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Overview:

In order to support its own mission and the broader mission of The College at Brockport, State University of New York, the Department of Communication holds the hiring and development of a balanced, reputable, and effective tenure-track faculty as a primary goal. As such, the guidelines in this document describe a set of performance expectations for faculty. Importantly, the evaluation of faculty performance is holistic, and, therefore, the guidelines here should not be construed as explicating a set of criteria that are sufficient for a positive recommendation. Ultimately, personnel decisions to appoint, reappoint, and promote faculty rest with the College’s President.

From the College’s Faculty Guide:

Departmental APT documents are explicit in describing the guidelines for evaluating teaching and the expected teaching loads for the department; the kinds of scholarship considered appropriate to the discipline and the quantity and quality measures used in determining appropriate scholarship for rank; and the department’s system of weighting the relative importance of teaching, scholarship, and service (though as a general rule, teaching must always be weighted at least 50% and scholarship must be weighted more heavily than service). Of course, departments can only make personnel recommendations. Ultimately, only the College President (in consultation with the school deans and academic VP) makes personnel decisions. These department APT documents are reviewed and approved by the deans and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Accordingly, they represent the minimum guidelines agreed to by College Administration in making these decisions. These guidelines in these departmental documents describe a set of minimal (necessary) performance expectations. They should not be construed, however, as explicating a set of criteria that are sufficient for a positive recommendation. Minimal expectations will be taken into consideration as part of a thorough and comprehensive evaluation of the candidate’s professional performance and contributions. Furthermore, the comprehensive evaluation should consider both retrospective and prospective points of view, including, for instance, the candidate’s potential for achieving and/or performing at the highest academic rank.
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DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION  
MISSION STATEMENT

The Department of Communication, through faculty scholarship, course offerings, student internships, extracurricular activities, and independent studies, is committed to providing an environment where students engage in scholarly, theoretical, applied, and experiential learning opportunities. Through teaching, research, and service, the Department’s faculty seeks to mentor students to become effective, responsible oral and written communicators and lifelong learners, prepared to function in a globally interdependent community.

General Principles and Evaluation Process

1. Faculty performance is measured in three areas: teaching effectiveness, scholarly productivity, and service contributions. Faculty are expected to meet departmental standards in all three areas. Additional or superlative work in one area cannot compensate for absence of work in another.

2. The standard teaching load for tenure-track faculty is three courses (consisting of three semester credits each) every semester for faculty demonstrating an active program of scholarship and service responsibilities.

3. College policy assigns to faculty who do not meet expectations in an active program of scholarship additional teaching and/or service assignments. It is the expectation of the Department of Communication that all of its faculty will be engaged in an active program of scholarship.

4. Tenured faculty may occasionally undertake workload readjustment to reflect short-term or long-term individual professional priorities or to respond to the needs of the department or college.

5. The faculty annual report is the central document in all performance evaluations, although it should be supplemented by additional documentation.

6. Departmental policies may be abrogated or superseded by college or SUNY policies.

Further, in accordance with College policy, the review process shall take place in the following order:

1. Faculty applicant/nominee  
2. Department APT Committee  
3. Department faculty  
4. Department Chair  
5. School Dean  
6. Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs  
7. College President
**Composition of Departmental Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committees**

Academic credentials and performance should be reviewed by those with similar knowledge and experience; therefore (with the exception of the Faculty Senate Observer/Consultant), only teaching faculty should be members of APT committees reviewing teaching faculty. All members of departmental APT committees should have continuing appointment. In the case of promotions, only those who have attained the rank of Associate Professor or higher may serve on the APT committee. In the case of promotion to Professor, the APT committee must include at least one Professor. If a Professor is not available among the members of the department, the dean, after consulting the Chair and members of the faculty in the department, will appoint an emeritus Professor from the department, or a Professor from another department, to the APT committee for the purpose of reviewing the promotion to Professor.

The department of the whole (all eligible faculty members as described below, including departmental members of the APT committee, but with the exclusion of the department Chair) registers its agreement with the recommendation of the APT committee. This vote does not involve the creation of a separate report, but the numerical tally recording the vote should be communicated to the Chair, Dean, Provost, and the President. Only the overall voting result is communicated to the entire department, not the tally of votes.

