

MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

PERIODIC REVIEW OF REAPPOINTMENT (OR RENEWAL OF CONTRACT),
TENURE, PROMOTION GUIDELINES

DEPARTMENT: School of Accountancy
COLLEGE: Business
SEMESTER/YEAR OF CURRENT REVIEW: Fall 2017
SEMESTER/YEAR OF NEXT REQUIRED REVIEW: Summer 2020

DEPARTMENT ADOPTION SIGNATURES:

Don Schreiber 4-28-2017
Department Personnel Committee Chair Date
[Signature] 4-28-17
Department Head Date

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

[Signature] 4-28-17
Dean Date
Chris Craig 4-28-17
Provost Date

THIS PLAN IS IN EFFECT FROM 2017, THROUGH 2020.

APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REVIEW POLICIES
SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTANCY
2017-2020

I. INTRODUCTION

Appointment, promotion, tenure, and review policies of the School of Accountancy are constrained to be consistent with the *Faculty Handbook*, and with other University policies. The School's policies also are consistent with those of the College of Business (COB). In cases of conflict, *Faculty Handbook* policies are followed in all cases.

The initial contract with the University and the annual role negotiation with the School Director both present opportunities for role specialization to each faculty member. Both Director and Peer evaluation of a faculty member must be on a basis consistent with that faculty member's role as determined by these two factors. Nevertheless, the *Faculty Handbook* clearly requires performance in all of the three traditional areas of teaching, research, and service as prerequisite to tenure and to promotions. In addition, the School of Accountancy expects collegiality of all faculty members, both before and after tenure/promotion. Therefore, roles of those faculty with an interest in tenure or in promotion must be negotiated with the School Director in such a way as to permit demonstration of acceptable levels of performance in all three areas.

The SOA Director shall supply new faculty with a copy of the SOA tenure and promotion guidelines in effect on the date of hire. During the first month of full-time employment the new faculty member shall meet with the Director to clarify the expectations of the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) document and to sign a copy of the P&T documents. The original copy should be placed in the faculty's personnel file, and a copy of the signed document should also be given to the candidate. If the SOA P&T guidelines change during the faculty member's probationary period, the faculty candidate has the right to be evaluated using the documents in effect at the time they were hired or they may elect to be evaluated under the new guidelines. If the candidate elects to use the new P&T documents, the Director and the candidate must sign the revised documents, again placing the original copy in the faculty's personnel file, and providing a second signed copy to the faculty member.

II. COMMITTEES

The Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T Committee) of the School of Accountancy shall consist of all tenured faculty of the School except for those acting in a university administrative appointment, those who have been officially notified of termination for reasons other than retirement, and those who are currently under sanction. The P&T Committee shall operate as an autonomous unit; therefore, the SOA Director shall not make decisions regarding its composition, actions, nor participate in its proceedings. The committee chair shall be the committee member with the highest rank, and in the case where one or more members have the same rank, the member with the most years of service to the university. If someone has served as the chair of the committee for three consecutive years, another member who consents to serve as chair may be elected by a majority affirmative vote of the committee members, but shall not serve more than one year unless re-elected in the following 2 years, at which time the highest

ranking member with the most seniority must serve again. Faculty are expected to serve, but shall abstain from any evaluation that involves a conflict of interest (e.g., evaluation of a spouse). The Committee is also responsible for annual appointment recommendations and for the annual review of untenured faculty that occur each year during the probationary period.

The Promotion Committee is a subset of the Promotion and Tenure Committee that shall consist of all tenured members reduced by those faculty of rank below that for which the candidate is applying and those upon whose applications the Promotion Committee would be acting. When the candidate is applying for the rank of Distinguished Professor, an exception shall be made to allow members of the Promotion Committee who have obtained the rank of Professor to still serve.

If the School of Accountancy P&T Committee/Promotion Committee should have less than three qualified members from the department, the committee membership must be supplemented by College of Business faculty from other departments. The resulting committee must have at least three members, and no more than five members. The supplemental committee members are to be chosen by the Dean, based on recommendations from the P&T Committee Chair and the faculty candidate.

III. PROCESSES

All processes shall follow the schedule and adhere to the deadlines published by the Provost's office. The candidate's application will be presented to the chair of the P&T Committee, who will undertake security of the application dossier. The P&T Committee will make the original recommendation in all cases involving promotion, tenure, or appointment. If there is a split vote among the tenured faculty, the minority may file a report, signed by each member of the minority, which will be forwarded with the majority recommendation.

