

Criteria Governing Tenure and Promotion

Department of Philosophy

University of South Carolina

Approved by the DCTP April 6, 1995

Revisions approved by the DCTP April 10, 1996

Additional revisions approved by the DCTP November 21, 1996

More revisions approved by the DCTP April 10, 1977

While it is recognized that faculty members display different strengths and abilities, it is normally* expected that they will be effective as teachers and that they will be presenting and publishing scholarly work and participating in professional societies. Contributions to the Department and university through service on committees and relevant public service will also be considered. Normally, teaching and research will count more than service of any sort. Teaching and research will have equal weight. Other relevant professional and personal characteristics may also be taken into account, such as length of service in the profession, relevant experience elsewhere, special administrative duties performed and supplementary education and training, as they affect the work of a faculty member; see the section on tenure and promotion procedures in the Faculty Manual.

In tenure and promotion decisions, the exact value placed upon any aspect of the candidate's record must in the end depend upon a judgment of its quality. The record must show significant achievements and give promise of further such achievements. Decisions take into account the complete professional record of the candidate. For the Departmental Committee on Tenure and Promotion (hereafter "DCTP"), the following considerations are especially important:

I. Teaching

Criteria Governing tenure at all ranks and promotion to associate and to full professor rank

The criteria are the same in all cases.

1. The DCTP expects that a candidate be a good teacher. A poor teacher will not be recommended for tenure or promotion regardless of achievements in other areas.
2. At a minimum, a teacher must perform the routines of teaching adequately: meeting classes, grading and returning papers promptly, and keeping regular office hours.
3. The Department of Philosophy expects the administration of a student evaluation form in every course offered in the fall and spring semesters. Normally a good teacher should receive student evaluations averaging between "good" and "excellent" in a range including "very poor, poor, fair, good, excellent." But student response is only one factor in the evaluation and it is not always sufficient evidence of good or poor teaching.
4. The candidate shall have at least three class sessions observed by one or more tenured faculty peers. These visitations shall occur during the period between the previous successful application for tenure and/or promotion, if any, and the current application. Written reports from these observers will serve as one source of evidence of the candidate's teaching ability.
5. Evidence that a candidate has contributed significantly to the academic and intellectual development of students is an additional item relevant to an assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness. The successful performance of students in advanced courses is one such kind of evidence, as are letters from graduates.

* Where the words 'normally,' 'usually,' or 'it is possible that' occur, the intent is to provide for a rare exception to the stated general rule. In such a case, a justification for the departure from precedent will be sent forward with the file.

6. Courses should contain adequate content, be suited to the curriculum of the Department, and be of a rigor appropriate for a given level of instruction. To assist the DCTP, candidates shall make available several representative course syllabi and samples of examinations and handouts used in their courses.
7. Further evidence may include the direction of theses and dissertations as well as the direction of students in independent study.
8. Other relevant items that may be considered in an assessment of teaching are the candidate's having developed new, appropriate, and successful courses or having introduced effective new teaching techniques, such as the development or implementation of effective and appropriate teaching software, or having been a nominee for, or a recipient of, a teaching award. A successful course is one which contributes to the undergraduate program or the graduate program of the Department, as determined by faculty approval and student response.

II. Research

Three sections, A, B and C, follow. Section A specifies how the specific criteria set out in Sections B and C are to be understood. Specific criteria follow in sections II-B and II-C. Criteria set out in B apply only to candidates for tenure at the Assistant or Associate rank and to candidates for promotion to Associate rank. Criteria set out in C apply to candidates for tenure at full professor rank and to candidates for promotion to full professor rank.