**Voting Process**

- All tenured or tenure-track faculty members who have successfully gone through their first-year renewal process may vote on departmental matters, including APT matters
- Only those who have reviewed an applicant’s materials may vote on applications for reappointment, continuing appointment and tenure, and promotion to professor
- Voting is done by secret ballot, administered by the departmental secretary, and is done independently outside of meetings
- Each individual who is eligible to vote has the right to freely and independently review and adjudicate an application and to undertake this process without pressure from others
- Any faculty member may abstain from voting without consequence

**Quorum**

Greater than 50% of the eligible departmental faculty must be present for meetings and votes to be considered official business. All APT decisions and votes assume the presence of a quorum for eligible voting faculty.

**Favorable Vote**

A favorable or supportive vote is constituted by greater than 50% of the eligible faculty.
Standards for Evaluating Teaching, Scholarship and Service Performance

Evaluation of Teaching

Values

The Department of Communication believes that teaching is its central function. Given this, the Department expects its faculty to embody the following values of excellence in teaching:

Student-centered Teaching

- Effective and appropriate pedagogical techniques, as is evidenced by course design, clarity of expectations, and use of teaching methods that promote student learning
- Engagement of students with high impact practices that are intellectually stimulating
- Pedagogical methods that are inclusive of a diverse student body
- Evidence of teaching excellence in the form of student evaluations of teaching, anonymous written feedback from students, peer observations of one’s teaching, and teaching materials such as syllabi, assignment descriptions, and samples of graded work

Rigor

- Instruction that involves a combination of high expectations for student performance, challenging learning experiences and assignments, and grade distributions that reflect adherence to rigorous standards (e.g., undergraduate: A = excellent, C = average, graduate A = excellent, B = Average)
- Evidence of rigor in forms including but not limited to assignment descriptions, samples of graded work, rubrics, individual assignment and final grade distributions

Support and Mentoring

- Maintaining at least four regularly-scheduled office hours per week
- Being accessible to and supportive of students
- Providing reasonable and effective support to students who have questions, need guidance, or are struggling to succeed
- Mentoring, advocating for, and helping students meet their academic and future professional goals
- When appropriate, faculty may provide advisement on students’ independent studies, theses, and related projects. Projects like these will be evaluated as a teaching activity

Continual Development

- Maintaining currency within one’s area of expertise
• Continual efforts to develop and improve as a teacher, in part, in response to feedback provided by the department’s TEC, as explained below
• Within the context of departmental needs, development of new courses, revision of existing courses, and teaching a variety of types of courses

* Candidates will be evaluated on the values noted above. However, the APT Committee may consider other evidence outside of the applicant’s file that has a bearing on a candidate’s teaching performance such as professionalism or other issues that may impact students.

Progress in these areas will be assessed using a three-person Teaching Evaluation Committee (TEC) for each candidate’s application for renewal, tenure, and/or promotion. One committee member will be chosen by the candidate, another by the APT Committee Chair, and the third by the first two committee members. Unless circumstances warrant choosing someone from outside of the department, the TEC will consist of voting members of the department. Although it may include tenure-track faculty, the majority should be tenured. A candidate’s TEC will submit a report for all major personnel actions (first reappointment, fifth-year reappointment, continuing appointment with promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to Professor). For the continuing-appointment action, because a report would have been completed during the previous year, the TEC may simply update the candidate’s materials for that one intervening year. The report will be submitted by the end of the spring semester before a candidate applies for a personnel action. The process will begin as early as a year before the personnel action and no later than the beginning of the spring semester before the personnel action and will involve the following activities:

• The candidate submits a statement of teaching philosophy to the TEC
• The candidate provides the TEC with teaching materials for the period under review (if the period is quite long, then the materials should come from the previous 4-5 years), including but not limited to: syllabi, assignment descriptions, samples of graded work, teaching evaluation scores and timely written feedback, grade distributions, examples of professional development efforts, evidence of mentoring, etc.
• Each member of the TEC will observe the candidate teach at least one class session, and ideally more than one session
• The candidate will give the TEC lists of current students who have earned As, Bs, and Cs (approximately 5-8 for each grade range) and the committee will interview approximately 1-3 from each grade level. All three TEC members will interview students (one at a time) as a panel
• The TEC also considers additional evidence such as student accomplishments and relevant service contributions that promote student success and engaged learning (e.g., advisement and mentorship, supervision of independent studies and theses, advisement of student clubs, research conducted with students)
• The TEC will compile their report with attention to the candidate’s progress with respect to the department’s four core teaching values
• The TEC will share a draft of the report with the candidate and then interview the candidate. During the interview the candidate will have an opportunity to suggest any corrections to the report and the TEC will have an opportunity to ask for clarification on any questions or issues that emerged from the review process.
• The TEC then will finalize their report and submit it to the department Chair. Their report will be included in the Teaching section of the dossier that the candidate submits for the personnel action in the fall semester.

