I. Introduction

Undergraduate education, graduate education, scholarship, and service represent the core missions of the Department of Mathematics at The University of Southern Mississippi. The Department strives to (1) provide high quality undergraduate and graduate education that prepares students to pursue professional degrees and/or to enter the workforce with skills necessary for life-long professional achievement, (2) advance the body of mathematical knowledge through the scholarship of discovery, integration, and application, and (3) offer technical and educational expertise through formal and informal outreach locally, regionally, nationally and internationally.

The Department of Mathematics expects its faculty members to contribute to its missions by fostering the intellectual growth of students through effective teaching and mentoring, and by advancing knowledge through productive research and scholarly activities. The Department also expects its faculty to render professional service to the University, the mathematics profession, and the general public. Service activities, whether compensated or not, that draw upon the faculty member’s professional expertise and relate to the teaching, research, and service missions the Department and the University are typically considered components of a faculty member’s workload. Activities in which faculty engage as citizens that do not involve their professional expertise (e.g., activities centered on the family, neighborhood, church, political party, community or social action group) are commendable, but are generally not components of the workload of a member of the faculty.

In evaluating faculty performance, the Department expects demonstrated achievement in all three areas of teaching, research, and service while recognizing that generally the first two categories weigh heavier as central criteria for tenure and promotion in rank. Demonstrated productivity in teaching, research, and service are expectations of all mathematics faculty members, although the level of productivity in the particular areas will vary depending on specific assigned responsibilities of faculty over extended periods of time. For example, the primary emphasis of the Department on the Gulf Coast campus is undergraduate education, including provision for undergraduate research. Consequently, evaluation of faculty on the Gulf Coast campus may be more weighted toward teaching excellence. However, no matter to which site a faculty member may be assigned, he or she is expected to demonstrate accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation (that is, there can be no voids).

II. Criteria for Appointment to Faculty Rank (normal expectations)

A. Those seeking promotion to the title of Professors are normally expected:

- To hold the doctorate or other terminal degree appropriate to mathematics instruction, research, and professional service
- To be accomplished teachers
- To have achieved a nationally recognized professional record of scholarship
To have participated significantly in the professional work of the discipline, in ways other than teaching and research
To have demonstrated clearly that they can work well with colleagues and students
To have normally served as an associate professor for at least five years
To have sought external funding on a regular basis

B. Those seeking promotion to the title of Associate Professors are normally expected:

To hold the doctorate or other terminal degree appropriate to mathematics instruction, research, and professional service
To be good teachers
To have produced a recognized professional record of scholarship
To have participated in the professional work of the discipline, in ways other than teaching and research
To have sought external funding on a regular basis
To have demonstrated clearly that they can work well with colleagues and students
To have normally served as an assistant professor for at least five years

C. Assistant Professors are normally expected:

To hold the doctorate or other terminal degree appropriate to mathematics instruction, research, and professional service
To show promise as teachers and scholars
To have begun to develop a program of research and scholarship (i.e., a program that generates scholarly activity, has the potential to provide opportunities for undergraduate and graduate student research, and lays a foundation for seeking extramural funding).
To show evidence that they can work well with colleagues and students

D. Instructors are normally expected:

To hold the Master's degree
To show a demonstrated ability in good teaching
To show a clear interest in professional development
To show evidence that they can work well with colleagues and students

In all of these ranks, concerned and effective student advisement and responsible service to the University are understood to be part of the normal task of a faculty member as is a collegial working relationship with colleagues and students.

III. Performance Assessment Criteria

A. Annual Performance Evaluation

1. Faculty members are expected to contribute to the missions of the Department in the three areas of teaching, research, and service, while recognizing that teaching and research generally weigh more heavily as criteria for tenure and promotion in rank.
2. Faculty members are evaluated annually and for promotion and tenure on a one to five scale [one (unsatisfactory); two (needs improvement); three (satisfactory); four (good); and five (excellent)] in the three areas of teaching, research and service. The evaluations in each category are weighted according to annual assigned responsibilities and on composite weightings for promotion and tenure evaluations. “Normal” weightings by categories for most tenure track faculty would be approximated by the following assigned weights: teaching, 40% - 60%; research, 30% to 50%; and service, 10% to 30%.

