



THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

TO: Rodney D. Bennett, President

FROM: Steven R. Moser, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

DATE: January 24, 2019

SUBJECT: Initiative #1: Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance

As reported and verified by Academic Reorganization Implementation Committee (ARIC) chair, Jeffrey Wiggins, this initiative has been revised through broad engagement, communication, and feedback from stakeholders, administrators and governing bodies since your initial approval of the proposal framework in February of 2018. Academic Structure and Evaluation Committee (ASEC) and ARIC have collated, discussed, reviewed and modified the document to achieve compromise between stakeholder responses while preserving the aspirational merits of the Phase I proposals.

The aspirational aims of this initiative are to afford unrestrained opportunities for professional development of faculty members, promote interdisciplinary activities among academic units, effectively harness faculty strengths to ensure student success, maximize impact of scholarly efforts from local to global communities, and efficiently respond to dynamic changes affecting the institutional mission and associated endeavors of its faculty. This initiative was submitted to Human Resources (HR) and General Counsel for a full review.

As Provost, I have engaged Deans and Council of Directors in a final review process and adjustments were made to the proposal based on that feedback and my input. The document is ready for your approval.

I recommend that the Initiative on Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance be approved.

Steven R. Moser, Provost
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Approval:

Rodney D. Bennett, President
The University of Southern Mississippi

1-25-19

Date

Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance

**INITIATIVE #1
Academic Structure and Evaluation**

January 17, 2019

Chair: Jacob Breland

Committee Members: Jonathan Barron, Sam Bruton, Angie Burton, Bridget Hayden, Frank Heitmuller, Joshua Hill, Ann Marie Kinnell, Alisa Lowery, Derek Patton, Bernd Schroder, Lachel Story

1.1 Introduction and Rationale

Annual evaluations of work performance are mandatory for members of the Corps of Instruction and all instructors of record at the University. The evaluation framework serves to ensure effectiveness in teaching, research/creative activities, and service by providing a common structure for annual evaluations. This structure includes the allocation of workload and periodic opportunities for professional development. Additionally, annual evaluations inform decisions for tenure, promotion, and merit-based salary adjustments.

The annual evaluation framework described here is oriented toward proactive engagement between faculty members and their peers and supervisors. The process is aimed at maximizing potential and supporting the University mission. Furthermore, the annual evaluation framework offers an ideal opportunity for reorganized academic units to encourage interdisciplinary linkages among faculty that will serve to engage our students, strengthen the University's reputation as a research institution, and provide service to the State of Mississippi, the Gulf South region, and beyond.

Flexibility, clarity, transparency, efficiency, and fairness are key attributes of the evaluation framework. Schools are largely responsible for developing work performance criteria/expectations, which are to be coordinated within the college structure, clearly articulated in writing, and made readily available to faculty and administration.

In all instances, work performance criteria are designed to *promote achievement* in teaching, research/creative activities, and service. The three-tier evaluation system provided here is intended to be both efficient and effective and it is based on meeting expectations established by academic units. Schools are responsible for designating faculty workload allocation percentages that align with guidelines suggested below where flexibility exists for adjustments as necessary. Processes are defined to stimulate feedback among faculty, school directors, and college deans to realize maximum potential, effectively allocate resources, and fairly arbitrate appeals made by faculty members.

1.2 General Evaluation Framework

The annual evaluation framework serves as the primary mechanism for communication of annual objectives and allocation of resources available for faculty members to attain professional goals and to progress toward promotion and tenure.

The framework includes the following: guidelines for workload allocation of faculty members; policies for evaluation committees; eligibility criteria for evaluation committee membership; faculty governance options; administration of annual evaluations; examples of criteria for evaluating faculty; appeal procedures; considerations for evaluating online instruction and faculty with interdisciplinary appointments; post-tenure review; and evaluations of administrators.

1.3 Workload Allocation

Annual evaluations of faculty performance are inherently tied to types and proportions of work activities throughout a given year. As a dynamic and responsive institution, The University of Southern Mississippi acknowledges that faculty workload allocation is a mechanism through which opportunities are seized, talent is strategically appropriated and maximized, professional achievements are appreciated, and meaningful impacts are realized. In this spirit, allocation of workload should not be static but should balance both the needs of a program and/or school and the professional goals of the faculty member; while maintaining the standards set forth by the School, College, and IHL. Therefore, in addition to a discussion of goals for research/creative activities, teaching, and service, the annual evaluation process should include a discussion of workload allocation for the upcoming year regarding teaching, research/creative activities, and service for all members of the Corps of Instruction. Workload should be clearly defined to promote transparency in allocation decisions and expectations for performance.

Faculty workload allocation decisions are made at the school level and should:

- ensure instructional functionality of degree programs
- support innovative modes of instruction
- promote student success and involvement
- encourage progress in research and creative activities
- accentuate strengths of disciplinary clusters
- foster interdisciplinary engagement
- support professional development opportunities for faculty
- serve the needs of the School, College, University, professional organizations, and communities

Allocation of workload should be established through meetings as needed between the school Director and the individual faculty member in consultation with a program coordinator and/or college Dean as appropriate, documented and signed by both parties to acknowledge completion of the process and receipt of the assignment, and approved by the college Dean. Other members of a Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) (see Section 1.4) should not be directly involved in decisions regarding workload allocation.

General Guidelines

Course load allocation is based on the equivalent of four 3-hour courses per semester. Each course is assigned a percentage that is determined in consultation with the faculty and Director. For more specific guidelines than those listed below, please refer to Appendix A. Deans and directors, or any other administrator responsible for determining workload allocation, should also consult the workload policy in the Employee Handbook.

- Faculty members with any expectations for research/creative activities should receive a reduction in course load in order to meet expectations for those research/creative activities.

- Assigned course load or allocation of teaching (or service at the discretion of the School) should take into account student mentorship activities not directly associated with classroom instruction.
- Assigned course load or allocation of teaching should take into account other factors that may increase time devoted to teaching activities.
- Service contributions (to the program, School, College, University, or profession) requiring a time commitment above and beyond the usual expectation for the School may warrant a reallocation of workload from either teaching or research/creative activities. This is particularly relevant for academic programs with few faculty members to sustain essential functions (e.g., annual reporting, academic advisement) and/or support strategic initiatives requiring service.
- Circumstantial adjustments to a faculty member's workload allocation (e.g., any sudden adjustments in workload due to unforeseen circumstances, such as unexpected increases in enrollment, the departure of a faculty that leaves a gap in the curriculum that must be covered, commitments as part of a new external funding agreement, or the need to participate in a significant service activity) may warrant an adjustment to the workload allocation.
- Workload allocation should be aligned with expectations for the identified role (teaching track, tenure track) for which the faculty member has been employed, such that decisions for promotion or tenure are based upon criteria appropriate for that role (see Promotion and Tenure Guidelines).