A. Framework governing tenure at all ranks and promotion to associate and to full professor rank

1. The DCTP draws a distinction between *major* and *minor* pieces of research. While the determination has to be made by the DCTP, a minor piece of research typically consists in a book review, a short contribution published in a volume of un-refereed proceedings, a commentary delivered at a conference, or a short contribution in applied Philosophy. Minor pieces of research provide a fuller picture of the candidate's interest and abilities, but by themselves are not sufficient evidence of adequate scholarship. Major pieces of research provide this evidence by testifying to sustained inquiry, and by being of greater depth and/or significance than minor ones. Such major pieces of research typically consist in single or co-authored books, substantial refereed articles in journals or volumes of proceedings, or professionally significant translations. Extensive reports in applied Philosophy, if they are of broad enough scope to be of general interest, and if they are intellectually significant, may count as major pieces of research. Major pieces of research address other professionals in the same area of research, or, if they address a wider professional audience or the general public, their subject matter must be of interest to professional philosophers. All major pieces of research should be presented in some public fashion.
2. In the case of co-authored work, when the co-authors have shared the work equally, each may receive full credit for the work.
3. Invited papers, edited volumes, textbooks and computer software may be judged to be either major or minor, according to their merits.
4. Papers read at professional meetings or at the invitation of other universities are expected to show evidence of new work on the part of the candidate. They will be assessed according to such criteria as the scope, depth and quality of the paper, the nature of the occasion, and other relevant factors.
5. The same criteria as those governing books and papers will govern pieces of research which appear as computer software, performances, exhibitions, presentations, or activities in applied Philosophy.
6. Where possible, the standards used for published work will be used to assess research that does not appear as a printed publication.
7. To be included in the candidate's file any piece of research must be documented in a manner amenable to its evaluation by the DCTP and external reviewers. Copies of publications constitute appropriate

documentation. In the case of presentations and commentaries at professional meetings, audio-visual presentations, computer software, exhibitions, or performances, the provision of a transcript, videotape, audiotape, disk, or catalogue may constitute adequate documentation.

8. In order to demonstrate substantial achievement in the pursuit of their research interests, candidates for tenure and/or promotion have to show how the items in their file address and advance those interests. They should do so by means of a cover-letter to the file.

B. Criteria governing tenure at assistant or associate professor rank, and promotion to associate professor rank.

1. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor must show real promise that they will become leading scholars and researchers. Promise should be substantiated by tangible, developing evidence.
2. Normally, to be tenured at the Assistant or Associate rank, candidates must have a record of *significant* research since appointment at USC. This record ~~should~~ shall include major publications; other pieces of research will also be taken into consideration. In general, *significant* work makes a valuable contribution to on-going professional dialogue on issues in the candidate's field of expertise. Evidence of the significance of research can be supplied by the extent of the reputation of the candidate as demonstrated by, e.g., invitations to deliver papers and speak at conferences, invitations to contribute to edited volumes, requests to reprint the candidate's work, reviews of books, citations in the professional literature, etc. Evidence can also be supplied by judgments of the quality of the work made by Departmental and external colleagues.
2. Normally, all candidates for promotion to associate professor must have a record of *significant* research. This record shall include major publications; other pieces of research will also be taken into consideration. In general, *significant* work makes a valuable contribution to ongoing professional dialogue on issues in the candidate's field of expertise. Evidence of the significance of research can be supplied by the extent of the reputation of the candidate as demonstrated by, e.g., invitations to deliver papers and speak at conferences, invitations to contribute to edited volumes, requests to reprint the candidate's work, reviews of books, citations in the professional literature, etc. Evidence can also be supplied by judgments of the quality of the work made by Departmental and external colleagues.

C. Criteria governing tenure at the full professor rank, and promotion to full professor rank.

1. Promotion from associate professor to professor normally should be based on the fulfilled promise of having become a leading scholar and researcher. A move to the rank of professor normally should be accompanied by evidence of attainment of national or international stature in the candidate's field of expertise.
2. To be tenured at the full professor rank or to be promoted to full professor, requires the publication of major pieces of research since the previous promotion. The complete research record, the candidate's body of work, should be of sufficient scope and coherence to constitute an *important* contribution to a particular field or fields of Philosophy. In general, an *important* body of work will make a sustained contribution which advances the candidate's field of expertise. Several kinds of evidence can demonstrate the importance of a candidate's research record. One is that the candidate's work should have attracted attention in the form of comments, responses and reviews in the professional literature. Another is the reputation of the candidate, as demonstrated by, e.g., invitations to deliver papers and speak at conferences, invitations to contribute to edited volumes, requests to reprint the candidate's work, etc; normally, important work is accompanied by national and/or international stature in the field in question. Other evidence is supplied by judgments of the quality of the candidate's research made by Departmental and external colleagues.

III. Service

Recommendations concerning tenure and promotion are based primarily upon the quality of teaching and research. Although it does not compensate for weakness in teaching and research, service is also an important activity as it contributes to the advancement of the department, the university and the profession. Service will be taken into account as it contributes to the overall value of the faculty member to the department, the university and the profession.