Note: For purposes of routine guidance, if not already accomplished through the normal TEC process, the department chair and/or a member of the APT committee will observe teaching on a yearly basis to provide feedback for improvement, especially for faculty on the tenure track or pursuing promotion to professor

Expected Progression as a Teacher

As tenure-track faculty advance through their careers at Brockport, it is expected that some of the following indicators of professional development are demonstrated:

• Refining courses (assignments, teaching methods, feedback to students) in ways that reflect increasingly effective instruction
• Developing new undergraduate and graduate courses (an indicator of increasing mastery)
• Remaining current with advancements in one’s field
• Engaging in professional development opportunities
• When appropriate, incorporating new methodologies into one’s teaching
• Taking on an increasing mentorship role of students (early on the focus is mostly on teaching courses well; over time, faculty can play a greater mentoring role)
• Particularly as one approaches Professor status, serving as a model of excellent teaching and mentoring junior faculty in the area of teaching

Evaluation of Teaching Portfolio: Expectations Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

For each type of reappointment/promotion listed below, a few considerations are provided. This progression reveals the kind of growth that is expected throughout a faculty member’s career:

Initial reappointment as Assistant Professor (2nd year review): Candidate demonstrates

• General competence in pedagogical methods
• Reasonable rigor for a faculty member who is adjusting to working with new students
• Support of students
• Efforts to develop one’s teaching

There are no major concerns and available evidence suggests the potential for meaningful improvement and increasing success as a teacher.

Second reappointment as Assistant Professor (5th year review): Candidate has made meaningful progress in any areas of concern/improvement outlined in the previous review, in addition to demonstrating an overall progression in the area of teaching. Furthermore, the candidate demonstrates

• Sound pedagogical methods
• Sufficient rigor
• Consistent and effective support and mentoring of students
• A record of engaging in professional development in the area of teaching

There are no major concerns and available evidence suggests the candidate has the potential to demonstrate mastery as a teacher.

**Continuing appointment (tenure/promotion to Associate Professor):** Candidate has made meaningful progress in any areas of concern/improvement outlined in the previous review (to the extent possible within a one-year time period). The candidate has a deepened understanding of relevant subject matter, has grown in meaningful ways as a teacher, and embodies the department’s teaching values. The candidate has demonstrated

- Mastery of pedagogical techniques
- Rigorous instruction
- Strong support and mentoring of students
- A record of professional development in the area of teaching

There are no major concerns and available evidence suggests the candidate has the potential to positively influence teaching within the department and take on an increasing leadership role in mentoring junior faculty in the area of teaching.

**Promotion to Professor:** Since promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate has demonstrated

- Continued and meaningful progress as a teacher in terms of demonstrating a deepening mastery of subject matter
- Teaching methods that reflect advancement and sophistication as a teacher
- Highly-effective engagement with students both in and out of the classroom
- Effective mentorship of junior faculty in the area of teaching

There are no major concerns and available evidence suggests the candidate will continue to serve as an exemplary teacher for years to come.

**Evaluation of Scholarship**

Faculty engagement in scholarship is essential to maintaining a high-quality learning environment for both undergraduate and graduate students. Scholarship includes the discovery, integration, and application of knowledge as well as the scholarship of teaching and learning.

**Values**

The department takes into consideration the following values when evaluating scholarship:
- **Quality:** The highest standard involves a process of blind peer review/adjudication and revision. We recognize publication in international, national, and regional journals as the strongest indicator of scholarly quality. It is further demonstrated by the reputation of the publication outlet or academic forum, outlet acceptance rates, the public impact of the work, its contribution to the advancement of knowledge or instruction, and evaluation by external peers who themselves have a record of scholarly achievement and expertise.
• **Quantity:** The highest standard involves establishing a record of multiple scholarly works, including publications, conference papers, works in progress, etc. that reflect a coherent research agenda
  
• **Cadence:** The highest standard involves sustained scholarly activity as evidenced by an ongoing scholarly agenda and steady stream of submissions and works in progress
  
• **Authorship:** While both individual and collaborative works are valued, the highest standard involves at least some works being single- or lead-authored

**Variable Expectations**

Faculty are expected to be actively engaged in scholarship through the progression of their career, with variable expectations in light of one’s rank and in balance with teaching and service obligations. The department readily recognizes the following characteristics as common indicators of advancement in the area of scholarship:
  