1.4 Faculty Evaluation Framework

Decisions for obligating authority for annual faculty evaluations are made at the school level and explained below in 1.4.1-1.5.2.

1.4.1 The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

The FEC serves as the evaluative unit of the University. FECs are elected annually by full-time members of the Corps of Instruction employed by the School (including jointly-appointed faculty with a minimum 50% appointment within the School). This election occurs at a school faculty meeting and is accomplished by means of a secret ballot. In consultation with the college Dean, some schools may elect to create FEC subcommittees if it is deemed that a subset of the school faculty best assures competent evaluation of those they represent.

1.4.2 Committee Membership Eligibility

All tenured members of the Corps of Instruction within the unit with a minimum of three years of service with the University, a minimum 50% appointment within the School (for jointly appointed faculty see Section 1.7), and who hold the rank of Associate Professor or higher are eligible for FEC membership.

Eligibility to serve on a FEC is closely tied to faculty evaluation ratings in the year prior to consideration for committee service. For example, faculty eligible for election to the FEC should have a minimum of “Meets Expectations” in teaching, research/creative activities, and service. Faculty members with annual evaluations lower than “Meets Expectations” in areas of teaching, research/creative activities, or service in the year prior to the current academic year are not recommended to serve on a FEC.

Eligibility to serve on a FEC is limited to tenured, associate rank members or higher of the University Corps of Instruction with exceptions for a teaching-track member as noted in Section 1.5.1. Eligibility to serve on a FEC should generally be limited to those faculty with workload allocations in all three areas of evaluation: teaching, research/creative activities, and service. However, an expanded FEC is available for schools employing teaching-track faculty (FEC Governance Options 2 and 3).

School directors are eligible to participate in the evaluation process upon initiation of their appointment. Because the evaluation process is closely tied to promotion and tenure progression, it is important that individuals who have already been granted tenure at the University serve as committee members. Thus, faculty members under review will receive feedback from individuals who have experienced the tenure process successfully.

For Options 2 and 3 (see Section 1.5.1), teaching-track faculty within the School with a minimum of three years of service with the University, a minimum 50% appointment within the School, and who hold the rank of Associate Teaching Professor or higher are eligible for committee membership. A teaching-track faculty member of an FEC is restricted to evaluate only other teaching-track members. They are excluded from evaluations of tenure-track faculty members.

Faculty holding an appointment within a school and serving as University administrative officers in the positions of President, Provost, Vice President, or college Dean may not be members of FECs. Faculty holding an appointment within the School and serving as Associate Dean, or Associate Provost are typically excluded from FEC eligibility, but may be eligible in the event that desired representation of an academic program would be unfilled because no other faculty members in the program meet eligibility requirements.

Faculty members in positions of Artist in Residence, Professor of Practice, Visiting Professor, Research Professor and those holding honorary rank, employed on a terminal contract, undergoing post-tenure review, or who are otherwise excluded for reasons specified in the rules governing school evaluation proceedings are ineligible to serve on a FEC.

Faculty who are related (as per Board and University Nepotism Policy) to parties being reviewed or evaluated in any personnel matter must recuse themselves for all evaluation proceedings involving the parties. In no event shall they vote or offer advice, either directly or indirectly, to other committee members.

1.5 Faculty Governance Options

The ability to choose governance options exists at the school level.

1.5.1 FEC Governance Options

A school must choose one of the following four options for its FEC. In situations where the school Director is untenured, the School must choose Option 3.

Option 1: Authority for all personnel evaluations and recommendations, exclusive of recommendations for pre-tenure review, tenure, and promotion, is vested in the school Director.

Option 2: A personnel committee consisting of the school Director and at least two tenured members of the Corps of Instruction employed by the school. The minimum three-member committee then elects its chair. The Chair of the committee, after obtaining signed concurrence or dissent from each committee member, submits the signed evaluations and recommendations of the FEC to the college Dean. The FEC should include no fewer than three members but can include additional members as deemed appropriate. In schools employing more than one teaching-track faculty member, the FEC may be expanded to include one member of the teaching track faculty. All teaching-track faculty within the School with a minimum of three years of service with the University, a minimum 50% appointment within the School, and who hold the rank of Associate Teaching Professor or higher are eligible for committee membership. Teaching-track faculty with the rank of Instructor, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Assistant Teaching Professor are ineligible for committee membership. A teaching-track faculty member of a FEC is restricted to evaluate only other teaching-track members.

Option 3: A FEC consisting of at least three tenured members of the Corps of Instruction employed by the School, exclusive of the school Director. The minimum three-member committee then elects its chair. The Chair of the committee, after obtaining signed concurrence or dissent from each committee member, submits the committee's evaluations and recommendations to the school Director. The FEC should include no fewer than three members but can include additional members as deemed appropriate. In schools employing more than one teaching-track faculty member, the FEC may be expanded to include one member of the teaching track faculty. All teaching-track faculty within the School with a minimum of three years of service with the University, a minimum 50% appointment within the School, and who hold the rank of Associate Teaching Professor or higher are eligible for committee membership. Teaching-track faculty with the rank of Instructor, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Assistant Teaching Professor are ineligible for committee membership. A teaching-track faculty member of a FEC is restricted to evaluate only other teaching-track members.

Those FEC evaluations and recommendations for which the school Director concurs are formally approved by signature and transmitted to the college Dean. If the school Director dissents from

one or more FEC evaluations and recommendations, the Director may prepare independent personnel evaluations and recommendations for those faculty and transmit them, along with the evaluations and recommendations of the FEC (with one or more noted by the school Director's signature to indicate dissent) to the college Dean with a copy sent to the faculty member and to the Chair of the FEC.