A. Framework governing tenure at all ranks and promotion to associate and to full professor rank

Examples of important service are listed below; all service will be evaluated in terms of level of responsibility and quality of work performed. Normally, service for regional, national or international academic professional organizations, will count more than other kinds of service. The following are considered important service:

1. Departmental College, or University administration.
2. Service on Departmental committees.
3. Organizing of conferences and colloquia.
4. Supervising library ordering
5. Service on college and university committees, especially those which are policy making or to which the candidate can contribute his professional skills.
6. Representing the Department, college, or university at university hearings of public meetings.
7. Participation in professional societies; reviewing for journals, publishers, and granting agencies; membership on editorial boards.
8. Development of computer software that aids and assists scholarly work.
9. Student advisement.
10. Public service where it draws upon the candidate's professional training or where it furthers the teaching and scholarly work of the Department.

B. Criteria governing tenure at assistant or associate professor rank, and promotion to associate professor rank

1. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion from assistant professor to associate professor should normally provide a record of service including participation on various Departmental and/or University committees, participation in professional organizations in the candidate's field of expertise, and/or public service which draws upon the candidate's professional training.

C. Criteria governing tenure at the full professor rank, and promotion to full professor rank.

1. Candidates for promotion from associate professor to professor should normally provide a record of service including participation on various Departmental and/or University committees, participation in professional organizations in the candidate's field of expertise, and/or public service which draws upon the candidate's professional training. Typically this participation will involve more responsibility—e.g., chairing a committee, or serving in an administrative role in a professional society—than that expected for candidates for tenure and/or promotion from assistant professor to associate professor.

Tenure and Promotion Procedures

Department of Philosophy

University of South Carolina

Approved by the DCTP April 6, 1995
Revisions approved by the DCTP April 10, 1996
Additional revisions approved by the DCTP November 21, 1996

Departmental Committee on Tenure and Promotion

The committee on Tenure and Promotion in the Department of Philosophy (hereafter "DCTP") consists of all tenured members of the faculty in philosophy, with the following provisions: (1) in candidacies for tenure, only DCTP members who have rank equal to or higher than the candidate's shall have voice and vote; (2) in candidacies for promotion, only members who have rank higher than the candidate's shall have voice and vote; (3) the Chair of the Department shall, in matters affecting both tenure and promotion, be considered as a regular member of the faculty; however, the Chair of the Department shall vote on each file only once (the appropriate place to register such a vote normally* is the Department Chair's letter to the Dean); and (4) in candidacies for promotion or tenure concerning which fewer than five members of the DCTP are eligible to vote, those members shall propose to the Dean's office a sufficient number of additional faculty members of the appropriate rank from other departments.

By the second week in April of each spring semester the DCTP shall elect a tenured full professor to serve as its chair for the following academic year. The name of the person elected shall be reported to the Provost and to the chair of the UCTP. The chair of the DCTP shall not be the Chair of the Department except when no other full professor can serve.

It is the responsibility of the DCTP to make recommendations concerning promotions and tenure in accordance with the procedures set forth in this document and the "Criteria Governing Tenure and Promotion" of the Department of Philosophy, subject also to the relevant provisions of the Faculty Manual. The DCTP shall also be responsible for reviewing cases in which its recommendations are overruled. Finally, the DCTP shall be responsible for adopting and publishing statements of criteria and procedures governing tenure and promotion within the Department. Such criteria and procedures shall be in accordance with the Faculty Manual.

Procedures

The following procedures apply to applications for both tenure and promotion. If a candidate is applying for both tenure and promotion at the same time, the DCTP shall vote separately on the two applications. However, in such cases the candidate need prepare only one file to serve as the basis for both decisions.

Each year all non-tenured tenure-track faculty members shall have the opportunity to be considered for tenure and all tenured or tenure-track faculty members below the rank of full professor shall have the opportunity to be considered for promotion by the DCTP. Tenure regulations and maximum probationary periods are as specified in the Faculty Manual. By the second week of April potential candidates for tenure and/or promotion shall be advised in writing by the Chair of the Department of their option to be considered for tenure and/or promotion review in the fall semester. By the end of the third week of April faculty who have been so notified shall respond to the Department Chair indicating whether or not they will request tenure and/or promotion review in the fall semester. Thirty days prior to the date files are to be completed, the DCTP Chair shall verify that all eligible faculty have been notified of their option for tenure and/or promotion review. At this same time, the chair of the DCTP shall notify the Dean of the college and the Chair of the Department of the initial meeting of the committee and invite them to submit to the DCTP any information relevant to the committee's review.