B. Requirements for Tenure

1. Criteria for tenure normally will be very similar to those required for promotion in rank to Associate Professor.

2. The Department will formally evaluate progress toward tenure through the pre-tenure review process, a cumulative review that generally occurs during the third year of University employment as a full-time, tenure-track faculty member. The tenure review normally occurs in the sixth year of a faculty member’s appointment.

3. All department tenure procedures including criteria are aligned with those of the University (See the University’s Faculty Handbook) and the College of Science and Technology (See the College of Science and Technology’s By-Laws, Appendix I, Tenure and Promotion Policies). Web addresses for accessing these documents are given in Section V of this document.

C. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

1. Selected Teaching Criteria (examples of contributions in teaching)
   - Participation in undergraduate and graduate course offerings
   - Development of undergraduate and graduate courses in area of expertise
   - Supervision of graduate and undergraduate research
   - Evaluation of quality teaching
     - a. Average scores of student evaluations and student comments
     - b. Self-Assessment including course portfolios
     - c. Letters from former students, both undergraduate and graduate
     - d. Outcomes from student-oriented scholarship, including publication and presentations
     - e. Post-graduate achievement/placement of graduate students

2. Research/Scholarship (examples of research/scholarship)
   - Dissemination of scholarly activity
     - a. Publication in peer-reviewed, national/international books, journals, proceedings, monographs, etc. A minimum of five refereed journal papers in the five years immediately preceding the evaluation would generally constitute persuasive evidence of publication. However, quality and length are important factors.
     - b. Presentations at national/international meetings/conferences/workshops
     - c. A published book of sufficient scholarly merit is a plus.
   - Extramural funding
a. Submission of proposals to external funding agencies as PI or Co-PI is essential.
b. Receipt of external funding is desirable.

3. Service (examples of service contributions)

- Institutional: Service on department, college and/or university committees.
- Community service/outreach
  a. Professionally based assistance to organizations such as schools, business/industry
  b. Presentations to lay audiences
- Participation in programs to advance mathematics education
- Professional discipline
  a. Participation in state, regional, national, international societies/organizations in area of expertise
  b. Review of journal articles and research proposals

4. Advisement

- Familiar with university, college and departmental requirements
- Assist undergraduate and graduate students in preparing class schedules and advising students on career goals and opportunities
- Writing letters of recommendation on behalf of students

5. Collegiality: Collegiality among faculty is essential for the effective operation of the Department. Hence, colleagues must be able to interact with faculty and students in a constructive and professional manner.

- Share committee assignments
- Participate in departmental and university functions
- Provide advice in areas of research and teaching to faculty and students
- Collaborate with colleagues within/without the Department when appropriate

D. Promotion to Professor with Tenure

1. Teaching (examples of contributions in teaching)

- Participation in undergraduate and graduate Course offerings
- Development of undergraduate and graduate courses in area of expertise
- Supervision of graduate and undergraduate research
- Graduation/placement of MS and PhD students
- Evaluation of quality teaching
  a. Average scores of student evaluations and student comments.
  b. Self-assessment including a teaching portfolio
  c. Letters from former students, both undergraduate and graduate
  d. Outcomes from student-sponsored research, including publication and presentations
  e. Post-graduate achievement including placement of graduate students
2. Research/Scholarship (examples of research/scholarship)

- Dissemination of scholarly activity
  a. Publication in peer-reviewed, national/international books, journals, proceedings, monographs, etc. A minimum of five refereed journal papers in the five years immediately preceding the evaluation would often be persuasive evidence of publication. However, quality and length are important factors.
  b. Sustained pattern of presentations at national/international meetings/conferences/workshops
- Attempted establishment of externally funded research program is required
  a. Pattern of submission of proposals to funding agencies as PI or Co-PI
  b. Success in attaining external funding is desirable
- Achievement of nationally recognized scholarly record
  a. Evidence that research has made an impact on the field and influenced the thinking of others in the field
  b. Peer evaluation (See Section III.D.6 below) by nationally recognized leaders in their respective fields
- Mentoring junior faculty

3. Service (examples of service contributions)

- Institutional: Accept leadership roles on department, college and/or university committees
- Community service/outreach
  a. Professionally based assistance to individuals, schools, business/industry; presentations to lay audiences
  b. Participation in programs to advance mathematics education
- Professional discipline: Leadership role in state, regional, national, and/or international societies/organizations in area of expertise
- Review of journal articles and research proposals
- Participation on review panels for funding agencies

4. Advisement

- Familiar with university, college and departmental requirements
- Assist undergraduate and graduate students in preparing class schedules and advising students on career goals and opportunities
- Writing letters of recommendation on behalf of students

5. Collegiality: Collegiality among faculty is essential for the effective operation of the Department. Colleagues must be able to interact with faculty and students in a constructive and professional manner.