1.5.2 Replacement of Committee Members

If a FEC member resigns, is no longer able to serve on that committee, or otherwise relinquishes the committee position, another eligible faculty member within the School must be elected in the same manner that the original members were chosen. If a school is operating under Option 1 (school Director) or Option 2 (the school Director and two or more other faculty members) and the school Director resigns from the FEC or is no longer able to serve on that committee, the members of the school's Corps of Instruction must reconvene and choose all members for Option 3 as their operational FEC for the remainder of the academic year and until the next annual election of the FEC option.

1.6 Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Teaching, research/creative activities, and service will be annually evaluated for each faculty member according to the following categories: "Does Not Meet Expectations", "Meets Expectations", and "Exceeds Expectations". Schools are responsible for determining and documenting reasonable criteria for meeting expectations in association with workload allocation guidelines, which should in all cases support achievement in teaching, research/creative activities, and service. These criteria require approval from the school Director and the college Dean before being made publicly available through the Office of the Provost. The criteria must be approved at all levels and formally established in writing before faculty members are held accountable to those standards. The separate category of "collegiality" should not be added to the traditional three areas of faculty performance. Academic units should instead focus on developing clear definitions of teaching, research/creative activities, and service, in which the virtues of collegiality are reflected.

Meeting expectations is not merely a matter of achieving a minimally acceptable level of performance to avoid contractual termination. While not a guarantee of success, meeting expectations in annual evaluations is an essential element of a successful path to tenure (for tenure-track faculty) and/or promotion. Considering the wide diversity of subjects offered at the University, schools are best suited to assess faculty contributions and are thus charged with the responsibility for determining and clearly documenting expectations for each of the three categories of work performance. These expectations could be subsumed within a detailed rubric (see Appendix B for an example) or a more simplified disclosure of standards that serve as a baseline for achievement. Further, schools should clearly articulate and document circumstances that warrant assignment of "Does Not Meet Expectations" and "Exceeds Expectations" (see Appendix C for examples). Work performance criteria require approval from school directors and college deans before being made publicly available through the Office of the Provost.

Upon request by the Office of the Provost, annual summaries by academic unit and/or faculty category (i.e., tenure- or non-tenure track, rank) are to be provided by colleges to facilitate assessment of evaluation metrics and to ensure consistent application of evaluation standards across the University.

1.6.1 Expectation Categories

Professional goals of faculty at The University of Southern Mississippi are facilitated by setting clear and measurable annual objectives for professional contributions. Within this broad framework, school directors work with faculty members to establish professional objectives for the year and further evaluate how objectives align with the aspirations of the School, College, and the larger institutional vision. Annual evaluations provide the opportunity to determine the extent to which objectives were met from the prior year and to set appropriate and aspirational targets for the year ahead. Although objectives are set annually, it is appropriate and encouraged to have discussions about progress towards objectives on an as needed basis, for example, when a major objective is attained early or some significant obstacle to fulfilling an objective arises or a new opportunity presents itself that cannot be postponed to the next evaluation year.

Meets Expectations

Expectations for faculty performance in teaching, research/creative activities, and service should be designed to promote high levels of achievement that ensure student success and contribute to professional communities in a manner consistent with the University mission. Meeting expectations implies that faculty achieve articulated and measurable professional objectives and maintain continuous career advancement, including progress toward tenure and/or promotion. Please refer to Appendix C for examples. Faculty are also expected to contribute positively to a culture of support for students and for unit development (i.e., collegiality).

Does Not Meet Expectations

Assignment of “Does Not Meet Expectations” should be made for faculty who are unable to produce evidence for having met objectives established in the prior year. Faculty whose objectives are met early in the year who did not recalibrate objectives in conjunction with their director also are not meeting expectations for faculty performance.

Exceeds Expectations

Assignment of Exceeds Expectations should be reserved for faculty who demonstrate excellence far beyond professional objectives set for the year, for achievement of highly ambitious objectives, or for a high level of contributions deemed complimentary to the program, School, College, and/or institutional initiatives that further the vision of the University. Importantly, this designation should be reserved for faculty who provide evidence that indicates high levels of performance in either teaching, research/creative activities, or service. For evidence presented that a faculty member achieved more than school expectations but not enough to merit assignment of “Exceeds Expectations”, a specific mention of this achievement should be included in the Noteworthy Activities and Remarks section of the annual evaluation form (see below). Please refer to Appendix C for examples.

Within schools, it is expected that faculty will work to contribute significantly in their professional roles and, thus, “meet expectations.” High fractions of faculty in a school who “exceed expectations” would suggest that directors should look closely at school strategies in goal-setting and work with faculty to adjust to a higher aspirational level to facilitate optimal faculty development and school success.

1.6.2 Noteworthy Activities and Remarks

Annual evaluation reports will include a separate section for Noteworthy Activities and Remarks that provides opportunity for evaluators to mention specific components of teaching, research/creative activities, and service that might not otherwise be discernible from the three-tier faculty evaluation system or that represent achievements or deficiencies insufficient in themselves to warrant assignment of a category that is not “Meets Expectations” (refer to Appendix C for examples). Additionally, activities considered exemplary of interdisciplinary collaboration are appropriate for inclusion in this section. Activities and remarks documented in this section can be used alongside the three-tier evaluation system for tenure and promotion decisions, merit-based raises, or other important personnel decisions. Importantly, Noteworthy Activities and Remarks is not intended to be a comprehensive list of annual faculty achievements or deficiencies, but instead to disclose aspects of a faculty member’s performance that evaluators consider as worthwhile to mention and/or clarify assignment of a particular category of the three-tier evaluation system.

1.6.3 Faculty Evaluation Meetings

The annual evaluation process should offer an opportunity for faculty members to communicate with their supervisors about professional objectives for the year ahead and to request resources necessary to accomplish those objectives. Evaluation meetings with individual faculty members should stimulate communication to achieve objectives, not merely serve as a disclosure and arbitration about activities during the previous year. Meetings should further include a conversation about how faculty can best align their professional goals with the needs and vision of the program, School, College, and University.

All faculty members of the Corps of Instruction will submit annual activity reports to the school Director by January 31st. These should include a summary of professional activities in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service during the year evaluated. The Director will subsequently distribute the activity reports to appropriate members of the FEC for their review. Each member of the committee (Options 2 or 3; see Section 1.5.1) will be evaluated by the other members of the committee. School directors and associate deans are evaluated for all work-related categories, including administrative performance, by the college Dean and not by the other members of the FEC. However, evaluation of directors and associate deans for teaching and research/creative activities are based on specifications as outlined in the school-level documents relevant to the person in question, which are provided to the Dean by the FEC upon request. Associate directors are reviewed by the FEC in the areas of teaching, research/creative

activities, and non-administrative service while administrative performance is evaluated exclusively by the director.

