assessment.

ii. The Department Chair shall make his or her independent assessment of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses, and append a recommendation separate from the DPC’s review process. Upon completion of the DPC and Department Chair’s assessment the dossier shall be transmitted to the Dean of the College of Social Sciences.

iii. The final DPC report will be provided to the candidate by the Department Chair.

C. Prior to the DPC review, the DPC and Department Chair shall not accept unsolicited information for inclusion in a tenure dossier without providing the information to the candidate and then giving the candidate the opportunity to provide a written response. Once the DPC has begun its review, no unsolicited information will be included in the dossier. This does not apply to solicited external reviews, including those agreed upon by the applicant, per the DPC procedures.

VII. Election of Department Chair

Per UHPA/BOR-UH Agreement, Article XB, recommendation of an UHPA Bargaining Unit 07 faculty member to serve as Department Chair shall be based on a majority vote of all UHPA Bargaining Unit 07 faculty members in the Department. The recommendation shall be forwarded to the Dean who must approve and hire the faculty member to serve as Department Chair.

VIII. Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty

When tenured faculty have been identified for regular periodic review and have not otherwise been reviewed during the previous five years, the following procedures will be followed.
A. The candidate shall be notified of the pending review and shall be required to submit an
"academic profile" to the Department Chair that covers activities during the past five
years (the period since the last review). The report should address the same general areas
and criteria as required for promotion to the candidate's current rank to demonstrate
continuing productivity, although the balance among activities may have shifted over
time. According to the contract, "the academic profile should include information on
teaching, research, service, and other professional activities appropriate to their position.
The academic profile may include work in progress or anticipated."

B. The Department Chair will review the materials and to determine whether the candidate's
performance has been satisfactory, and follow the procedures outlined for periodic
review.

C. When the Department Chair is up for review, the review may be submitted to the Chair of
the DPC.
Appendix A. Relevant College of Social Sciences Criteria for Tenure and Promotion: College Focus, Part Two, Organizational Philosophy and Value-Driven Governance, pp. 7-9, 10/10.

G. The Contract Review System
There are two types of contracts, which must be reviewed periodically, those for probationary faculty and those for faculty on limited-term (non-tenure-track) contracts. UHPA/UH Agreement establishes the context within which contract renewals for probationary faculty must take place. The college views the contract review as an important means of evaluation of the faculty member's professional and personal qualities. Contract review is of great value to the faculty member and the unit and, thus, should be conducted in a thorough manner. For the faculty member, such a review allows for an objective and thorough assessment of strengths and weaknesses, which can be used by the faculty member to enhance her/his professional development. For the unit, it is an opportunity to assess and guide a faculty member's fit into the values, goals, and needs of the unit as well as an opportunity to facilitate the retention of the faculty member by enhancing her/his development. If the faculty member's contract is not renewed by the unit, it has first rights to the position.

The UHPA/UH Agreement includes "personal qualities" as a criterion in the review which is interpreted in the college to mean collegiality; i.e., joining the college's commitment to mutual respect, openness, and cooperation. College values dictate that the faculty on non-tenure-track contracts be dealt with fairly and equitably and be given ample notification when their contracts are not to be renewed. While University regulations make assessments of limited-term faculty by personnel committees optional, requiring only assessments from chairs/directors, common sense dictates that these be handled in a manner similar to that of probationary faculty. Further, written narrative assessment of their strengths and weaknesses should reflect the major duties assigned to them. For example, if the primary duty of the faculty member is teaching, it is not appropriate to weigh research efforts heavily.

Guidelines for assessing a faculty member's scholarly activities and citizenship are described in Section I: Assessment of Faculty Activities.