- Sharing committee assignments
- Participation in departmental and university functions
- Providing advice in areas of research and teaching to faculty and students
- Collaborate with colleagues within/without the Department when appropriate
6. External Evaluation

- At least three letters of evaluation that address the quality of a candidate’s published research and possibly other categories of evaluation as well are required as a part of the dossier for promotion to professor. The process for selecting external evaluators is addressed later under the “Policy and Procedures” portion of this document.

It is assumed a candidate for promotion and tenure demonstrates sufficient quality in the activities he or she offers in support of promotion in rank and tenure. Frequency of activity is often important (such as frequency of publication), but establishing sufficient quality is paramount.

E. Emeritus Designation

The emeritus designation is awarded to faculty members who have served The University of Southern Mississippi with distinction for an extended time. The status recognizes faculty who have excelled in the areas of teaching, research, and service throughout their careers at the University. Normally, faculty members who desire to remain active in their profession and contribute to the University during their retirement request emeritus status. For eligibility requirements and procedures for emeritus designation, see the Faculty Handbook Section 3.7.

IV. Policy and Procedures

A. Annual Performance Review: (See Faculty Handbook Section 8.4.)

1. Evaluation of calendar year performance is conducted annually between January 15 and March 15 of the year following the period under review.

2. Employees on sabbatical leave must be evaluated for the semester within the period of evaluation, if any, that they were regularly employed (i.e., not on sabbatical leave) and/or for the semester or semesters they were on sabbatical leave, the latter evaluation being based on the degree to which they accomplished the goals set forth in their approved application for sabbatical leave.

3. Employees on educational or professional leave must be evaluated on the basis of the degree to which they accomplished goals set forth in their application for leave.

4. On or before January 15, faculty members submit their Annual Report of Faculty Scholarly Activities (see Appendix A) to departmental Personnel Authority. Faculty members include in their report how their activities during the year under review met their goals and objectives.

5. Annual evaluation conferences are held between January 15 and March 1 to ascertain and discuss professional accomplishments during the period of evaluation and to discuss and establish goals and objectives to be pursued during the next period of evaluation. See Appendix B for basis for annual evaluation.
6. Annual Evaluation Report: The departmental Personnel Authority prepares a written report summarizing the essential content and result of the evaluation, including recommendations arising from the evaluation of performance. See Appendix C.

7. Duties of the Departmental Chair: (See Faculty Handbook Sections 8.4.2.c and 8.4.6.)
   a) Review the Pre-Tenure Reviews and Annual Performance Review Reports of the Departmental Personnel Committee, reconvening committees in the event of substantive or procedural discrepancies.
   b) Prepare independent written recommendations either concurring or disagreeing with the Pre-Tenure Reviews and Annual Performance Review Reports.
   c) Submit reports to the college dean by March 15.
   d) File copies of both reports in departmental personnel files. Concurrently, department chairs shall submit copies of the Pre-Tenure Reviews, Annual Performance Review Reports, and Faculty Development Plans to evaluated parties.
   e) The departmental Chair must evaluate the faculty serving on the personnel committee.

8. Departmental evaluation reports are forwarded to the Dean on or before the date specified by the University's Academic Calendar.

9. When funds are provided for merit pay increases, the departmental Chair assigns amounts of increases according to merit group classification. The departmental Chair submits departmental recommendations to the Dean of the College of Science and Technology.

B. Promotion (See Faculty Handbook Sections 9.4 and 9.5.)

1. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor should declare their intention during the spring semester before the formal application is submitted and provide any credentials needed for evaluation by at least three external referees deemed qualified by the Promotion Committee (i.e., nationally recognized leaders in their respective fields). The candidate may assist the Committee in their selection of external referees by suggesting a list of potential referees. The Chair of the Promotion committee solicits and receives letters from external referees selected by the Committee (see Appendix D).