For Re-Appointment: The candidate shall initiate the annual appointment process, submitting relevant materials to the chair of the P&T Committee at a date specified by the Committee. The P&T Committee will make the initial recommendation and forward it to the Director, who will then add his/her recommendation and forward both to the Dean. The Director shall not be a participant in the voting or deliberations of the P&T Committee. Copies of P&T Committee and Director recommendations shall be provided to the candidate, who must acknowledge by signature receipt of the P&T Committee's and the Director's recommendations before forwarding can occur.

For Pre-Tenure Review: All non-tenured, ranked probationary faculty members shall apply for annual review as a prerequisite to reappointment each year. Annual reappointment reviews of probationary tenure-track faculty members will conform to departmental guidelines and timelines set forth in this document as well as requirements set forth by the Provost Office. The dates the university follows are set by AAUP guidelines. Probationary faculty shall submit a reappointment application to the chairperson of the SOA Promotion and Tenure Committee. The application shall be placed in a notebook with tabs. At a minimum, the following items should be included in the application: letters of understanding at the time of hire, the SOA P&T documents signed by the faculty member and the Director, all previous annual performance

reviews and recommendations, all student evaluation summaries, at least one classroom peer review, all published articles and all manuscripts under review, a list of service activities, and an updated matrix of accomplishments in accordance with SOA tenure and promotion guidelines. If a person is hired ABD, their satisfactory progress toward completion of the terminal degree should be considered in the annual review.

Faculty in their first year at the University must file an application for reappointment to the SOA Office by the date specified in the *Provost's Calendar for Faculty Evaluation, Tenure & Promotion, and Reappointment* (hereafter, referred to as the "Provost's required date"). Notification of re-appointment will occur by March 1. If the first year reappointment letter indicates a serious concern of the faculty member's progress, then the faculty in the second year of their contract must apply by the end of October, and satisfactory progress will result in reappointment for year 3, but an unsatisfactory amount of progress will result in notification of non-reappointment by December 15 of the second year of service. However, if the first year reappointment letter indicates that no such concern exists, the faculty member must submit their annual reappointment materials by the Provost's required date and their appointment will be renewed for the third year if they are making appropriate progress. Faculty members in the third year must apply by the Provost's required date, and will be renewed for through the fourth year if the faculty member is making appropriate progress, or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before the expiration of their appointment. Faculty members in the fourth year will apply by the Provost's required date and will be renewed through the fifth year if they are making appropriate progress, or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before the expiration of their appointment. Faculty members in their fifth year will apply by the Provost's required date and will be renewed through the sixth year if they are making appropriate progress, or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before the expiration of their appointment. Faculty members in their sixth year will be notified of receiving tenure or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before the expiration of their appointment.

Renewal or Nonrenewal of Contract: The SOA Promotion and Tenure Committee will evaluate, in writing, the probationary faculty member's progress toward tenure as "satisfactory," "questionable," or "unsatisfactory," in the areas of teaching, research, and service in accordance with SOA documents and the faculty member's MSU employment contract. A person is making satisfactory progress toward tenure if the person is satisfying the relevant components of the matrix. Meeting minimal expectations for annual re-appointment will not guarantee tenure and promotion. Any concerns noted by the P&T committee should be addressed by the faculty member. Once the P&T committee has evaluated the faculty member, the recommendation along with the candidate's dossier will be forwarded to the Department Head, who will add his/her evaluation and then forward the materials to the Dean. In the case of a nonrenewal, all of the materials will be forwarded to the Provost.

For Tenure or Promotion: When a faculty member submits application for promotion or tenure, the evaluation of that application shall not preclude the regular yearly review. Such evaluation will be based upon the departmental statement of expectations provided by the faculty member upon employment and upon the regular yearly reviews, as well as the documentation presented by the candidate.

External reviewers are required for all tenure and promotion decisions. External reviewers will primarily assist in the evaluation of research and scholarship. Reviewers will be identified and selected by the Director of the School of Accountancy in consultation with the candidate. The Director may also consult the P&T Committee and/or Promotion Committee to assist in reviewer selection. Selection of reviewers will follow guidelines published by the Office of the Provost. Reviews provided by external reviewers will become part of the candidate's dossier. External reviewers should be faculty members at AACSB accredited institutions that would generally be considered peer institutions (or above).

Faculty applying for tenure will be evaluated according to their performance in accumulated assignments since employment at Missouri State University and when applicable, in accumulated assignments at other institutions for which credit equivalent to service at Missouri State University was granted. Faculty applying for promotion will be evaluated according to performance in present rank. Each faculty member making application is responsible for assembling evidentiary documentation, for making the case in support of the application, and for submitting materials according to established deadlines.