Evaluation meetings should be scheduled annually between February 1st and March 15th. Two distinct meetings are necessary to complete the annual evaluation process for each faculty member: (i) review and evaluation of the previous year's activities and (ii) establishment of professional objectives and workload allocation for the year ahead.

The first meeting to evaluate the previous year will include the faculty member, school Director, and FEC members. The proceedings should disclose rationale for the evaluation and clarify any miscommunications with respect to faculty activities during the year evaluated.

The second meeting to establish professional objectives and allocate workload percentages for the following academic year is to be done exclusively between the Director and the individual faculty member. In the event that a faculty member and the Director are unable to establish a consensus for what constitutes appropriate annual objectives, the college Dean serves as the final arbitrator.

Prior to signing completed annual evaluations, faculty members may request written communication from administrative evaluators to outline strategies for improving workload allocation issues and/or requesting resources available for high-quality teaching and research/creative activities. Faculty may also appeal results of their annual evaluation if they disagree with the assigned categories (i.e., "Does Not Meet Expectations" and "Meets Expectations") or written comments from the evaluation committee. In either case, if the return communication remains unsatisfactory to the faculty member and efforts to resolve issues are unsuccessful at the school level, an appeal process can be initiated pursuant to the grievance procedure outlined in the Faculty Handbook. Faculty who are repeatedly overruled in their efforts to appeal annual evaluation results, but nevertheless continue to appeal evaluation results, are subject to reprimand and concerns regarding their collegiality.

Although not required, quarterly or mid-year meetings are strongly encouraged between faculty and directors as an opportunity to revisit objectives and to promote faculty success and continuous professional development.

1.6.4 Considerations for Online Instruction

Due to the unique nature of the online learning environment, online teaching requires its own set of evaluation benchmarks. While specific assessment benchmarks may vary from one academic unit to another, it is important for each unit to develop online teaching evaluation criteria that meet or exceed standards set through the online instructional policy (<https://www.usm.edu/institutional-policies/policy-acaf-ool-001>).

1.7 Interdisciplinary Appointments

1.7.1 Policies and Procedures

Jointly-appointed faculty are those faculty whose workload assignment (FTE) is shared between two evaluative units¹. Policies for Jointly Appointed/Interdisciplinary faculty should be established that include the following elements:

1.7.1.1 Letter of Agreement when Faculty are Appointed

When faculty are jointly-appointed, there should be a letter of agreement between academic units that outlines the responsibilities of the faculty member with respect to each unit with regards to teaching, research/creative activities, and service. For new appointments, this letter should be part of the offer letter. Differences between academic units in policies and procedures should be recognized and resolved in the letter of agreement. This includes workload allocation, annual evaluation, and promotion and tenure policies. Agreement should be such that overall expectations of a faculty member are not more than for any non-jointly appointed faculty member.

For example, the jointly appointed faculty member should not have more responsibilities in terms of unit meetings and unit advising than non-jointly appointed faculty. Other terms such as resources provided, physical space usage, and use of technical and support staff, among others, should be specified. Procedures to address conflicts between academic units should be specified. Whether or not the joint appointment status can be renegotiated in the future should be specified.

1.7.1.2 Annual Evaluations

As per letter of agreement, expectations for annual evaluations should be set, modified, and/or reconciled based on the specific needs of the joint appointment. Units should establish one set of expectations based on the joint appointment rather than simply requiring faculty member to meet both units' expectations. Units may be able to set expectations based on percentage of the faculty member's appointment in each unit, especially for teaching workload and advising workload. However, issues of research/creative activities may require a new set of guidelines based on the specifics of the joint appointment (e.g., outlets for activities and types of products may need to be expanded). Evaluation committees for jointly appointed faculty should include at least one voting member of the minority evaluative unit.

1.7.1.3 Promotion and Tenure Reviews

As per letter of agreement, expectations for promotion and tenure should be set, modified, and/or reconciled based on the specific needs of the joint appointment. Units should set one set of

¹ At USM, a budgetary unit is a school whereas an evaluative unit would be under the jurisdiction of a FEC. A faculty member could be jointly appointed between two schools or jointly appointed between two evaluative units within one school.

expectations based on the joint appointment rather than simply requiring faculty members to meet both units' expectations. Both units are encouraged to be flexible in modifying traditional disciplinary standards for research/creative activities without compromising the rigor of the program. Although tenure may be granted in a "home" unit and tenure and promotion reviews shall not require review by multiple school-level committees, the faculty member's promotion/tenure committee should include voting members from the other evaluative units that are part of the agreement. The committee makeup can be roughly proportional to the percentage of the faculty member's appointment in each unit. School directors will write a joint letter.

1.7.2 Recommendations for Affiliated Faculty

When faculty have 100% of their budgeted line in a home unit but have teaching and/or research/creative activity responsibilities in another budgetary/evaluative unit, they are considered affiliated and not jointly appointed. However, many of the same recommendations above should apply to these faculty.

1.7.2.1 Documented Affiliation Agreement

A letter of agreement between units needs to be established with the appointment specifying the rights and responsibilities of the faculty member and the units. Annual evaluation and promotion and tenure guidelines for affiliated faculty should consider and account for their affiliated/interdisciplinary status. The home unit is encouraged to be flexible in modifying traditional disciplinary standards of evaluation without compromising the rigor of the program. The home unit will solicit input from the affiliated unit. The affiliated unit will be invited to provide a separate review to the process.

1.8 Post-Tenure Review

1.8.1 Preamble to the Policy (from Faculty Handbook 8.5)

The University of Southern Mississippi consists of a community of scholars who are engaged in the responsibilities of scholarly development while accorded the privilege of academic freedom. Tenured faculty members fulfill a multiplicity of University, college, and unit roles and responsibilities yet, at the same time, pursue self-directed inquiry and development.

Tenured faculty members balance teaching, research, and service roles at sustained levels of achievement. The tenured faculty represent the most important intellectual resource at the University. Faculty have a stake in the accomplishments and contributions of others, as well as a stake in their own accomplishments.