• Development of a sustained research agenda
• Development of works of greater magnitude (e.g., a book, a series of articles, more in-depth studies)
• Involvement of students in research projects
• Professional or public impact of research as demonstrated by awards, publication citations, and other indicators of one’s reputation

**Levels of Scholarly Activity**

The department recognizes a variety of scholarly activities as indicators of faculty engagement in the discovery, integration, and/or application of knowledge. The level of activity of any particular work should be evidenced by appropriate documentation in the candidate’s scholarship portfolio. *The following examples of levels of scholarly productivity are intended to be representative rather than exhaustive:*

**Level 1:** Published peer-reviewed or adjudicated products, such as scholarly books, textbooks, monographs, or electronic equivalents.

• A peer-reviewed monograph or textbook may count for up to four level-two works. To do so, it must meet agreed upon approximate guideposts such as 1) be a single-authored text, 2) contain five or more chapters, and 3) be contracted with a reputable publisher.

• Monographs or textbooks which are co-authored or contain fewer chapters will be prorated accordingly by using the above as the full equivalent of four level-two works. In exceptional circumstances, however, the above guideposts such as single authorship or number of chapters may be adjusted.

• Distinctions are made among international, national, regional, local, university, academic, commercial, and vanity presses

**Level 2:** Published peer-reviewed or adjudicated products, such as published articles, book chapters, reviews, and peer-reviewed proceedings in refereed scholarly outlets (print or electronic), edited books, and successfully funded grants.
• Distinctions are made among international, national, regional, local, university, academic, commercial, and vanity presses
• Some invited works such as journal articles or book chapters may be best characterized as Level 2 works on a case-by-case basis to the extent that they are peer adjudicated and appear in reputable outlets
• Grant activity should be documented with similar distinctions made among international, national, state, etc. funding agencies

Level 3: Non-refereed products, such as published articles, book chapters, textbook ancillaries, proceedings, and public scholarship in non-refereed outlets (print or electronic) and professional training seminars and consulting activity.

• Distinctions are made for scholarly works or those that have received some form of recognition or honors that speak to a work’s merit or impact
• Quality of professional training seminars and consulting activity should be clarified based on context, scope, significance, and extent to which the activity is based upon the faculty member’s expertise

Level 4: Submitted, accepted, and presented papers and panels, preliminary research projects, works in progress, and grant proposals.

• Distinctions should be made between competitively and noncompetitively selected works as well as international, national, state, etc. scholarly forums
• Works in progress should include explanation of plans for submission

Additional Evidence of Scholarly Achievement and Impact

The following illustrative examples of additional activities is not exhaustive or ranked, but may be integrated into a scholarship portfolio as further evidence of scholarly engagement and expertise at any level.
• Invited public or university lecture
• Interview about one’s research with a news outlet
• Guest writer for a reputable blog or news source
• Invited or non-refereed book review
• Forward or introduction for another author’s book
• Citations of one’s work in reputable scholarly publications
• Book contracts
• Note: Faculty may advise student theses or other substantial projects that eventually result in co-presented or co-authored published works. In these cases, the product counts as a scholarly contribution
Evaluation of Scholarship Portfolio: Expectations for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion to Professor

Like teaching, faculty scholarship is evaluated in relation to the following stages of progression:

**Initial appointment as Assistant Professor:** The candidate should have earned a PhD (or related terminal degree) in Communication (or related disciplinary area) and demonstrated promise of a continued commitment to produce scholarship.

*Note:* Employment as a full-time Lecturer at the college does not count toward a future tenure position. In contrast, time at the college as a full-time Instructor does count toward the tenure clock.

**Initial reappointment as Assistant Professor (2nd year review):** Because the candidate has been employed for just one year, she or he may have few scholarly products completed. However, the candidate should demonstrate a continued commitment to producing scholarship through presentation of research at conferences, submission of works for refereed or adjudicated publication, and/or development of works in progress.

**Second reappointment as Assistant Professor (5th year review):** Collectively, the candidate’s works should embody the department’s values of quality, quantity, cadence, and authorship. Specifically, sufficient progress is evidenced by having at least two or more peer-reviewed or adjudicated works (see Levels 1 and 2) and evidence that other types of scholarly products (see Levels 3 and 4) have a strong potential to become Level 1 or 2 works in time for the application for continuing appointment. *Note:* One in-production Level 1 work can be counted as a Level 1 work with clear evidence that the author’s work on the project is complete (e.g., the work is typeset, in production, etc.) but not yet in print. Similarly, one Level 2 work that is completed but not yet in print can be counted (e.g., accepted, completed, scheduled for a specific journal issue, etc.).