The Committee will give to the candidate a copy of its recommendation and the written rationale therefore. At each subsequent stage of evaluation, beginning with that by the School Director, a copy of the recommendation and a probative rationale therefore will be furnished to the candidate and to the Committee for its information and records. Confidentiality of information must be maintained throughout the entire process. Committee members assume personal responsibility to ensure that confidentiality is not violated.

IV. EVIDENCE

Each year in late spring or early summer, every faculty member will discuss with the Director (1) the results of prior performance and (2) objectives for forthcoming performance. Where progressive performance expectations are pertinent, these will be specifically addressed. The results of this meeting will be summarized in writing and placed in the School personnel file, with copies provided to the faculty member and to the appropriate Committee as required for promotion, tenure, or appointment recommendations.

Teaching: Quality teaching is the most important responsibility of faculty members in the SOA. For tenure and promotion, faculty members must provide evidence of effective teaching. This evidence should include documentation that the faculty member is remaining current in the field (maintaining academic or professional qualifications). Other documentation of effective teaching must be presented by the candidate to establish teaching effectiveness. The evaluation of teaching must be based on a variety of evidence. No more than 50% should depend on student evaluations. Rather, student evaluations shall be used in combination with other evidence to develop a balanced assessment of teaching performance. The examples of evidence provided below are intended to be illustrative, not exhaustive. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide evidence to support quality teaching.

- *Self-Evaluation* submitted by the candidate should include a portfolio containing course syllabi, policy statements, samples of assignments, samples of examinations,

representative samples of work turned in by students. It may also include evidence of significant course or curriculum development, evidence of instructional methods development, evidence of instructional technology utilization, on-line course information, and evidence of academic and career advising. Finally, it may include evidence of continuing professional education, advanced study, certificates earned, and honors and awards for teaching.

- *Student Evaluation* materials may include summary means, ratings on individual items, and written comments by students.
- *Peer Evaluations* may include honors and awards for teaching, reports of classroom observation, reviews of course materials, reviews of video tapes of classroom presentations, and reviews of online course materials.
- *Scholarship of Teaching* may include publications and presentations related to teaching. It may also include evidence of cooperative scholarship with students, including publications, presentations, direction of theses or special projects, and service on thesis committees.
- *Learning Outcome Measures* may be supplied if they provide evidence for learning in courses taught by the candidate. Examples include instructor-administered pretests-posttests.
- *Administrator Provided Indicators* may include the Director's assessment of the candidate's availability to students, participation in curricular development, and appropriate use of instructional technology.

Scholarship/Research: As the School supports the Master of Accountancy program and other COB graduate degrees and as the School holds separate accounting accreditation from AACSB International (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business), the scholarship of discovery is recognized as an essential element of the School's mission and a valued contribution by any candidate. Examples include the following:

- Scholarly monographs or books that advance understanding.
- Original research findings published in scholarly journals.
- Successful grant applications for research.
- Presentations of original research findings.

The scholarship of integration and the scholarship of application are essential elements of the School's mission to support business and economic development, in conjunction with supporting the teaching mission of the university, and are valued contributions by any candidate. Examples include:

- Published textbooks summarizing existing research.
- Published professional or applied research journal articles.
- Published literature reviews or position papers.

- Published research protocols or teaching methodologies.
- Published case studies/teaching cases based on actual organizations.
- Published bibliographies.
- Published critical reviews of scholarly projects, business practices, or legal positions.
- Successful grant applications for applied research.
- Presentations of integrative or applied research.

The scholarship of teaching is recognized as an essential element of the School's mission and an essential element of every teaching candidate's performance. Evidence of this form of scholarship is necessary, but it alone is not sufficient for tenure and for promotions. Examples include:

- Scholarly presentations to campus-based or community groups.
- Designing and refining media of expression.
- Improving the effectiveness of one's own teaching through seeking and using peer and student feedback.
- Assessing effectiveness of new learning technologies for teaching one's own courses.
- Preparing, compiling, and disseminating custom texts, reading packages, and/or ancillary materials for one's own courses.
- Successful grant applications for developing or enhancing one's own courses.

Additional evidence of scholarship may include: paper and manuscript submissions, book chapters completed, and honors and awards.

Both the quantity and the quality of scholarship are to be evaluated. Evidence of quality includes evidence of the perceived quality of journals in which the candidate has published, evidence of citation of the candidate's work by other scholars, and letters of support from recognized scholars in the candidate's discipline including letters from external reviewers.