The University of Southern Mississippi recognizes that the tenure system is essential to protect academic freedom and support the pursuit of scholarship that leads to advancement in knowledge. The provisions of freedom and economic security through the tenure system are indispensable elements to the success of the University in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society. The University, therefore, seeks to uphold and maintain the tenure system both

for protection of individual faculty members and as visible evidence that uninhibited scholarship and instruction are the highest priority for faculty members.

The traditional approaches to annual evaluation in which the University already engages highlight the many contributions of scholars. The goal of post-tenure review should be one of enhancing faculty development and professional skills by providing evidence of documentation and accountability to the University and the Institutions of Higher Learning.

The post-tenure review should not be a re-evaluation of tenure. The post-tenure review process provides for substantive due process of individual faculty members at all times and should emphasize and foster professional development. Through this process, faculty can sustain mutual respect and a sense of collective purpose while optimizing faculty skills and performance.

1.8.2 Post-Tenure Faculty Development

Opportunities for professional development of faculty members should continue beyond achievement of tenured status. This commitment not only should enhance productivity of faculty members and success of their students, but also avoid consideration of punitive measures associated with post-tenure review (PTR).

A formal development plan for improvement is initiated by the school Director and FEC after a faculty member receives: (i) their second consecutive assignment of “Does Not Meet Expectations” in one of the three categories of faculty workload (teaching, research/creative activities, service) or (ii) assignment of “Does Not Meet Expectations” in at least two categories in the same year. In addition to specific goals in the deficient areas, the development plan should include specification of the resources, training, and services, among others, that the faculty member needs to return to satisfactory productivity. Having a development plan in place does not mean that the faculty member is on PTR. A development plan is a proactive step to prevent the need for PTR. The development plan should follow the guidelines established in the annual evaluation process.

A faculty member’s workload should be reviewed by the school Director as part of the development plan. If it is possible that a reweighting of workload obligations would solve the deficiency, it should be done as part of the process. For example, a faculty member later in their career who is doing less research would be assigned a 4/4 teaching schedule, would have expanded service obligations, and would have fewer research expectations. This approach may be the best way to support tenured faculty later in their career who are still meeting expectations in two evaluative areas but are weak in the third.

1.8.3 Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Criteria

The PTR process must follow an opportunity for a faculty member to address deficiencies outlined in the formal development plan (as per section 1.8.2) and is based upon the results of annual evaluations at the school level. The PTR process is initiated if a faculty member receives: (i) a “Does Not Meet Expectations” in any two categories for two consecutive years or (ii) a “Does Not Meet Expectations” in any category for four consecutive years. The review process should commence unless there are substantive mitigating circumstances, including, but not limited to, serious illness. A faculty member should be taken off PTR if the faculty member receives a Meets Expectations for all three evaluative categories within two years of being placed on PTR. For a faculty member who does not receive a ranking of “Meets Expectations” for all three evaluative categories within two years of being placed on PTR, the school Director, college Dean, and Provost should collectively agree on a course of action that could include termination of employment.

1.8.4 PTR Scheduling

The PTR process should be initiated as soon as the annual evaluations are approved by the college Dean(s) for an academic year. Schools should not wait until the Fall semester (or later) after the annual evaluation process is concluded in the Spring to initiate the PTR process.

1.8.5 PTR Committee (from Faculty Handbook 8.5.3)

A three-member committee will conduct the review. The college Dean, school Director, and faculty member will each choose one member of the committee. The members of the committee may come from any school or college within the University. By unanimous consent of the committee of three, up to two additional members may be added by the committee. Members who accept appointment should realize that the committee will meet over a two-year period. If a committee member cannot fulfill her or his term, another member will be appointed by the individual, or their successor, who made the original choice.

1.8.6 PTR and Jointly-Appointed/Affiliated Faculty

1.8.6.1 PTR Committee Make-up

The evaluation committee with oversight of the PTR process for jointly-appointed faculty should include members from each unit (as per section 1.7.1.2). For affiliated faculty, at least one member of the committee should be from the affiliated unit if the affiliation is to be continued. The faculty development plan should be tailored to the specific circumstances of the joint or affiliated appointment.

1.8.6.2 Approval Process

The path of approval for jointly-appointed faculty should be specified at the beginning of the PTR process. Depending on the situation – joint appointment across budgetary units within a college or joint appointments in budgetary units in two colleges – directors and deans may act in concert or the school Director and college Dean of the home unit may take precedence with input from the others. This process should be agreed upon with the Provost when PTR is initiated.

1.8.7 Post-Tenure Portfolio and Post-Tenure Faculty Development Plan (modified from Faculty Handbook 8.5.4)

Within one month of the date of notification of the post-tenure review (PTR) – or not later than September 1 of the year of the criteria for initiation of PTR, the faculty member will prepare and submit a portfolio of all documents, materials and statements that the faculty member deems relevant and necessary. All materials submitted by the faculty member will remain in the portfolio. A portfolio must include the current annual evaluation; the annual evaluations from the four preceding years; the goals for each of those years, if goals are part of the annual evaluation process; a current curriculum vita; evidence of performance in teaching, research/creative activities, and service; and a newly crafted faculty development plan designed to end PTR. The school Director or college Dean may add other pertinent information to the portfolio. Additional materials may be added at any time during the review process. All materials that are added to the portfolio must be shared with the faculty member.

1.8.7.1 (from Faculty Handbook 8.5.5)

The committee will review the portfolio within one month after submission. The review will be based on the faculty member's specific role and responsibilities in the School as outlined in the goals approved for that faculty member, if such goals exist, and the annual evaluations. The committee will review the new faculty development plan presented by the faculty member and, with the participation of the faculty member, modify it as appropriate to assist the faculty member in correcting the identified deficiencies.

1.8.7.2 (from Faculty Handbook 8.5.6.1)

The new faculty development plan will indicate how identified deficiencies in the performance of a faculty member, as indicated by the review committee, will be corrected. The final plan, to be approved by the college Dean, will be developed by the faculty member in collaboration with the school Director and the review committee.

1.8.7.3 (from Faculty Handbook 8.5.6.2)

The faculty development plan will be tailored to individual circumstances. The new plan will: (a) identify specific deficiencies found by the committee; (b) define specific goals to correct the deficiencies; (c) outline the activities to achieve the goals; (d) set time lines for accomplishment of the activities; (e) indicate the criteria for assessment of progress; and (f) identify institutional resources necessary to support the plan (to the level available to other faculty). The plan should

also include a review and possible reweighting of the faculty member's workload obligations if appropriate.