* Where the words 'normally,' 'usually,' or 'it is possible that' occur, the intent is to provide for a rare exception to the stated general rule. In such a case, a justification for the departure from precedent will be sent forward with the file.

It is primarily the responsibility of the candidate to construct the file that shall be used by the DCTP in deciding on the candidate's application. The file should include those items of evidence which bear on whether or not the candidate has satisfied the criteria for tenure or promotion as set forth in the "Criteria Governing Tenure and Promotion" of the Department of Philosophy and in the Faculty Manual. Faculty appointed prior to January 1, 1995 may choose to be evaluated in terms of criteria set out in the document in force at the time of their appointment, or by those in force at the time of their application for tenure or promotion. Faculty members hired into the tenure track after January 1, 1995 will be responsible within their probationary period for meeting the unit tenure and promotion criteria and University standards in effect at the time of their hiring. For all subsequent promotions the faculty member will be responsible for meeting unit criteria and University standards in effect at the time of their application for that promotion. The file should include a copy of the relevant criteria document, signed by the candidate to indicate his or her awareness of the criteria being applied. Candidates should consult with the DCTP chair concerning the format and contents of the files. Failure of a potential candidate to submit a file by the date that the file is due in the hands of the DCTP shall be interpreted as a request by the potential candidate not to be considered.

At the earliest convenient time (usually by June 15), but in no case later than the date for submitting files, the candidate shall provide to the DCTP chair: (1) the candidate's up-to-date curriculum vitae, (2) a copy of each of the candidate's relevant publications, and (3) the names of at least five recognized scholars who are not members of the USC faculty and who are able to give an objective evaluation of the candidate's scholarship. The candidate may also at this time provide a list of no more than two names of persons who shall not serve as referees. Members of the DCTP shall select, by vote if necessary, up to seven additional names. The DCTP will then select at least five external referees from the combined list. The chair of the DCTP should make every reasonable effort to ensure that two-thirds of all external reviewers come from the DCTP list. Copies of all relevant materials, including the Department's criteria, will be sent to the referees sufficiently in advance of the decision to give them time to provide detailed and careful evaluations. The confidentiality of the referees' letters will be respected, to the extent allowed by law. Evaluations from the external referees shall accompany each candidate's file.

A copy of the candidates file including all supporting materials will be made available to all voting absentee members of the DCTP.

After the votes on the candidates, three lists shall be attached to the Chair's letter: 1) a list of persons not wishing to be considered; 2) a list of persons considered but not recommended at this time; 3) a list of persons recommended for tenure or promotion. There shall be no prejudice to future consideration with regard to persons on lists 1) and 2), except in the case of a candidate in the final decision year for tenure.

Lists 2) and 3) shall be determined in the following manner: the members of the DCTP who qualify as having voice and vote in the matter of the candidacy shall examine and discuss all material submitted. The chair of the DCTP shall notify qualified members who are or who expect to be on leave that in order to have voice and vote on a candidacy they must signify in writing prior to the first day of classes of the semester in which such considerations take place their intent to participate in the considerations of the DCTP. In each case, the chair of the DCTP shall have a ballot sent to all members of the committee eligible to vote on that case. Each such member shall vote privately "yes," "no," or "abstain" and return the ballot to the chair of the DCTP. Each vote (including abstentions) must be supported by a written justification, which may be unsigned, and which must be submitted to the DCTP chair within three working days of the day of the vote (unless otherwise agreed by the committee). A simple majority of "yes" votes among all those voting "yes" or "no" constitutes the committee's recommendation in favor of the candidate's application, be it for tenure or promotion. Less than a simple majority of "yes" votes among those voting "yes" or "no" constitutes the committee's decision not to recommend the candidate's application, be it for tenure or promotion. A record of the votes, including abstentions, is to be made in all instances. This record, and the written justifications, shall be forwarded when appropriate through all the proper channels. The chair of the DCTP will notify Departmental faculty of its recommendations for tenure and promotion and invite letters from the faculty regarding each candidate. Each faculty member, whether or not authorized to vote on a particular candidate, may, if he or she chooses, write a letter to the Department Chair or directly to the Dean, and such letters shall become part of the candidate's file at the level to which the letter is addressed.