**Continuing appointment (tenure/promotion to Associate Professor):** Collectively, the candidate’s works should embody the department’s values of quality, quantity, cadence, and authorship. The candidate should demonstrate the ability to publish independent research and make a significant contribution to the field. Consistent with the College’s guidelines for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor, *at a minimum the candidate should have published four peer-reviewed or adjudicated works or their equivalent* (see Levels 1 and 2) combined with other scholarly products that demonstrate a trajectory for future publication (see Levels 3 and 4).

Of the works a candidate submits, a preponderance should be traditionally blind peer-reviewed or adjudicated. The candidate may consult the APT Committee, who will work with the Department Chair and Dean to consider other scholarly products.

**Promotion to Professor:** Collectively, the candidate’s works should embody the department’s values of quality, quantity, cadence and authorship. The candidate should demonstrate notable development in scholarship since being appointed to Associate Professor as evidenced by the publication of a significant book (see Level 1), the sustained output of articles/chapters in reputable journals/books (see Levels 2), and/or some combination of such works. At least two
works should have been published within the five years prior to applying for promotion. Evidence of sustained commitment to scholarly productivity should also be demonstrated (see Level 4).

Credit for Prior Scholarly Works

- Consistent with college policy, faculty may have work published during a period prior to their employment at The College at Brockport count in their promotion and tenure applications. Such inclusions should be requested and negotiated at the time of the job offer and acceptance.

Evaluation of Service

Service contributions are important in maintaining the vitality of an academic community. According to the Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee Final Report (1998), faculty service “encompasses governance of the department, the school, the college, the university, or the profession, as well as discipline-based or college mission oriented contributions to the community that are not included in scholarship.” Examples of governance include but are not limited to:

- At the departmental level, attending department and committee meetings, advising students for registration, working at registration sessions, representing the department at admissions open houses, and reviewing colleagues’ teaching
- At the school level, serving on award and ad-hoc committees
- At the college level, serving on the College Senate, participating in college-wide committees, serving in college administrative roles, and advising college-wide student organizations
- At the university level, serving in the University Senate and SUNY ad hoc committees
- At the professional level, providing leadership in discipline-based organizations and serving on editorial boards for journals or serving as an ad hoc journal reviewer
- At the community level, offering leadership and guidance related to a faculty member’s area of professional expertise

Although service can be demonstrated at multiple levels, the department’s well-being is foundational. Consistent with their rank, faculty members should contribute meaningfully and proportionately to departmental service to maintain quality curriculum, programs, assessment, advisement, recruitment, and collegial relations. As faculty advance in experience and rank, they are encouraged to make service contributions beyond the department.

Characteristics of Effective Service

The department values the following as characteristics of effective service:

- **Citizenship:** Faculty members should demonstrate the ability to negotiate multiple and potentially conflicting service roles. Simultaneously, they should establish a commitment to the successful functioning of the department and to promoting and extending the department’s interests at multiple levels (e.g., school, college, community).
• **Active participation**: Whereas membership refers to one’s assigned status or role in a group, active participation refers to one’s tangible contributions (e.g., completing a committee report or collaborating with peers in solving a problem). Active participation is valued over membership.

• **Quality of contributions**: Faculty members should demonstrate the ability to complete significant projects that require sustained effort, effectiveness, and initiative. Quality is generally valued over quantity of contributions.

• **Leadership**: Faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they can successfully work well with their colleagues, organize cooperative ventures, and establish and meet deadlines. Examples of leadership include chairing or co-chairing a committee, serving as a director or coordinator for the department or college, initiating service projects with peers, and preparing essential reports or documents. Leadership is generally valued over participation.