1.8.7.4 (from Faculty Handbook 8.5.7)

As a matter of due process, the faculty member shall have the right to meet with the review committee prior to its final recommendation. The review committee will specifically elaborate in writing its findings concerning the faculty member's developmental plan and will provide copies to the faculty member, school Director, and college Dean. The final plan must be developed within two months of the recommendation to develop the new faculty development plan. The new plan must be implemented the semester following its development (summer generally excluded).

1.8.7.5 (from Faculty Handbook 8.5.8)

The faculty member may appeal the findings of the committee and the recommended faculty development plan to the Provost, who will consult the College Personnel Committee and may seek the advice of the University Personnel Committee. The faculty member may then appeal the findings of the Provost and the recommended faculty development plan to the President who will make the final decision.

1.8.7.6 (from Faculty Handbook 8.5.9)

The faculty member and school Director will meet a minimum of one time each semester to review the progress of the faculty member. After each meeting, the school Director will send a progress report to the faculty member, review committee, and the college Dean. The faculty member may request a review of progress by the review committee, and the findings will be forwarded to the school Director and the college Dean.

1.8.7.7 (from Faculty Handbook 8.5.10)

When the objectives of the faculty development plan have been met, as determined by the review committee, or not later than two years after initiating the plan, the school Director will make a final written report, including an overall rating for the period of the plan, to the faculty member, the review committee, and the college Dean. The overall report will include ratings for teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activities.

1.8.7.8 (from Faculty Handbook 8.5.11)

If after two years the faculty member has not shown improvement in the identified deficiency areas and has not achieved an overall rating at the department level of Meets Expectations in all three categories, the committee will recommend sanctions, which may include termination, to the

school Director and the college Dean. If the College Dean recommends termination, the termination procedures set out in the Faculty Handbook will apply.

Appendix A

The content here includes guidelines specific to faculty workload allocation, which are intended for insertion in the Employee Handbook. It is essential that workload guidelines complement annual evaluations of performance and are consistent with decisions for promotion and tenure. Whereas the Faculty Handbook should present a general philosophical framework for faculty workload allocation that conforms to the ideals of Vision 2020 (see Section 1.3 above), the Employee Handbook is a more appropriate document to consult for guiding principles that inform discussions between school directors and faculty members that are intended to effectively and fairly distribute workload on an annual basis for various activities. Excerpts from both documents should not contradict each other to avoid inconsistent interpretation and application across academic units.

Workload guidelines

- Course load allocation is based on the equivalent of four 3-hour courses per semester. Each course is assigned a percentage that is determined in consultation with the faculty and Director *and signed* by both to acknowledge completion of the process and receipt of the assignment.
- Intersession or summer courses may or may not be included in regular teaching load depending on the needs of the program and the individual faculty member.
- Teaching track faculty, instructors, visiting faculty, professors of practice, and clinical faculty teach 4 courses per semester as a general rule.
- Tenure track faculty who are required to engage in research, scholarship, and creative activities should receive the equivalent of one 3-hour course load reallocation to allow time for this work. Further, course load reallocations may be made based on the complexity/scope and productivity of an academic unit (for example, course reallocations for chairing multiple dissertation committees or mentoring students in scientific lab work). Finally, faculty may receive an adjusted course load (fewer or more courses) based on their level of productivity in research, scholarly, and creative activity.
- Assigned course load or allocation of teaching (or service at the discretion of the School) as a percentage of total workload should take into account student mentorship activities not directly associated with classroom instruction. At a minimum, course loads or teaching workload allocation should take into account time and effort associated with direction of undergraduate honors, graduate, and post-doctoral students. Dissertation and thesis courses may warrant a reduction in teaching load if the faculty member can demonstrate significant work in directing the students enrolled in these hours. Dissertation and thesis hours in and of themselves do not warrant a reduction in course load.
- Assigned course load or allocation of teaching as a percentage of total workload should also take into account other factors that may increase time devoted to teaching activities:
 - The nature of the course: lab, studio, practicum, or similar courses (courses whose actual contact hours are not accurately reflected by the credit hours of the course).
 - The enrollment size of the course, especially those courses taught without additional support for grading and course management.

- Off-campus activities associated with course delivery (e.g., clinical supervision in the field, student field trips, travel to/from campuses).
- The development and implementation of new courses or other curricula, especially the development and implementation of team-taught courses.
- Faculty involvement in intensive teaching development activities (e.g., ACUE Course in Effective Teaching Practices) where these activities are not compensated by the development program.
- Significant service contributions (in quantity of time or quality of contribution) to the program, School, College, University, or profession may warrant reallocation of workload from either teaching or research/creative activities. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate that the time and effort required for one or more service activities exceeds the typical service workload and warrants extra consideration for workload reallocation. Serving on committees without demonstration of significant contribution does not automatically warrant reallocation.
- For a Faculty Librarian (University Libraries), teaching load is determined through librarianship activities, which may or may not include classroom instruction, rather than number of courses.

Jointly-appointed faculty

If a faculty member is jointly appointed, workload allocation should be agreed to by the faculty member in consultation with directors of both schools.

Administrator workload

- School Directors and Associate Deans are administrators who hold faculty rank, however all aspects of job performance (i.e., teaching, research/creative activities, service, administrative functions) are annually evaluated by their immediate superior administrator. Associate Directors, however, will be evaluated on their contributions to teaching, research/creative activities, and non-administrative service by their respective school's Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC). The administrative performance of an Associate Director is evaluated by the school Director.
- School Directors are generally expected to teach a minimum of one class per year. Associate Deans above the school director level holding faculty rank are normally expected to teach one class per year. Associate Directors are generally expected to receive a reassignment of one course per semester during their service. Depending upon the scope and breadth of responsibilities, however, more or less courses could be required to be taught by these administrative faculty.
- Faculty administrators are expected to remain current in their respective field and demonstrate some contribution to scholarship in their field. However, as it is recognized that faculty administrators have significant administrative duties that impact their ability to sustain a program of research, scholarship, or creative activity, they should not be evaluated with the same expectations as the tenure-track faculty. General expectations for scholarly productivity should be established each year between the faculty administrator and the Dean, or in the case of an Associate Director, with the FEC and Director. If the faculty administrator meets these expectations, they should receive a minimum

evaluation of “Meets Expectations” in the category of research, scholarly, and creative activity (see Section 1.6).