Each faculty member who is considered shall be informed in writing by the Department Chair whether the recommendation was favorable or unfavorable. Faculty shall be informed as to whether the Department voted to recommend or not recommend the faculty member's application for tenure and/or promotion. The specific vote tally and the number of "yes" or "no" votes shall not be revealed to the candidate. Faculty members wishing to appeal unfavorable decisions of the DCTP must file written notice of appeal with the chair of the DCTP within one week of notification of

the Departmental committee's recommendation. The chair shall have the candidate's file sent forward through channels for consideration by the UCTP, and shall notify the faculty of all cases of appeal, inviting letters from them regarding each candidate filing an appeal.

Revision Procedures

Changes to or revisions of this document or the "Criteria Governing Tenure and Promotion" shall be discussed at a meeting of the entire Departmental faculty before being voted on by the DCTP. Such changes and revisions must also receive the approval of the UCTP prior to implementation.

Criteria Governing Tenure and Promotion

Department of Philosophy

University of South Carolina

Approved by the DCTP April 6, 1995

Revisions approved by the DCTP April 10, 1996

Additional revisions approved by the DCTP November 21, 1996

While it is recognized that faculty members display different strengths and abilities, it is normally* expected that they will be effective as teachers and that they will be presenting and publishing scholarly work and participating in professional societies. Contributions to the Department and university through service on committees and relevant public service will also be considered. Normally, teaching and research will count more than service of any sort. Teaching and research will have equal weight. Other relevant professional and personal characteristics may also be taken into account, such as length of service in the profession, relevant experience elsewhere, special administrative duties performed and supplementary education and training, as they affect the work of a faculty member; see the section on tenure and promotion procedures in the Faculty Manual.

In tenure and promotion decisions, the exact value placed upon any aspect of the candidate's record must in the end depend upon a judgment of its quality. The record must show significant achievements and give promise of further such achievements. Decisions take into account the complete professional record of the candidate. For the Departmental Committee on Tenure and Promotion (hereafter "DCTP"), the following considerations are especially important:

I. Teaching

Criteria Governing tenure at all ranks and promotion to associate and to full professor rank

The criteria are the same in all cases.

1. The DCTP expects that a candidate be a good teacher. A poor teacher will not be recommended for tenure or promotion regardless of achievements in other areas.
2. At a minimum, a teacher must perform the routines of teaching adequately: meeting classes, grading and returning papers promptly, and keeping regular office hours.
3. The Department of Philosophy expects the administration of a student evaluation form in every course offered in the fall and spring semesters. Normally a good teacher should receive student evaluations averaging between "good" and "excellent" in a range including "very poor, poor, fair, good, excellent." But student response is only one factor in the evaluation and it is not always sufficient evidence of good or poor teaching.
4. The candidate shall have at least three class sessions observed by one or more tenured faculty peers. These visitations shall occur during the period between the previous successful application for tenure and/or promotion, if any, and the current application. Written reports from these observers will serve as one source of evidence of the candidate's teaching ability.
5. Evidence that a candidate has contributed significantly to the academic and intellectual development of students is an additional item relevant to an assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness. The

* Where the words 'normally,' 'usually,' or 'it is possible that' occur, the intent is to provide for a rare exception to the stated general rule. In such a case, a justification for the departure from precedent will be sent forward with the file.

successful performance of students in advanced courses is one such kind of evidence, as are letters from graduates.

6. Courses should contain adequate content, be suited to the curriculum of the Department, and be of a rigor appropriate for a given level of instruction. To assist the DCTP, candidates shall make available several representative course syllabi and samples of examinations and handouts used in their courses.
7. Further evidence may include the direction of theses and dissertations as well as the direction of students in independent study.
8. Other relevant items that may be considered in an assessment of teaching are the candidate's having developed new, appropriate, and successful courses or having introduced effective new teaching techniques, such as the development or implementation of effective and appropriate teaching software, or having been a nominee for, or a recipient of, a teaching award. A successful course is one which contributes to the undergraduate program or the graduate program of the Department, as determined by faculty approval and student response.

II. Research

Three sections, A, B and C, follow. Section A specifies how the specific criteria set out in Sections B and C are to be understood. Specific criteria follow in sections II-B and II-C. Criteria set out in B apply only to candidates for tenure at the Assistant or Associate rank and to candidates for promotion to Associate rank. Criteria set out in C apply to candidates for tenure at Full Professor rank and to candidates for promotion to Full Professor rank.