H. The Tenure and Promotion Review System
The tenure and promotion process is specified in UHPA/UH Agreement. According to this agreement, certain procedures must be followed in preparing, processing, and evaluating tenure and promotion applications. For each step within the college, there should be a fair and equitable assessment of the candidate. The evaluation process should involve an open and frank discussion of the candidate based on valid and reliable information. Information should be provided by the candidate, members of the unit (faculty, staff, and students), and sources outside the unit. While the composition of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) for tenure and promotion may vary from unit to unit, it is important that all faculty members of a unit be involved in the discussion and the recommendation of the candidates. Before the recommendation is sent to the dean, the candidate may request to review the statements of the DPC and chair/director. Before the recommendation is sent to the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee, the candidate may...
request to review the statement of the dean. Faculty members who are recommended for tenure and/or promotion should enhance the quality of scholarship and the collegial climate of the unit and college. Specifically, it is expected that for tenure and promotion, the faculty member must demonstrate excellence in one form of scholarship (i.e., teaching, discovery, or application), more than a satisfactory level in another, and at least a satisfactory level in a third. Furthermore, it is expected that the faculty member exhibit at least a satisfactory level of collegiality. If the faculty member's application for tenure is denied by the unit, it has first rights to the position. Guidelines for assessing a faculty member's scholarly activities and citizenship are described in Section I., Assessment of Faculty Activities.

I. Assessment of Faculty Activities
Faculty members in the College of Social Sciences have four main responsibilities. Three are related to scholarly activities: teaching, research, and application. The fourth responsibility is citizenship. Some activities in application and citizenship are what traditionally have been called "service" at the university level. The delineation between application and citizenship makes an important distinction between these two responsibilities and offers a more inclusive set of activities within each responsibility. The definition, scope of activities, and assessment of each responsibility are described in Appendix III. The scope of activities and the use of specific types of assessment are meant to serve as examples. Use by departments and programs may vary depending upon what is most appropriate to the particular discipline.
Appendix B. Relevant College of Social Sciences Criteria for Tenure and Promotion:
College of Social Sciences, Assessment of Faculty Activities*, Appendix II, Rev. 12/10

A. Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching
1. Definition
Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching are separate activities which, at the level of practice, are inextricably linked, but at the level of definition can be delineated. Good teaching involves the ability to interact effectively with students. Pedagogical procedures must be carefully planned, continuously examined, and directly related to the subject taught. Good teachers stimulate active, not passive, learning, and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over.

As a scholarly enterprise, teaching begins with what the teacher knows. Those who teach must be, above all, well informed, and steeped in the knowledge of their fields. Hard work and serious study underpin good teaching. Good teaching means that faculty, as scholars, are also learners. At its best, the Scholarship of Teaching means not only transmitting knowledge, but also transforming and extending it. Although distinctions have been made between teaching activities, and those activities related to the Scholarship of Teaching, both of these activities are integral for establishing proficiency in this area.

2. Scope of Activities
Teaching activities include those that involve direct or indirect contact with specific learners. Some examples are:
   A. Classroom presentations, such as lecturing, seminars, leading discussion, stimulating debate, individual instruction of 3/4/6/799 courses, guest lecturing.
   B. Advising and counseling students; supervision of undergraduate theses, chair of M.A. committees, member of M.A. committees, chair of Ph.D. committees, member of Ph.D. committees, supervising practicums/internships, independent studies, honors theses and graduate directed research and theses; and/or advising academically relevant student groups or clubs.
   C. Writing and critiquing exams, papers, or other work produced by students, course preparation, new course/curriculum revision, developing learning communities.

The Scholarship of Teaching includes those activities that are involved in gathering material that one can teach. Activities of this type include:
   A. Writing textbooks and/or publications in pedagogical journals, developing case studies with instructional materials, generating instructional software, and/or producing instructional materials, generating instructional software, and/or producing publicly available materials describing the design and implementation of new courses.
   B. Designing new courses, integrating new developments into existing courses, reading to keep one’s knowledge current.
3. Assessment
Teaching is a public activity; therefore, the assessment of teaching requires that the activities and
products of the scholarship be open to public scrutiny and appraisal. Evidence related to
Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching might include the following:
A. Student evaluations including the use of standard teaching evaluations such as CAFE.
B. Evidence of student academic development and achievement, including command of
disciplinary literature, intellectual capabilities, applied skills.
C. Peer evaluations – this would include those activities whereby faculty work together to
establish criteria for good teaching and whereby they evaluate each other by moving
freely in and out of classrooms, observing colleagues and discussing their own teaching
procedures.
D. Self-evaluations – Faculty might periodically prepare a statement about the courses
taught which includes a discussion of class goals and procedures, course outlines,
descriptions of teaching materials and assignments, and copies of examinations.
Instructors could detail how they have incorporated the two or three most important new
developments or significant movements in their fields into the classroom.
E. Examination of course materials, including syllabi, audio-visual materials, student
manuals, etc.
F. Interviews with students, including alumni whose post-graduate careers were influenced
by the quality of the professor’s teaching
G. Evidence of advising, counseling, or other work that contributes to continuing intellectual
development
H. Evidence of the professor’s methods for remaining current in the subject matter taught,
and/or integrating the latest developments into the classroom
I. College, University, national, international, and professional awards for teaching