### Minimum Departmental Service Activities

The basic minimum requirements of service include:

- Attending department and area meetings on a regular basis
- Providing quality academic advising to students who are registering for classes
- Participating in important department functions (e.g., open houses, late registration sessions, special events, etc.)
- Attending significant university functions (e.g., Academic Convocation, Undergraduate and Graduate Commencement Ceremonies)

### Departmental Roles and Expectations

Departmental service obligations, roles, and committees are detailed in the department’s constitution. However, for the purpose of clarity, it is useful to distinguish between these roles:

- Leadership positions entail active facilitation of collaboration among peers. Examples of leadership positions include department Chair, graduate director, and APT Committee chair.
- Coordinator positions, while not precluding collaboration, emphasize individual efforts to complete designated projects. Examples include assessment coordinator and advisement coordinator.
- Representation positions involve representing the department in college-wide forums (e.g., UUP, College Senate)

### Expectations For Junior Faculty Members

Barring unique and/or extraordinary circumstances, tenure-track (i.e., junior) faculty will have fewer service requirements than tenured faculty. Additionally, service expectations for junior faculty members will be primarily at the departmental level:

- First-year faculty will have a small advising load and may have limited roles at late registration events, open houses, and other events
• By their third year, junior faculty will have an expanding role but will serve in no more than two department coordinator or representation roles prior to the fifth-year review.
• Junior faculty will not serve in major leadership positions until at least their fifth year.

Expectations For Tenured Faculty Members

Once tenured, beyond performing the minimum service obligations for the department, they should have an expanded role. Tenured faculty members are:
• Involved in department, school, and college governance.
• Involved with department, school, and college events, activities, and programs.
• Involved in service at multiple levels, including department, college, university, community, and professional. (Community service must be linked to the faculty member’s scholarly expertise.)

Evidence of Service to the Field

• Invited response to a conference presentation
• Organizing and/or chairing conference panels or programs
• Chairing a professional association interest group
• Editorial board membership
• Guest editor for a special issue of a journal
• Participation in scholarly conferences, workshops, or institutes

Evaluating of Service Portfolio: Expectations for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion to Professor

Initial reappointment as Assistant professor (2nd year review): The candidate’s early service activities should suggest that in the coming years the candidate will embody the department’s values of citizenship, active participation, quality of contributions, and leadership. At this point a candidate may have few service accomplishments to note in their application. However, the candidate should (1) meet minimum departmental service obligations; (2) participate actively in departmental activities; (3) demonstrate quality contributions in their service role(s); and (4) demonstrate potential to succeed in coordinator roles in the future. In addition, there should be no major causes for concern regarding the candidate’s service or citizenship within the department.

Second reappointment as Assistant professor (5th year review): The candidate’s service record should embody the department’s values of citizenship, active participation, quality of contributions, and leadership. Specifically, the candidate should (1) consistently meet minimum departmental service obligations; (2) demonstrate effectiveness in at least one departmental coordinator role; (3) participate actively in departmental committees and functions; (4) regularly make quality contributions in service activities; (5) demonstrate leadership, active participation, and/or quality contributions in at least one venture outside of the department (e.g., college, university, community); and (6) demonstrate the likelihood of continued success in the area of service. In addition, there should be no major causes for concern regarding the candidate’s service or citizenship within the department.
Continuing appointment (tenure/promotion to Associate Professor): The candidate’s service record should embody the department’s values of citizenship, active participation, quality of contributions, and leadership. Specifically, the candidate should (1) consistently meet minimum departmental service obligations; (2) demonstrate effectiveness in at least one departmental coordinator role; (3) participate actively in departmental committees and functions; (4) regularly make quality contributions in service activities; and (5) demonstrate leadership, active participation, and/or quality contributions in at least one venture outside of the department (e.g., college, university, community). Additionally, the candidate should have demonstrated growth since the last review and the potential for increasing leadership. Finally, there should be no major causes for concern regarding the candidate’s service or citizenship within the department.

Promotion to Professor: The candidate’s service record should embody the department’s values of citizenship, active participation, quality of contributions, and leadership. Specifically, the candidate should (1) consistently meet departmental service obligations; (2) demonstrate effectiveness in coordinator roles; (3) participate actively in departmental committees and functions; (4) regularly make quality contributions in service activities; (5) demonstrate effective leadership in service roles at multiple levels; and (6) engage in professional service and/or service to the community. Additionally, the candidate should have shown growth since the last review and set an example of leadership that encourages an environment of collegiality, support, and departmental health. Finally, there should be no major causes for concern regarding the candidate’s service or citizenship within the department.

Portfolio Development

Candidates preparing portfolios for APT Committee review should consult the guidelines in this document carefully and select supporting materials that demonstrate the relevant expectations for faculty performance. The dean of the School of Arts and Sciences may provide additional guidance for the development and presentation of portfolio materials.

Consulting and Outside Employment

Faculty should coordinate any outside employment or consulting opportunities with the Department Chairperson and be willing to comply with all relevant College and University Policies.