2. Eligible candidates for promotion prepare and submit a promotion dossier to the departmental Chair on or before date specific in the College's annual Academic Calendar. Instructions for preparation of the dossier may be found at http://www.usm.edu/provost/forms.htm. Faculty being reviewed may supplement their dossiers with additional relevant information, including a response to negative recommendations, at any level of the promotion process.

3. The departmental Chair convenes the departmental Promotion Committee, provides the committee with the promotion dossier, pre-tenure review reports, tenure review reports
and annual evaluation reports of the candidate, and sits as a nonvoting ex officio member. The Committee, chaired by a member elected by a simple majority vote of other members, conducts the review and votes to recommend or decline to recommend promotion. The result of this vote is recorded on the Promotion Recommendation Form that is submitted to the departmental Chair. This form may be obtained at http://www.usm.edu/provost/forms.htm.

4. In addition, the chair of the Promotion Committee prepares and submits to the departmental Chair a written document, signed by the committee members, that records the vote and recommendation of the Committee along with a narrative detailing the rationale for the recommendation.

5. The departmental Chair reviews the written report of the Promotion Committee and prepares an independent report either concurring or disagreeing with the recommendation of the Promotion Committee.

6. Copies of the Committee’s report and the Chair’s report are placed in the candidate’s personnel file and also submitted to the candidate. Then the Promotion Recommendation Form, the Committee’s report and the Chair’s report are added to the appropriate sections of the dossier and forwarded to the Dean.

C. Tenure (See Faculty Handbook Sections 9.6 and 9.7.)

1. Pre-tenure Review Proceedings

   a) Formal Pre-tenure Review of progress toward tenure is normally conducted during the third year of University employment as a full-time, tenure track faculty member. Credit for prior service may be included in determining years of service provided that credit for this service was negotiated and included at the time of the appointment.

   b) The review is normally conducted in conjunction with annual review.

   c) Faculty to be reviewed submit a pre-tenure review dossier to the departmental Chair on or before date specific in the College's annual Academic Calendar. Instructions for preparation of the dossier may be found at http://www.usm.edu/provost/forms.htm. Faculty being reviewed may supplement their dossiers with additional relevant information, including a response to negative recommendations, at any level of the pre-tenure review process.

   d) The departmental Chair convenes the departmental Tenure Committee, provides the committee with the pre-tenure review dossier and annual evaluation reports of the candidate, and sits as a nonvoting ex officio member. The Committee, chaired by a member elected by a simple majority vote of other members, conducts the review and votes to recommend or decline to recommend renewal. The result of this vote is recorded on the Recommendation Form for Third-Year Review that is submitted to the departmental Chair. This form may be obtained at http://www.usm.edu/provost/forms.htm.
e) In addition, the chair of the Tenure Committee prepares and submits to the departmental Chair a written document, signed by the committee members, that records the vote and recommendation of the Committee along with a narrative detailing the rationale for the recommendation.

f) The departmental Chair reviews the written report of the Tenure Committee and, if tenured, prepares an independent pre-tenure review report either concurring or disagreeing with the report of the Tenure Committee.

g) Copies of the Committee’s report and the Chair’s report, if applicable, are placed in the candidate’s personnel file and also submitted to the candidate. Then the Third-Year Review Recommendation Form, the Committee’s report and the Chair’s report, if applicable, are added to the appropriate sections of the dossier and forwarded to the Dean.

2. Tenure Proceedings

a) Eligible candidates for tenure prepare and submit a tenure dossier to the departmental Chair no later than the last day of the first full week of the fall semester. Instructions for preparation of the dossier may be found at [http://www.usm.edu/provost/forms.htm](http://www.usm.edu/provost/forms.htm). Faculty being reviewed may supplement their dossiers with additional relevant information, including a response to negative recommendations, at any level of the tenure review process.

b) The departmental Chair convenes the departmental Tenure Committee, provides the committee with the tenure dossier, pre-tenure review reports and annual evaluation reports of the candidate, and sits as a nonvoting ex officio member. The Committee, chaired by a member elected by a simple majority vote of other members, conducts the review and votes to recommend or decline to recommend tenure. The result of this vote is recorded on the Tenure Recommendation Form that is submitted to the departmental Chair. This form may be obtained at [http://www.usm.edu/provost/forms.htm](http://www.usm.edu/provost/forms.htm).

