

DOWNLOAD THIS DOCUMENT TO MAKE EDITS.
*****OFFICE OF THE PROVOST UNIT POLICY TEMPLATE*****
TENURE-TRACK FACULTY REVIEW AND PROMOTION

Unit:

Previous version approved:

Faculty approved:

Dean's revision received by OtP:

Date of OtP approval:

Note: Text in [blue and brackets] indicates where units should develop and insert language specific to their unit practices, standards, and criteria. Other text is directly from the CBA or university policy and should not be altered.

Unless noted otherwise, this policy is based on CBA Article 20, US20/21-04, US21/22-06, or US22/23-11.

I. PREAMBLE

This policy applies only to faculty members in the Tenure-Track and Tenured classification. Tenure is in the University, and not in a college, school, department, program, or discipline. The award of tenure requires an express grant by the Provost communicated in writing to the faculty member and signed by the Provost. There is no de facto tenure. Tenure means that the faculty member's employment may be terminated only for cause (CBA Article 24), or in case of program eliminations or reductions (CBA Article 25).

The University follows the same general timetable, process, and standards of performance for evaluation and promotion as do many other public research universities, particularly Association of American Universities (AAU) institutions. The University also considers American Association of University Professors (AAUP) guidelines for tenure review and promotion. All department or unit review guidelines shall be established and revised by the processes set out in CBA Article 4.

While the AAUP does not prescribe institutional tenure guidelines, this policy adheres to the principles of academic freedom, clear written guidance, stipulation of periods/timing of reviews, and criteria consistent with rank and position as detailed in this policy. As an interdisciplinary unit, we recognize that there are many forms of scholarship in the College and attend to such variation in this policy.

II. GENERAL OVERVIEW

A. Types of Reviews

Reviews for faculty members in the Tenure-Track and Tenured classification will consist of the following:

- (1) annual reviews for faculty not holding tenure;
- (2) mid-term reviews between appointment and tenure review for the faculty without tenure;
- (3) tenure-and-promotion review;
- (4) third-year post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty in the third year following:
 - a tenure and/or promotion decision, or
 - a previous third-year review for associate professors (if a promotion to full professor review is not taking place in the same year), or
 - following a sixth-year post-tenure review for full professors;
- (5) promotion-to-full-professor review for tenured faculty in their sixth year or later after receiving tenure; and
- (6) sixth-year post-tenure reviews for full professors in their sixth year following a promotion to full decision or following a previous sixth-year review.

For eligibility, timing, submission materials, and review processes, see CBA Article 20.

B. General Considerations and Standards

Each department's or unit's tenure-track and tenured review criteria are intended to be consistent with those of other major research universities and shall include expectations, including the proportional weights, for each of the following, as defined by each department or unit (CBA Appendix 2).

- **Sustained high-quality, innovative scholarship** in the faculty member's discipline, demonstrated through a record of concrete, accumulated research or creative activity;
- **Effective, stimulating teaching** that meets university-wide teaching standards established by the University Senate, to the extent applicable, in courses taught and in contributions to ensuring academic success for undergraduate and graduate students, as applicable;
- **Ongoing, responsible service and leadership** to the faculty member's students and department, the university, the community, and the faculty member's professional discipline more broadly.

Contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion should be taken into account, as appropriate.

Only significant information relevant to the review shall be included in a review file. Relevant information is information that relates to the review criteria as defined in this Agreement. Reviews should provide justifications for their conclusion based on the file, previous levels of review, and the unit-level policy. Reviews shall consider any lack of resources necessary to the performance of professional responsibilities that were identified in previous workload discussions (Article 17, Section 3).

It should be noted that while the criteria that follow establish the standards for meeting expectations, merit reviews will necessitate determining the extent to which faculty perform beyond these standards.

III. PRIMARY EVALUATION CRITERIA

All review types will assess faculty performance in the following areas:

- Research, scholarship, creative, and artistic achievement
- Teaching effectiveness
- Service and leadership

Units should specify expectations and proportional weights for each area consistent with CBA Appendix 2 and norms of AAU institutions. Contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion should be taken into account for each area as appropriate.