- Administrative duties are separate from service. Significant service contributions (in quantity of time or quality of contribution) to the University or profession should allow for reallocation of workload from either teaching or research/creative activities. It is the responsibility of the faculty administrator to demonstrate that a service activity is significant and requires extra consideration for workload reallocation. If the service is to the program, School, or College, it is the responsibility of the faculty administrator to demonstrate how the service is separate from their administrative duties. Serving on committees without demonstration of contribution does not automatically result in reallocation.

Circumstantial adjustments to workload allocation

Circumstantial adjustments to a faculty member’s workload allocation (e.g., any unexpected or sudden adjustments in workload due to unforeseen circumstances such as the departure of a faculty member which leaves a gap in the curriculum that must be covered, commitments as part of a new external funding agreement, need to participate in a significant service activity) should:

1. Be negotiated between the faculty member and the school Director (in consultation with the Dean as necessary);
2. Be documented, and signed or electronically approved by both the school Director and the faculty member;
3. Include a defined period of time for the adjusted workload allocation; and
4. Hold a provision that if the affected faculty member disagrees with the proposed circumstantial workload allocation, an appeal pursuant to the grievance procedure outlined in the Faculty Handbook can be made, which can also serve as a mechanism to appeal for the expiration date of the re-allocated responsibilities.

Appendix B

The following is offered as a draft framework for consideration. Our intent is to begin discussion on a general framework used consistently across the University. Schools may individualize this to the expectations for their academic units. For example, if application for internal/external funding is not pursued in a unit, they could adjust the rubric accordingly.

The school Director and/or FEC would circle/highlight as measured. Totals should be completed for each category.

TEACHING				
	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Comments
Coursework	Coursework (development, materials, and assessments) does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate University groups, (e.g. online steering committee).	Coursework (development, materials, and assessments) reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate University groups, (e.g. online steering committee).	Coursework reflects innovative development which may include service learning, active learning, honors theses, SPUR projects, etc. consistent with school directives and exceeding the unit expectations.	
Course delivery	Course delivery (attendance, course load, syllabi, grading deadlines, etc.) is not performed according to University calendar and guidelines.	Course delivery (attendance, course load, syllabi, grading deadlines, etc.) is performed according to University calendar and guidelines.	Course delivery exceeds unit and University guidelines by the addition of independent studies, thesis or dissertation coursework, etc. added to existing load.	
Student teaching evaluations	Teaching evaluations conducted by students do not reflect the standard	Teaching evaluations conducted by	Teaching evaluations conducted by	

	performance level identified within the unit.	students reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit.	students exceed the standard level of performance level identified within the unit.	
Peer teaching evaluations	Teaching evaluations conducted by peers do not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit	Teaching evaluations conducted by peers reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit	Teaching evaluations conducted by peers exceed the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
Innovative teaching	Teaching evaluations and/or peer reviews reflect a lack of change or inclusion of relevant material in the course experience	Teaching evaluations and/or peer reviews reflect the use of new materials, new approaches to engage students	Teaching evaluations and/or peer reviews show engaged learning based on innovative teaching methods	
TOTAL SCORE: 3/5 in Exceeds Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations = Exceeds Expectations 3/5 in Does Not Meet Expectations with 0 in Exceeds Expectations = Does Not Meet Expectations				
Collegiality in Teaching Statement: (provide 1-2 sentences describing collegial efforts through teaching. Collegiality is defined in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (Section 2.3).				

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES				
	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Comments
Participation in research/creative activities	Participates or demonstrates continuous effort in research/creative activities at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Participates in research/creative activities by initiating new activity and/or demonstrating continuous effort on existing activity as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Participates in research/creative activities by initiating new collaborative interdisciplinary activity and/or demonstrating continuous effort on existing interdisciplinary activity exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
Dissemination of research/creative activities	Disseminates work through unit identified channels (i.e., peer-reviewed journals, books, performance, etc.) at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Disseminates work through unit identified channels (i.e., peer-reviewed journals, books, performance, etc.) as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Disseminates work through unit identified channels (i.e., peer-reviewed journals, books, performance, etc.) at a rate that exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
Applications for internal/external funding	Submits application for internal/external funding of research/creative activities at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Submits application for internal/external funding of research/creative activities as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit. (e.g., unit may define expectations as annual, bi-annual,	Procures internal/external funding of research/creative activities exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	

		tri-annual submissions, etc.)		
TOTAL SCORE:				
2/3 in Exceeds Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations = Exceeds Expectations				
2/3 in Does Not Meet Expectations with 0 in Exceeds Expectations = Does Not Meet Expectations				
Collegiality in Research/Creative Activities Statement: (provide 1-2 sentences describing collegial efforts through research/creative activities). Collegiality is defined in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (Section 2.3).				

SERVICE

	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Comments
Institutional committees	Serves on appointed/elected committees at the department, college, and University level at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit or does not attend committee meetings to represent the unit.	Serves on appointed/elected committees at the department, college, and University level as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit; attends meetings and contributes to the needs of the committee.	Serves on appointed/elected committees at the department, college, and University level at a rate exceeding the standard performance level within the unit; attends meetings, completes a leadership role for the committee or sub-committee.	
Professional organizations	Contributes to their identified field of study through membership and participation in professional organizations within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, and/or statewide at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Contributes to their identified field of study through membership and participation in professional organizations within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, and/or statewide as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Contributes to their identified field of study through membership, participation in, and committee service on professional organizations, publications, activities within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, and/or statewide exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
Campus activities and community service	Facilitates growth of the University/college/school/department through active participation in University campus	Facilitates growth of the University/college/school/department through active participation in University campus activities (i.e.,	Facilitates growth of the University/college/school/department through active participation in University campus	

	activities (i.e., Eagles Spur, recruitment, retention, etc.) and community service related to their profession at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Eagles Spur, recruitment, retention, etc.) and community service related to their profession as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.	activities (i.e., Eagles Spur, recruitment, retention, etc.) and community service related to their profession exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
Student mentorship	Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student committees to include graduate examinations and dissertations as well as undergraduate honors theses, delivery of independent study courses, etc. at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student committees to include graduate examinations and dissertations as well as undergraduate honors theses, delivery of independent study courses, etc. as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student committees to include graduate examinations and dissertations master's theses, and undergraduate honors theses, etc. exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
TOTAL SCORE:				
3/4 in Exceeds Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations = Exceeds Expectations				
3/4 in Does Not Meet Expectations with 0 in Exceeds Expectations = Does Not Meet Expectations				
Collegiality in Service Statement: (provide 1-2 sentences describing collegial efforts through service activities). Collegiality is defined in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (Section 2.3).				