c) In addition, the chair of the Tenure Committee prepares and submits to the departmental Chair a written document, signed by the committee members, that records the vote and recommendation of the Committee along with a narrative detailing the rationale for the recommendation.

d) The departmental Chair reviews the written report of the Tenure Committee and, if tenured, prepares an independent report either concurring or disagreeing with the recommendation of the Tenure Committee.

e) Copies of the Committee’s report and the Chair’s report, if applicable, are placed in the candidate’s personnel file and also submitted to the candidate. Then the Tenure Recommendation Form, the Committee’s report and the Chair’s report, if applicable, are added to the appropriate sections of the dossier and forwarded to the Dean.
V. Miscellaneous Information

A. Important Document Locations

1. The University of Southern Mississippi Faculty Handbook:
   http://www.usm.edu/provost/Faculty_Handbook_revised_07.pdf

2. Tenure and Promotion Related Forms (Word and pdf formats):
   http://www.usm.edu/provost/forms.htm
   This page will provide access to the following forms.
   
   Format for Tenure and Promotion Dossiers
   Third Year (Pre-Tenure) Review Form
   Instruction Sheet for Promotion Recommendation Form
   Promotion Recommendation Form
   Instruction Sheet for Tenure Recommendation Form
   Tenure Recommendation Form

3. The College of Science and Technology By-Laws:
   http://www.usm.edu/cost/cost_bylaws_070104.doc
Appendix A

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

Faculty Annual Activities Report

January 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007

_________________________

Name

TEACHING

I Courses Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPRING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II Improvements And Innovations In Teaching

(You may attach student evaluations or other data that address the quality and the effectiveness of your teaching.)

III High School And Undergraduate Research/Special Problems/ Student Projects Directed

(Include name of the student and brief description of problem and/or title.)

A. High School
Appendix A

B. Undergraduate

IV Graduate Students Directed
A. Graduate research/special problems directed (Include name of student and brief description of problem and/or title):
B. Masters theses directed (List author, title, date):
C. Dissertations directed (List author, title, date):

V Other Teaching Activities
(Coordinator for student teachers, service on special panels or commission on teaching, etc.)

SCHOLARSHIP

I Books
A. Books
B. Chapters in Books
C. Monographs or Guides

II Refereed Journal Articles
A. International Journals
B. National Journals
C. Regional or State Journals

III Unrefereed Journal Articles
A. International Journals
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B. National Journals

C. Regional or State Journals

IV Other Publications

A. Abstracts

B. Preprints

C. Non-Print Media

V Presentations

A. Professional Audience, International or National

B. Professional Audience, Regional or State

C. Professional Audience, Local

D. Lay Audience, Academic Subject

VI Book Or Software Reviews

A. Refereed

B. Unrefereed

VII Patents

SERVICE
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I Professional

A. Officer in Organization
   1. International
   2. National
   3. Regional or State

B. Member of Committee
   1. International
   2. National
   3. Regional or State

C. Article Reviews
   1. National
   2. Regional or State

D. Journal Referee Reports

E. Prepublication Reviews

F. Workshop or Seminar
   1. Official Organizer (International/National or Regional/State)
   2. Workshop or Seminar
      a. Chair
      b. Panel Member

G. Accreditation Team
   1. Chair
   2. Member

H. Grant Proposal Reviews
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I. Miscellaneous

II University

A. University-wide Committee
   1. Elective
   2. Appointive

B. College-wide Committee
   1. Elective
   2. Appointive

C. Academic Advisor to Student Group

D. Departmental Committees/ Program Coordinators

E. Teaching
   1. Students actually advised
      Semester       Number Advised
      Spring         
      Summer         
      Fall           

   2. Graduate Committees
      a. Master’s committee chair for (List names):
      b. Master’s committee member for (List names):
      c. Ph.D. committee chair for (List names):
      d. Ph.D. committee member for (List names):

   3. Miscellaneous Teaching Related Service
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III Community

A. City-wide Committee

B. Community-wide Committee

GRANTS

I Proposals Submitted

II Proposals Funded By External Agency

III Proposals Funded By Internal Agency, But External To Department

IV Publication Of Final Document

V University/Industry/Government Agency Cooperative Efforts, Consulting
   Arrangements, etc.