A. Research, scholarship, creative, and artistic achievement

Categories to be considered: [The COE criteria for promotion and/or tenure are inclusive to accommodate a wide range of scholarly approaches, and research methods. In evaluating a faculty member's collective research and scholarship, criteria should allow reviewers to take into account and contextualize each faculty member's work in terms of their research agenda, the nature of the discipline or field of study in which the research is being conducted, rank, and the possibility that a variety of formats and forums may be appropriate for exposition of scholarly work. A faculty member's dossier may not provide evidence in every category below; the comprehensive list of categories is designed to be inclusive of the disciplines and scholarship trajectories for faculty within the COE.](#)

[Distinctions should be made regarding the difficulty, complexity, scale, and time required to conduct the research and prepare refereed scholarly products for publication. Some programs of study lend themselves to reporting incrementally different findings from the same or similar studies, whereas others encompass consideration of entirely new phenomena for each study. In addition, attention should be given to disciplinary expectations and the availability of external support for the candidate's interests and areas of scholarly activity. Additionally, the COE acknowledges that different research questions require different disciplinary approaches and/or research methodologies. No one form of inquiry or research method should be presumed to have greater weight than another. Rather, all questions require rigorous and appropriate processes of inquiry.](#)

[In general, research, and scholarship may be demonstrated in the following categories with progression in activity and recognition commensurate with rank:](#)

0. publications of significance (e.g., [a] publication of books in an academic press or trade press, [b] publication of articles in peer-reviewed outlets [c] publication of other scholarly works, such as book chapters, non-refereed journal articles, practitioner and public-facing publications, or technical reports);
1. participation in conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings (e.g., keynote addresses, peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed presentations at regional, national or international academic professional organizations; organizing panels; and/or serving as a discussant;
2. applied research or scholarship that is community-engaged and/or influences public policy or contributes to societal benefits;
3. adoptions of candidate's research innovations by other researchers, organizations, or the public;
4. externally funded or internally competitively funded research;
5. recognized evidence of scholarly and professional visibility, such as membership in the national academies or other selective research societies, competitive research awards and prizes, unsolicited scholarly citations or book reviews, and the republication of work;
6. patents, intellectual property developed; technologies licensed.

Unit-specific criteria for evaluating research, scholarship, and creative activity are as follows:

Meets expectations: Promotion and tenure expectations should be consistent with COE annual workload expectations and evaluations.

The COE expectation for a full-time tenure track faculty member is that they should publish an average of two peer-refereed products per calendar year across the full review period (not including manuscripts that have been submitted but not yet accepted or accepted pending revisions) or a single refereed scholarly product of comparable scope during the review period, such as a published book or a book that is in production (such that final corrected page proofs are accessible), which would be expected to take several years to complete. Chapters in books and professional presentations complement such productivity. Consideration will be given to the quality of the publication outlet, author order, and inclusion of students or colleagues as co-authors. When a candidate's productivity does not meet the expectation of on average publication of two peer-refereed products per year, evaluators must consider the context and development of the candidate's research agenda and rank in evaluating scholarly productivity.

Although the number of peer-refereed publications or published book-length manuscripts are the traditional indicator of scholarly productivity, it is not the only measure. In addition to productivity (i.e., quantity), the COE uses quality, rigor, and

impact as indicators to evaluate scholarly contributions. Quality and rigor indicators include the importance of the research questions being studied, peer review, quality and ranking of publication outlets, for example as determined by disciplinary standards and impact factor, unsolicited citations of one's scholarly work, record in obtaining competitive funding, and professional awards related to scholarly activity.

Impact of refereed publications is measured by publication in journals with higher impact factors within the faculty member's discipline and field of study or in specialized journals that, which could have lower overall impact factors, but may be the most likely outlets to reach other researchers, practitioners, or policy makers. Impact of larger refereed scholarly products (e.g., books) is measured by publication by a high impact university or trade press with assessment of the appropriateness and impact of the publication outlet by external reviewers. The significance and impact of the faculty member's research agenda is also evaluated in terms of its impact on other scholars, the professional community of practitioners, standards of professional practice, the policy environment, and the general public. For instance, research or professional consultation for federal agencies, foundations, or other research sponsors suggests expanded impact of scholarly work. The quality of the scholarship produced (i.e., scholarly rigor) is judged based on the criteria established within that disciplinary tradition. It is the expectation that impact is commensurate with rank.