A. Framework governing tenure at all ranks and promotion to associate and to full professor rank

1. The DCTP draws a distinction between *major* and *minor* pieces of research. While the determination has to be made by the DCTP, a minor piece of research typically consists in a book review, a short contribution published in a volume of un-refereed proceedings, a commentary delivered at a conference, or a short contribution in applied Philosophy. Minor pieces of research provide a fuller picture of the candidate's interest and abilities, but by themselves are not sufficient evidence of adequate scholarship. Major pieces of research provide this evidence by testifying to sustained inquiry, and by being of greater depth and/or significance than minor ones. Such major pieces of research typically consist in single or co-authored books, substantial refereed articles in journals or volumes of proceedings, or professionally significant translations. Extensive reports in applied Philosophy, if they are of broad enough scope to be of general interest, and if they are intellectually significant, may count as major pieces of research. Major pieces of research address other professionals in the same area of research, or, if they address a wider professional audience or the general public, their subject matter must be of interest to professional philosophers. All major pieces of research should be presented in some public fashion.
2. In the case of co-authored work, when the co-authors have shared the work equally, each may receive full credit for the work.
3. Invited papers, edited volumes, textbooks and computer software may be judged to be either major or minor, according to their merits.
4. Papers read at professional meetings or at the invitation of other universities are expected to show evidence of new work on the part of the candidate. They will be assessed according to such criteria as the scope, depth and quality of the paper, the nature of the occasion, and other relevant factors.
5. The same criteria as those governing books and papers will govern pieces of research which appear as computer software, performances, exhibitions, presentations, or activities in applied Philosophy.

6. Where possible, the standards used for published work will be used to assess research that does not appear as a printed publication.
7. To be included in the candidate's file any piece of research must be documented in a manner amenable to its evaluation by the DCTP and external reviewers. Copies of publications constitute appropriate documentation. In the case of presentations and commentaries at professional meetings, audio-visual presentations, computer software, exhibitions, or performances, the provision of a transcript, videotape, audiotape, disk, or catalogue may constitute adequate documentation.
8. In order to demonstrate substantial achievement in the pursuit of their research interests, candidates for tenure and/or promotion have to show how the items in their file address and advance those interests. They should do so by means of a cover-letter to the file.
9. Evidence of the *significance* of research can be supplied by the extent of the reputation of the candidate as demonstrated by, e.g., invitations to deliver papers and speak at conferences, invitations to contribute to edited volumes, requests to reprint the candidate's work, etc. Evidence can also be supplied by judgments of the quality of the work made by Departmental and external colleagues.
10. Several kinds of evidence can demonstrate the *importance* of a candidate's research record. One is that the candidate's work should have attracted attention in the form of comments, responses and reviews in the professional literature. Another is the reputation of the candidate, as demonstrated by, e.g., invitations to deliver papers and speak at conferences, invitations to contribute to edited volumes, requests to reprint the candidate's work, etc. Other evidence is supplied by judgments of the quality of the candidate's research made by Departmental and external colleagues.

B. Criteria governing tenure at assistant or associate professor rank, and promotion to associate professor rank

1. Normally, to be tenured at the Assistant or Associate rank, candidates must have a record of significant research since appointment at USC. This record shall include major publications; other pieces of research will also be taken into consideration (see II-A-9).
2. Normally, all candidates for promotion to associate professor must have a record of significant research. This record shall include major publications; other pieces of research will also be taken into consideration.(see II-A-9).

C. Criteria governing tenure at the full professor rank, and promotion to full professor rank

To be tenured at the full professor rank or to be promoted to full professor, requires the publication of major pieces of research since the previous promotion. The complete research record should be of sufficient scope and coherence to constitute an important contribution to a particular field or fields of Philosophy.(see II-A-10). These criteria elucidate criteria found in the Faculty Manual (pp. 23-5).

III. Service

Criteria governing tenure at all ranks, and promotion to associate professor rank, and to full professor rank

The criteria are the same in all cases. Examples of important service are listed below; all service will be evaluated in terms of level of responsibility and quality of work performed. Normally, service for regional, national or international academic professional organizations, will count more than other kinds of service. The following are considered important service:

1. Departmental College, or University administration.
2. Service on Departmental committees.
3. Organizing of conferences and colloquia.
4. Supervising library ordering
5. Service on college and university committees, especially those which are policy making or to which the candidate can contribute his professional skills.
6. Representing the Department, college, or university at university hearings of public meetings.
7. Participation in professional societies; reviewing for journals, publishers, and granting agencies; membership on editorial boards.
8. Development of computer software that aids and assists scholarly work.
9. Student advisement.
10. Public service where it draws upon the candidate's professional training or where it furthers the teaching and scholarly work of the Department.