GOALS

Teaching:

Research:

Service:
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# Appendix B

Department of Mathematics: Examples of Responsibilities for Faculty Upon Which Annual Evaluations Will Be Based

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mathematics: Possible Examples Contributing to a Faculty Member’s Annual Evaluation</th>
<th>Role in annual workload</th>
<th>Semester Time Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Percentage of a semester load</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Number of courses taught during the evaluation period</td>
<td>Essential in determining percentage of workload</td>
<td>Three 3 hour classes (up to 60% of load)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Large enrollment classes (50 or more students?)</td>
<td>A factor in percentage of workload</td>
<td>Two large enrollment classes (up to 50% of load)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Graduate courses taught</td>
<td>Generally more preparation time</td>
<td>One graduate class, one undergraduate class (up to 50% of load)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) New course development</td>
<td>Generally more start up time involved.</td>
<td>One of two classes (up to 50% of load)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Number of graduate student’s supervised</td>
<td>Time commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Number of undergraduate students supervised in special projects such as undergraduate research</td>
<td>Time commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Number of undergraduate advisees</td>
<td>Time commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Number of instructionally related proposals written for external funding</td>
<td>Percentage of time committed to grant writing</td>
<td>Development of a major grant (50k-100k or more) (15% to 25% of load)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Number of instructionally related proposals funded by external agencies</td>
<td>Qualitative factor plus time required to effect the terms of the grant</td>
<td>In accordance with the terms of the grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Student evaluations of teaching</td>
<td>Qualitative factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) College and University teaching awards</td>
<td>Qualitative factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Other teaching factors (either as a factor in assigned load or qualitative evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching load as a percentage of workload</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Normally 10% per course taught but could be more depending on the number and type of course or other teaching related duties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH</th>
<th>Role in annual workload</th>
<th>Percentage of a semester load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research grant awarded</td>
<td>Qualitative factor plus time required to effect the terms of the grant</td>
<td>Time required to effect the terms of the grant negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Research and preparation to submit a publication to a refereed journal with stature</td>
<td>Time for research and submission should be negotiated each semester.</td>
<td>Assigned time for research and writing (up to 40%) with understood expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accepted publication in an appropriate refereed journal</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Un-refereed publication</td>
<td>Assigned or completed for a specific purpose?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Published abstract</td>
<td>Lead in for professional presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Preparation and publication of an appropriate book</td>
<td>Time devoted to project determined by semester</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Books edited</td>
<td>Time devoted to project determined by semester</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Writing and publishing of a book chapter</td>
<td>Time devoted to project determined by semester</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Technical report prepared and published</td>
<td>Time devoted to project determined by semester</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Time to prepare a major research proposal (50k-100k?)</td>
<td>Time devoted to project determined by semester</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Funded research proposal</td>
<td>Qualitative factor plus time required to effect the terms of the grant</td>
<td>In accordance with the terms of the grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. National or international presentation</td>
<td>Time devoted to project determined by semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. State level presentation</td>
<td>Time devoted to project determined by semester</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Invited presentation at another university</td>
<td>Time away for the presentation</td>
<td>Time away for the presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Regular on campus research seminar</td>
<td>May substitute for part of the teaching assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Miscellaneous assigned and/or accepted research activities</td>
<td>Time devoted to project determined by semester</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research load as a percentage of semester workload: Up to 30% to 50% with active program involving assigned and understood research activities and expected outcomes.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>Role in annual workload</th>
<th>Percentage of a semester load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Administrative service (e.g., &quot;Director of...&quot;)</td>
<td>Specifically assigned and understood administrative duties</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) University/College Committee Chair</td>
<td>Depends of type of committee</td>
<td>15% to 20% (e.g., Faculty Senate, Academic Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Departmental committee chair</td>
<td>Depends on type of committee</td>
<td>Up to 20% in combination with other departmental service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) University/College committee member</td>
<td>Depends on type of committee</td>
<td>10% to 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Departmental committee member</td>
<td>Depends on type of committee</td>
<td>Up to 20% in combination with other departmental service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) National committee chair</td>
<td>Depends on type of committee</td>
<td>15% to 20% if the assignment is extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) National committee member</td>
<td>Depends on type of committee</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Chair at a session at a national or international meeting</td>
<td>Travel time and time away</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Chair of a session at state/regional meeting</td>
<td>Travel time and time away</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Officer of a professional organization</td>
<td>Depends on responsibilities</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Journal editor</td>
<td>Depends on journal and responsibilities</td>
<td>Could be 15% to 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Off campus grant review panel</td>
<td>Preparation time and time away</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Referee papers and proposals</td>
<td>Part of standard assigned time for service/research</td>
<td>Included in typical 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Student organization advisor</td>
<td>Depends on time needed</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair as part of overall service assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Member graduate student committee</td>
<td>Depends on the number</td>
<td>Normally part of normal service and research load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Presentation to lay audience</td>
<td>Normally just incorporated in to service load</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Recruiting activities</td>
<td>Depends on time needed (such as visits to schools)</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instructional workshop (≥ 1 day)</th>
<th>Time away from regular duties</th>
<th>Others generally responsible for covering regularly assigned duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community activities</td>
<td>Generally on personal time</td>
<td>Not generally assigned specific service time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Miscellaneous activities</td>
<td>Depends on activities</td>
<td>Negotiated with chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Service load as a percentage of semester workload | Typically 20% |