Although external funding is highly valued in the COE, obtaining external funding is not a requirement for promotion and/or tenure. Successfully securing external funding usually requires a rigorous external review process in which one competes with leading scholars in a field. Such competitions may require evidence of deep understanding of a field and the ability to make connections between the theoretical and applied dimensions of a field of study. Thus, external funding is valued as one indicator of scholarly productivity and success but is not a substitute for publication of refereed articles and other large scholarly products. External funding is differentially available to scholars depending on their interests and area of scholarly activity as well as fluctuations in external funders' priorities and available resources.

Regarding performance reviews (e.g., annual reviews), faculty members achieving the performance standards described above are recognized as meeting expectations.

Does not meet expectations: A candidate who fails to meet the above described minimum expectations does not meet expectations for promotion or for tenure.

Regarding performance reviews (e.g., annual reviews), faculty members not achieving the performance standards described above are recognized as not meeting expectations.

B. Teaching

Evaluation of teaching will include available evidence from multiple sources (Student Experience Surveys, peer evaluations, and optional self-reflection) assessed, at a minimum, against the four university standards: professional, inclusive, engaged and research-informed teaching as described below.

Student Experience Surveys will be offered for all courses with five or more students, and these should be considered in the context of the response rate. Evidence will be drawn from all parts of a course for which an instructor is responsible (including labs, discussion sections, etc.).

Peer Reviews of Teaching shall be included based on the frequency defined in the CBA and described in the unit's Peer Evaluation of Teaching policy.

Instructor Reflections are optional and can be completed at the end of each quarter. Faculty can choose to include them as part of their teaching materials submitted for evaluation.

Unit-level personnel Committees, Unit Heads, College-level Personnel Committees and Deans will offer a summary evaluation of the faculty member's teaching based on the standards and criteria in the Teaching Evaluation Rubric. [The linked Teaching Evaluation Rubric \[see COE Teaching Rubric attached to this email\]](#) is organized to be consistent with the COE's pedagogical values and the four pillars of excellence as developed by the Teaching Engagement Program (TEP) and adopted in the COE policy for instruction. The rubric accounts for instruction as inclusive of both didactic instruction and clinical supervision.

. Professional Teaching

- a. Readily available, coherently organized, and high-quality course materials; syllabi that establish student workload, learning objectives, grading, and class policy expectations.
- b. Respectful and timely communication with students. Respectful teaching does not mean that the professor cannot give appropriate critical feedback.
- c. Students' activities in and out of class designed and organized to maximize student learning

i. Inclusive Teaching

- a. Instruction designed to ensure every student can participate fully and that their presence and participation are valued.
- b. The content of the course reflects the diversity of the field's practitioners, the contested and evolving status of knowledge, the value of academic questions beyond the academy and of lived experience as evidence, and/or

other efforts to help students see the relevance to themselves in the work of the course.

ii. Engaged Teaching

- a. Demonstrated reflective teaching practice, including through the regular revision of courses in content and pedagogy

iii. Research-Informed Teaching

- a. Instruction models a process or culture of inquiry characteristic of disciplinary or professional expertise.
- b. Course content includes reading and instruction that reflect the current state of research knowledge relevant to the course.
- c. Evaluation of student performance linked to explicit goals for student learning established by faculty member, unit, and, for Primary education, university; these goals and criteria for meeting them are made clear to students.
- d. Timely, useful feedback on activities and assignments, including indicating students' progress in course.
- e. Instruction engages, challenges, and supports students.

The unit-specific criteria for evaluating teaching are as follows:

Meets expectations: Consistent evidence of teaching excellence in at least 3 of the 4 categories as indicated by the data sources presented.

Does not meet expectations: Limited evidence of teaching excellence in 2 or more categories as indicated by the data sources presented.

C. Service

Service should include contributions to the department, college, university, profession, and community, as appropriate. The unit-specific criteria for service are as follows:

Does not meet expectations: The faculty member with assigned FTE for service or an approved exception for service provided limited or insufficient evidence of service, during the review period, falling below the agreed-upon expectations in either scope, alignment, or total contribution hours.

Meets expectations: The faculty member with assigned FTE for service or an approved exception for service provided evidence of service consistent with FTE and or position description, during the review period, falling below the agreed-upon expectations in either scope, alignment, or total contribution hours.

The service expectations for TTF increases as one moves up in rank. For example, leadership at the department/college/university level, in addition to substantive contributions to the field.

D. Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Contributions to the University's goals regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion should be taken into account, as appropriate, in the categories described in III. as applicable to the discipline and the specific job duties of each faculty member.

IV. REVIEW TYPES – See appendix XX for timing and rights of faculty relative to reviews

A. Annual Pre-Tenure Reviews

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review will have an annual review conducted by the department or unit head or designee. These annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate the tenure-track faculty member's performance and offer an opportunity to address problems and to support faculty members in their progress toward the mid-term and tenure reviews.

Criteria: See Primary Evaluation Criteria (III.)

B. Mid-Term Review

The mid-term review shall be an assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and should assist the faculty member's development. Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure will have a mid-term review approximately halfway between appointment and eligibility for tenure, except those appointed with a tenure review date three years or less from the time of their initial appointment (Article 16, Section 6). The timing of this review generally will be established at the time of appointment, in that this review will usually take place during the last year of the faculty member's initial contract. A successful review is one prerequisite for contract renewal.

[If your unit has an optional policy or practice of providing the faculty committee's mid-term report to the faculty member, describe the policy or practice here. If your unit does not have one, leave this blank.]

Note to faculty—the COE does not currently have a policy or practice, so the committee proposes: Department Head meets 1:1 with the faculty member to verbally share a summary of strengths and any concerns/growth areas.

C. Promotion to Associate with Tenure Review

Full review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

- **External Review**

The department or unit head will prepare a list of qualified external reviewers, with input from the department or unit faculty eligible to vote on a tenure and promotion case. The department or unit head will select a majority of the external reviewers from this independently prepared list, but the department or unit head's primary responsibility is to obtain the best judgments from the most highly qualified experts in the appropriate areas.

Concurrently, the candidate provides a list of qualified reviewers to be submitted to the department or unit head. Reviewers nominated to serve as external referees by both the department head and candidate will be from AAU institutions if at all possible. If there are not enough experts in the candidate's field to fulfill this requirement, a majority will come from AAU institutions, with the remainder being from other Research 1 (R1) universities. All external referees will be at or above the rank of that being sought (i.e., only professors can review for promotion to professor). Further, not more than one reviewer will be sought from a given institution.

Departments or units will provide external reviewers with the criteria for promotion and tenure. External reviewers may not be asked to evaluate the candidate against the standards of their own institution.

- i. **Faculty Review**

Review of a candidate's file occurs at both the department and unit (COE) levels. The eligible faculty in the candidate's department will review the file and the external reviews, and vote. In cases where there are too few eligible faculty members at or above the rank being sought within the candidate's department or unit, the department or unit head will work with the appropriate dean to establish a committee including appropriate faculty members from outside the department. A final vote will be conducted by signed ballot, which may happen electronically, and the ballots will remain confidential to the extent permitted by law.

All tenured faculty at the rank being sought or higher within the candidate's department will review and vote on a candidate's dossier at the department level. All members of the COE Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) at the rank being sought or higher will review and vote on a candidate's dossier unless the COE FPC member previously voted at the department level. COE FPC members who voted on a dossier at the department level are ineligible to vote on the same dossier at the COE FPC level. The department head does not vote as they are tasked with providing their own independent review of the file.

Following review at the department level, the COE Faculty Personnel Committee will review all elements of the dossier, prepare a report, and vote by signed ballot, which

may happen electronically, and the ballots will remain confidential to the extent permitted by law. Faculty who may have voted at the department level will be deemed ineligible to review the dossier and vote at the College level. The Dean will inform the faculty member whether the outcome of the vote was positive or not for both the department and FPC results. A de-identified vote tally, however, will be provided to the faculty member in the event of an appeal.

Criteria: See Primary Evaluation Criteria (III.)

D. Post-Tenure Reviews

Unit-level standards and criteria for post-tenure reviews should be closely aligned and entirely consistent with the criteria for promotion to Associate with Tenure (see IV.C). For full professors, the additional standards in Section IV.D.i and IV.D.ii should also be used, as modified by the unit. Furthermore, reviews must include a determination if the faculty member meets or does not meet expectations in their assigned duties. In general, an associate professor meets expectations according to unit-level standards, both consistent with the CBA and disciplinary norms at AAU institutions, in a third-year review if they are on track for a successful promotion to full professor. In general, a full professor will meet expectations in a third-year review if they are on track to meet expectations according to unit-level standards, both consistent with the CBA and disciplinary norms at AAU institutions, in their next major review.