B. Scholarship of Research

1. Definition
For most faculty, the Scholarship of Research is equivalent to basic research -- delving into some
question in that faculty member’s field and seeking to add to the reservoir of knowledge. Such
endeavors not only result in the creation of knowledge, but also invigorate student-faculty
relationships inside the classroom and out. The Scholarship of Research includes the act of
knowledge creation through the publication or dissemination of original or innovative
theoretical, empirical, or creative work.

Increasingly, the Scholarship of Research also includes applied research and the translation of
research results into changes in politics or practices in government and the private sector. In this
form, the Scholarship of Research includes working with clients who are seeking to solve
problems and are looking to the results of research to help solve those problems. In many cases,
applied research is done for government agencies and non-profit organizations who are seeking
to improve the quality of life for the citizens of our State, our Nation, and the Asia/Pacific
Region. The results of this form of the Scholarship of Research are disseminated through policy
and technical reports, briefings, training programs, and electronic media.
The Scholarship of Research also encompasses integration, making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in a larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, and/or educating non-specialists. In this form of Research, serious, disciplined work seeks to draw together, interpret, and bring insight to bear on original research. Scholars engaged in this type of work ask, "What is to be known?" "What is yet to be found?" "Is it possible to interpret what's been discovered in ways that provide a larger, more comprehensive understanding?"

The intellectual excitement and progress that are generated by the Scholarship of Research are vital to a research university such as ours.

2. Scope of Activities
The Scholarship of Research includes activities such as:
A. Publication of new knowledge in the form of refereed articles written in journals, monographs, scholarly and professional books, chapters in scholarly and professional books, proceedings, policy papers, and technical and project reports for clients of applied research.
B. Presentation of papers at scholarly meetings, and publication of associated abstracts of those presentations, and hearings and presentation of the results of applied research to clients.
C. Efforts at writing grant proposals, and success in obtaining funding for research and other creative activities.
D. Activities that increase the coherence and connection between disciplines, and between disciplines and people such as cross-disciplinary research, meta-analyses, literature reviews, bibliographies, writing for non-specialists, such as textbooks for students, articles or books for the general public, preparing quality computer software, video or TV presentations.

3. Evaluation and Assessment
Some discovery activities easily lend themselves to external review and evaluation, while other activities are more difficult to evaluate. Evidence for the Scholarship of Research might include:
A. Quality and quantity of publications as mentioned by citation, reviews, and other forms of external assessment.
B. Applying for, and/or securing, contract and grant support.
C. College, university, national, international, and professional awards for research.
D. Fellow status in professional organization.
E. An evaluation of the key ideas and whether they have been well defined and well presented.
F. Demonstration that the use of techniques of the discipline showed some degree of innovation.
G. An explanation of how the material demonstrates integrative and interdisciplinary perspectives.
H. Demonstration that the faculty member's disciplinary horizons expand in ways that are likely to result in more sophisticated work in the future and hold value to many members of the discipline.
I. Evidence of an increase in the faculty member's own conceptual understanding of his or her academic field
J. Demonstration that the faculty member's work contribute to the solution of important social, economic, or environmental problems.
K. An examination of which publics have been reached by the endeavor and in what ways public discourse may have been advanced by the work.

C. Scholarship of Application

1. Definition
The Scholarship of Application occurs when one applies expertise, information, interpretation, or techniques characteristic of one's discipline to consequential real-life problems. The activity must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to one's professional activity. The Scholarship of Application is serious, demanding work that requires the rigor and accountability traditionally associated with research activities.