To be completed by evaluator:

NOTEWORTHY ACTIVITIES AND REMARKS	
Evaluator may list any activities they identify as noteworthy or include other remarks for the academic year (see Section 1.6.2)	
Teaching	
Research/Creative Activities	
Service	

Appendix C

The content here includes examples of criteria that could be used or modified by schools to develop expectations for faculty performance in the categories of teaching, research/creative activities, and service. The examples below do not constitute an exhaustive list, but instead are intended for reference during the development of school criteria.

Meets Expectations

Examples of expectations for teaching could include, but are not limited to the following:

- Development of courses consistent with school directives.
- Good scores on student course evaluations.
- Good scores on peer-review evaluations.
- Direction of undergraduate Honors student thesis projects or SPUR projects.
- Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation projects.
- Demonstration of course breadth and periodic improvements through a teaching portfolio.

Examples of expectations for research/creative activities could include, but are not limited to the following:

- Publication of peer-reviewed journal articles.
- Submission of a book draft as part of a contract with a publisher.
- Development and submission of a proposal for external funding.
- Administration of an externally funded grant.
- Presentation of research at national or international conferences.
- Production and/or direction of dance or theatrical performances.

Examples of expectations for service to the University and professional communities could include, but are not limited to the following:

- Participation in student recruitment and retention initiatives.
- Peer review of manuscripts for academic journals.
- Membership in University or college committees.

- Editorship for an academic publishing company or academic journal.
- Session organization at a regional, national, or international conference.
- Serving in a disciplinary cluster or school in one or more unfunded (i.e., no stipend) or uncompensated (i.e., no course release) capacities (e.g., undergraduate or graduate coordinator).
- Participation in sanctioned performances, showings, or outreach programs
- Committee or board appointments serving the State or other entity approved by the School Director.

To complement standards for meeting expectations, schools may elect to designate standard workload allocation percentages for teaching, research/creative activities, and service for tenure-track and teaching-track faculty (see Section 1.3); and adjust expectations in accordance with the established standard workload allocation.

For example, if a school (or disciplinary cluster) with a standard workload allocation of 40% teaching, 40% research/creative activities, and 20% service establishes one published article per year as the expectations for research/creative activities of tenure-track faculty, and a tenure-track faculty member is allocated a 60% teaching, 20% research/creative activities, and 20% service workload for one year, then that member will meet expectations if evidence is presented that considerable progress was made on a manuscript designated for peer review but was not published that year. Further, if the 60/20/20 workload allocation were to be maintained for two years, then only one published article would be required to meet expectations for research/creative activities for that duration. For accreditation standards, colleges may have standards for research/creative activities that inform the school's allocation for tenure-track faculty and for other faculty in the Corps of Instruction.

Does Not Meet Expectations

Assignment of "Does Not Meet Expectations" should be made for faculty who are unable to produce evidence for meeting annual expectations documented by their academic unit.

Exceeds Expectations

Examples for exceeding expectations for teaching could include, but are not limited to the following:

- Innovative development and successful implementation of service learning or active learning courses consistent with school directives.
- Very high scores on student course evaluations (e.g., ≥ 1 standard deviation of the school mean).
- Very high scores on peer-review evaluations (e.g., ≥ 1 standard deviation of the school mean).
- Direction of substantially more undergraduate Honors student thesis projects or SPUR projects than needed to meet school expectations.
- Direction of substantially more graduate thesis or dissertation projects than needed to meet school expectations.

- Demonstration of superior course breadth or major improvements through a teaching portfolio.

Examples for exceeding expectations for research/creative activities could include, but are not limited to the following:

- Publication of peer-reviewed journal articles in excess of school expectations.
- Publication of a book with an internationally-recognized publisher.
- Successful acquisition of external funding in excess of school expectations.
- Presentation of research as a keynote speaker at national or international conferences.
- Production and/or direction of a dance or theatrical performance at an internationally-recognized venue.
- Creation of critically acclaimed works of art at an internationally-recognized showing.

Examples for exceeding expectations for service could include, but are not limited to the following:

- Initiation of an outreach program that definitively resulted in recruiting ## students.
- Peer-review of manuscripts for academic journals well in excess of school expectations.
- Participation in a proposal-review board at an established national funding agency.
- Editor-in-chief responsibilities for a peer-reviewed journal.
- Serving as President of Faculty Senate or Chair of the Undergraduate or Graduate Councils.
- Lead organizer of a traveling regional, national, or international conference.
- Direction of a University-sponsored research center or outreach program.
- Chair of a committee or board serving the State or other entity approved by the school.

Noteworthy Activities

Examples of noteworthy activities or remarks could include, but are not limited to the following:

Achievements

- Faculty member A jointly developed a new interdisciplinary course with faculty member B that attracted ## students and resulted in addition of ## new majors to the program.
- Faculty member served as Chair of the ... Committee.
- Faculty member received an award from the American Society for ...for excellence in creativity.
- Faculty member was co-author on a research article published in..., which is the top peer-reviewed journal in the discipline.
- Faculty member authored and submitted two research proposals to the National Institute of ... and two research proposals to the National Academy of ..., all of which were unfunded but received promising comments for re-submission.

- Faculty member received an invitation to participate in a summer workshop to develop strategies for developing education programs in schools in Mississippi.
- Faculty member is exceptionally collegial in and/or outside of the classroom; exemplified by ..., ..., and ... (see Promotion & Tenure guidelines 2.3).

Deficiencies

- Faculty member has received multiple complaints about being absent from scheduled office hours.
- Faculty member is irresponsive to e-mail communications within a reasonable amount of time (i.e., within three business days).
- Faculty member did not contribute to any research proposal submissions. [In disciplines in which regular proposal activity is expected.]
- Faculty member consistently exhibits non-collegial and inappropriate behavior in and/or outside of the classroom; exemplified by ..., ..., and ... (see Promotion & Tenure guidelines 2.3).