In addition to the items ordinarily submitted in other major reviews, faculty under review must submit, if applicable, a sabbatical report, which is a report of the accomplishments and benefits resulting from sabbatical.

[If your unit has an optional policy or practice of providing the faculty committee's review report to the faculty member, describe the policy or practice here. If your unit does not have one, leave this blank.]

. Third-Year Post Tenure Review

The primary function of post-tenure review is to foster continued faculty professional growth and is not a process to reevaluate the award of tenure. Tenured faculty members at the rank of associate professor will have a third-year review in the third year following promotion and every three years thereafter. Tenured associate professors will not be required to complete a third-year review in a year when they are seeking a promotion to full professor. Following promotion, full professors will have alternating third-year reviews and major sixth-year post-tenure reviews.

Criteria: See Primary Evaluation Criteria (III.) above and CBA (Article 20, Section 39).

ii. Sixth Year Post Tenure Review

Only full professors will have sixth-year post-tenure reviews, which will be in the sixth year following promotion to full professor or six years after their previous sixth-year post-tenure review. The review period will include all work accomplished during the previous six years, taking into account any leaves and resulting clock stoppages (Article 20, Section 7).

Criteria: See Primary Evaluation Criteria above (III.) and CBA (Article 20, Section 39).

The same criteria used for promotion and tenure reviews apply for post tenure reviews.

[

E. Promotion to Full Professor

The process and timelines for review and evaluation for promotion from associate professor to professor are the same as those for promotion to associate professor and tenure, except:

- There is no requirement to initiate the promotion process to professor.
- Faculty members with tenure who are denied promotion from associate professor to professor will remain employed at the associate professor rank.
- If the review criteria have changed during the six years prior to the review, the faculty member may elect either the earlier or current set of criteria.
- The results of post-tenure reviews during the review period will be included in the promotion file.
- The review period for promotion reviews shall include all work accomplished since being awarded tenure.

Criteria: See Primary Evaluation Criteria above (III.)

The COE evaluates faculty by using evidence of the developmental progression of a faculty member's research and scholarship. The COE expects that the performance and impact of a more established faculty member is measurably different from an earlier career faculty member's scholarship in terms of productivity, rigor, and impact. The COE's expectation is that more established, tenured faculty demonstrate an increase in the quality, rigor, and impact of their scholarly work across the review period, as they progress in rank. For instance, a candidate's peer-refereed publications will demonstrate increased rigor in research methodology, include student co-authors, and demonstrate influence on public policy and/or contribute to societal benefit in measurable ways. A successful candidate's participation in professional conferences might include invited presentations and keynote addresses, suggesting increased recognition by peers of the quality, rigor, and/or impact of the faculty's scholarship on

their professional communities. Similarly, progression in research impact, and recognition at the national and/or international level should increase commensurate with rank. Progression of service to the unit should also increase commensurate with rank as faculty take on more leadership and responsibility.

APPENDIX xx

Early Review. An early tenure review may occur in particularly meritorious cases as determined by the Office of the Provost in consultation with the appropriate dean, department, or unit head, and the bargaining unit faculty member.

Notice of Meetings. A bargaining unit faculty member will receive at least three days' notice of any meeting or hearing which the member is invited or required to attend with a dean or the Provost or designee regarding recommendations or decisions on promotion or tenure. The bargaining unit faculty member may have a colleague or Union representative present at the meeting as an observer.

Waiver of Access to Materials. Bargaining unit members have the right whether to waive in advance in writing their access to see any or all of the evaluative materials (see Article 8, Personnel Files, CBA). The choice by the bargaining unit faculty member to waive or not waive access to evaluative materials shall not be considered during the evaluation process. Such waivers, however, shall not preclude the use of redacted versions of these documents in an appeal process (Article 21). The redacted versions are intended to protect the identity of the reviewers, who are informed about the faculty member's waiver choice.

Stopping of the "Tenure, Promotion, and Review Clock." The "tenure, promotion, and review clock" shall be stopped for one year in the following circumstances, unless the bargaining unit faculty member specifies otherwise: upon the birth or adoption of a child; due to a leave of absence or intermittent leave with a duration of twelve weeks or longer as a result of an ADA or FMLA qualifying event. No more than two extensions may be granted under this subsection between any clocked review (i.e., between successive PTRs).