Activities that any person might engage in as part of being a functioning member of a community are not considered to be part of the Scholarship of Application. For example, participation in town councils, youth clubs, or civic service organizations, while commendable, are not typically considered part of the scholarship of application. Activities that relate directly to the intellectual work of the professor are considered part of the Scholarship of Application. Those assessing applied scholarship should ask: is the activity directly related to the academic expertise of the professor? Have project goals been defined, procedures well planned, and actions carefully recorded? In what ways has the work not only benefited the recipients of such activity but also added to the professor's own understanding of her or his own academic field?

2. Scope of Activities
Activities include:
A. Unpaid consulting activities
B. Published reports that define or resolve relevant local, national, or international problems or issues
C. Studies and/or surveys for public or private organizations
D. Activities which have traditionally been considered to be "professional service," which are based on expertise, such as journal editorships, giving "expert testimony" before a government or civic body, paper reviewer, etc.
E. Use of state-of-the-art knowledge to facilitate change in organizations or institutions.
F. Establishment of intervention programs to prevent, ameliorate, or remediate persistent negative outcomes, or to optimize positive outcomes.
G. Drawing on professional expertise to plan and produce public service programs, publications, or educational broadcasts (television, radio, web, etc.).
3. Assessment
Evidence for the Scholarship of Application might include:
   A. An explanation of how the activity was related to the faculty member's academic expertise
   B. A definition of the goals, planning procedures, and actions that were required by the project.
   C. Demonstration that the use of techniques of the discipline showed some degree of innovation.
   D. Evaluation of the work by the beneficiary of the project
   E. An increase in the faculty member's own conceptual understanding of his or her academic field. The Scholarship of Application has value when the faculty member's disciplinary horizons expand in ways that are likely to result in more sophisticated work in the future and hold value to many members of the discipline.
   F. Applying for and/or securing contract and grant support.
   G. College, university, national, international, and professional awards for application.

D. Citizenship

1. Definition
Citizenship is service that contributes to the greater good of the university, college, department or program and the discipline. It includes activities that create a collegial climate and an exemplary organization.

In the College of Social Sciences, collegiality is a prime value. At a minimum, collegiality speaks to the importance of treating others with respect, civility and professional regard. Openness, another important component of collegiality, speaks to relating with others in a receptive and honest manner. Cooperation, the third element of collegiality, signifies a willingness to work together. Another core value of the college is excellence, the continuous pursuit to make one's department, program, college, and university more effective and efficient.

2. Scope of Activity
Participation in governance is the responsibility of every faculty member, and these activities are an important part of university life. Citizenship includes activities at all levels of the university and the profession.
   A. Add to the collegial climate of department, program, college and university.
   B. Initiate activities that enhance the mission and operations of the department, program, college, and university.
   C. Activities that benefit the unit, not just the individual.
   D. Participation in faculty meetings, recruiting new faculty, departmental decision-making, and responding to requests for information required by the university or state
   E. Participation on elected committees, advisory boards, ad hoc groups, self-study sections, and other committees responsible for the governance and guidance of the department, program, college, university and/or profession.
F. Chair department or program, chair tenure and promotion review committee, webmaster for department/program, new faculty mentor.
G. Coordinating and participating in non-instructional and non-research oriented activities that benefit and promote the department, program, college or university, e.g., open house, fundraising, etc.

3. Assessment
Evidence of positive contributions can be judged by the following criteria:

A. Amount—certainly a quantitative assessment of numbers of service commitments can be made.
B. Quality—in addition to the number of service commitments, the faculty member’s contributions to the work of a group can be qualitatively assessed.
C. Importance—Some endeavors are more critical than others. The benefit of the project(s) should be considered.
D. Time—Some commitments take considerably more time than others and should be considered when assessing citizenship.
E. Cooperation with colleagues through joint scholarship or service activities
F. Rapport with students as measured by certain questions on the teaching evaluation, or selection of the faculty person to be an advisor, independent study or practicum supervisor, etc.
G. Willingness to participate in and support governance activities.

E Adherence to Professional Standards

Personal integrity and adherence to standards are the hallmarks of any profession. The professoriate is no exception. Professional conduct and personal integrity are minimal expectations for any faculty member.