| TEACHING+RESEARCH +SERVICE TOTAL | Loads in each category will depend on a semester-by-semester understandings with the chair. Typical load would by 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. However, typical ranges for assigned responsibilities for a give semester would be 30%-60% for teaching, 20% to 50% for research, and 20% for service |
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REPORT OF ANNUAL EVALUATION
For Calendar Year 2007

Faculty member:     Unit:
Rank:               Tenured:
Years in service at USM:  Total years full time teaching experience:

| Excellent/far exceeds expectations: 5 | | |
| Good/exceeds expectations: 4 | | |
| Satisfactory/meets expectations: 3 | | |
| Needs improvement: 2 | | |
| Unsatisfactory/far below expectations: 1 | | |

PERCENTAGE OF EFFORT

NARRATIVE REPORT OF RESULTS OF ANNUAL EVALUATION

Teaching:

Research:

Service:
2008 OBJECTIVES

Teaching:

Research:

Service:

EVALUATORS

SIGNATURES

________________________________________  ____________________
Director/chair                               Date

________________________________________  ____________________
Dean                                         Date

I have received a copy of the evaluation report.

________________________________________  ____________________
Faculty Member                               Date

ORIGINAL:    DEAN
COPY:        DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL FILE
             FACULTY MEMBER
Dear XXX:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for FACULTY MEMBER, who is a candidate for promotion to the academic rank of Professor in the Department of Mathematics at the University of Southern Mississippi. The Department of Mathematics offers through the College of Science and Technology the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Computational Science with an emphasis in Applied and Computational Mathematics. More information is available if you would take a minute to visit the Department's web site: http://www.usm.edu/math/

On behalf of the Department's Promotion Committee, I enclose the candidate's curriculum vitae, publications representative of the candidate's scholarship, the candidate's synopsis of contribution in the areas of teaching, research and service, and a copy of the tenure and promotion guidelines of the College of Science & Technology, which should help to guide your evaluation. Tenure-track faculty in Mathematics are expected to contribute to our instructional programs while developing an active research program that includes opportunities for undergraduate and/or graduate education. Our evaluation of the candidate's research record includes consideration of both the pace of publication and the quality of the published work. We expect those promoted to the rank of Professor to have established a national reputation in his/her field of study. With respect to extramural funding, we consider both the effort and success at obtaining funding for research.

We are especially interested in your assessment of the following:

1. Candidate's professional competency.
2. Quality and significance of the candidate's professional publications/performances.
3. Candidate's reputation and relative standing in the discipline.
4. Candidate's service to the profession.

I encourage you to send your letter of evaluation via e-mail (see below) to be followed by a hard copy on your institutional letterhead addressed to the Chair of the Promotion Committee, The University of Southern Mississippi, Department of Mathematics, 118 College Drive #5045, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001. A response by XXX DATE XXX, if not sooner, would be very helpful. Please be advised that your letter may be subject to examination by the candidate in the event of University or Institute of Higher Learning appeal unless the candidate has waived his or her right to view the document. Otherwise, your reply is kept in strict confidence.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions, and thank you once again for your assistance in this important process.

Sincerely,
Appendix D

C. S. Chen  
Professor & Chair  

Enclosures  

Phone: 601-266-4289  
FAX: 601-266-5818  
E-mail: cs.chen@usm.edu