The review clock may also be stopped in other extraordinary circumstances, including up to two years for approved leaves of absence without pay lasting two or more terms during each year of the approved leave, as approved by the Office of the Provost.

If the faculty member opts to restore the period when the clock was stopped, they may apply for review at the time they would have become eligible without the stopping of the clock. Leaves not resulting in a clock stoppage will be considered as a part of review periods. This applies to mid-term, tenure, and promotion reviews, as well as third-year and sixth-year post-tenure reviews.

Policy Guidance

This guidance should be used only to draft your unit’s policy document, and not as an appendix to your policy. It will be removed during the review process. This and additional resources can be found on <https://provost.uoregon.edu/cba-changes-and-resources>.

SECTION 1: SUMMARY OF REVIEW TYPES

Review Type	Cycle/Timing	Main Evidence	Decision Authority	CBA Reference
<i>Annual Pre-Tenure</i>	Each year prior to tenure	CV, annual report	Dean	Art. 20 § 10
<i>Mid-Term</i>	Typically year 3	Full dossier	Provost	Art. 20 § 11–17
<i>Tenure & Promotion</i>	Year 6 (typical)	Full dossier + external reviews	Provost	Art. 20 § 18–28
<i>Third-Year PTR</i>	3 years after tenure	CV + faculty candidate report	Dean	Art. 20 § 30–31, 39
<i>Sixth-Year PTR</i>	6 years after tenure or prior PTR	Comprehensive file	Provost	Art. 20 § 30, 32–39
<i>Promotion to Full</i>	6+ years after tenure (typical)	Dossier + evidence of leadership	Provost	Art. 20 § 29

SECTION 2: RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, CREATIVE, AND ARTISTIC ACHIEVEMENTS

In general, research, scholarship, and creative achievement may be demonstrated in the following categories. Units may insert additional categories or amend the existing categories as long as the changes they propose are consistent with the general standards; they should delete categories that are not applicable to their discipline or interdisciplinary area; they should create hierarchy or tiers of relative importance (e.g., publications more important than participation in conferences):

1. publications and/or creative activities of significance;
2. externally funded research;
3. patents, intellectual property developed; technologies licensed, companies spun off;
4. adoptions of candidate’s research innovations by other researchers, organizations, or the public;
5. research awards and prizes;
6. membership in the national academies or other selective research societies;

7. Research-in-progress and substantially planned work (including grant proposals) in accordance with departmental policy;
8. translational research or scholarship that influences public policy or contributes to societal benefits; units may add a category that explicitly identifies and sets out criteria for evaluating public-facing scholarship, as applicable.
9. participation in conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings;
10. professional peer review, holding office in academic and professional organizations, serving on committees and/or on editorial boards;
11. association with organizations and groups that will result in professional improvement of the faculty member and bring recognition to the university;
12. research or professional consultation for federal agencies, foundations, or other research sponsors;
13. recognized evidence of scholarly and professional visibility, such as special awards, scholarly citations, and the republication of work;
14. scope and depth of scholarship as revealed in public lectures, book reviews, and, in special circumstances, discussions;
15. works of art, such as painting, sculpture, design, planning, musical composition, poetry, fiction, drama, dance, photography, and film disseminated or exhibited in recognized venues of quality and distinction;
16. public performances: musical recitals, concerts, conducting, theater performance and production, dance performance and production, radio or television production disseminated/exhibited in recognized venues of quality and distinction;
17. public recognition: exhibitions, commissions, acceptance of work for permanent collections, awards.

SECTION 3: SERVICE

Service must include some of the following Units may insert additional categories or amend the existing categories as long as they are consistent with the general standards below; they should not delete categories unless the category is not applicable to their discipline or interdisciplinary area; they should create hierarchy or tiers of relative importance (e.g., unit-level service more important than service to professional and disciplinary organizations).

- a. Leadership in academic and administrative roles:
 - Academic program area or departmental administration and curriculum;
 - Personnel and policy committees or activities;
 - College or school administration and committees or activities;
 - University or state system administration and committees or activities.
- b. Service and activities on behalf of the larger community (local, state, national, and international governmental bodies, NGOs, etc.);
- c. Academic contributions to community activities, either as an individual or as a representative of the university;
- d. Service to professional and disciplinary organizations;
- e. Academic service on behalf of the public interest.