Service: Evidence should be provided for both internal and external service activities. Each candidate is expected to participate actively in the shared governance structure of the University by serving on School, College, and/or University committees and by assuming an appropriate share of requisite duties. This expectation includes cooperation with reasonable requests regarding reports, meetings, annual performance reviews, and updating faculty data for SOA and COB reporting (e.g., Digital measures). Refusal to serve on any particular committee or service assignment, however, shall not preclude a faculty member from receiving tenure or promotion, whereas consistent refusal to accept anything but a minimal amount of committee/service assignments should be considered in the evaluation process. A minimum of at least one committee/service assignment per year within the SOA, COB, or the university is expected of each SOA faculty member. Evidence for internal service activity may also include advising active student organizations, establishing opportunities for student learning experiences, removing barriers to learning, and obtaining funding and other resources to support teaching and scholarship. The University's emphasis on public affairs requires that the candidate's service to the community be recognized and rewarded. External service activity includes participating in professional organizations and public bodies, and providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, and community organizations. Documentation of external service should

include evidence of centrality of the service to the discipline of the faculty member, the value of the contribution, the amount of time and energy invested, and assessment of outcomes.

V. CRITERIA

General: Statements of criteria regarding expected, above expected, and excellent performance for each area of evaluation establish minimum expectations for being considered for a given level of performance. For example, at a minimum, an applicant must meet COB guidelines for being “scholarly academic/practice academic” or “scholarly practitioner/instructional practitioner” to be considered for an “expected” rating in research. Meeting these guidelines is in no way a guarantee of tenure or promotion. In all cases, it is the candidate’s responsibility to explain and document achievement of a certain level of performance.

Teaching: Expected performance is achieved by meeting all *Faculty Handbook* teaching responsibility criteria, providing an expected self-evaluation portfolio and achieving expected student evaluations. An expected portfolio is one that provides substantial evidence of competence in courses taught. Expected student evaluations using the 1-5 scale of the instrument currently in use, will generally include a long-term average overall evaluation no lower than 3.80 or no lower than 0.25 below the average overall evaluations of all faculty in courses actually taught by the candidate. Absence of such an overall average evaluation creates a refutable presumption that evaluations are unacceptable. A candidate may rebut the presumption of unacceptability by arguments based on the facts and circumstances of his or her teaching experience.

Above expected performance is achieved by exceeding expected performance in at least three ways; including, but not limited to, the following:

providing a high quality teaching portfolio, achieving unusually high student evaluations, substantial evidence of engagement in the scholarship of teaching, substantial course development activity, substantial curriculum development activity, support of graduate theses, substantial student advisement, substantial contribution to the public affairs mission, innovative use of instructional technology, and development of internet courses.

Excellent performance is achieved by exceeding expected performance in at least five ways, including, but not limited to, those listed in the above paragraph.

Research: In general, expected performance in research is minimally achieved by publishing five-peer reviewed articles in six years.

Above expected performance is minimally achieved by exceeding that standard with at least six peer-reviewed articles in six years. The number of publications represents minimum expectations and in no way is a guarantee of tenure or promotion.

As the quality of intellectual contributions also plays a role in tenure and promotion decisions, the publication of a lesser number of articles of high quality can provide qualitative evidence of

expected or above expected performance. For example, publications in journals of the American Accounting Association or established, peer-reviewed journals with acceptance rates of 20% or less might provide qualitative evidence of a given level of performance even though the total number of articles might be less than the minimum.

Excellent performance may be demonstrated by exceeding above expected performance qualitatively, quantitatively, or in combination. Examples of evidence for excellent performance might include (1) publication of three articles in six years, at least two of which are in AAA journals or other academic journals of similar quality; (2) a diversified portfolio of at least ten publications and presentations in a six year period that includes at least seven published, peer-reviewed articles of acceptable quality; (3) meeting both the qualitative and the quantitative tests for above expected performance.

Service: Expected performance includes service to the School and participation in relevant professional societies. Above expected performance extends beyond expected performance to include significant service to the School, College, or the University, and either significant activity in professional societies or significant community service. Excellent performance extends beyond expected performance to include leadership roles in internal and in external service. Internal leadership roles include holding offices in faculty governance and chairing of School, College, or University committees. External leadership roles include holding offices in professional societies and holding office or board positions in community organizations.

VI. STANDARDS

Annual Appointment of untenured faculty requires expected performance in the areas of assigned responsibility: teaching, research, and service.

Tenure requires above expected performance in teaching or research and at least expected performance in the other two categories.

Promotion to Associate Professor requires above expected performance in two categories and at least expected performance in the third.

Promotion to Professor requires excellent performance in teaching, research or service and at least above expected performance in the other two categories with one exception. If a faculty member has excellent performance in teaching and research, only expected performance is needed for service.

Promotion to Distinguished Professor requires a record of "extraordinary accomplishments" in research and a sustained record of excellence in teaching and service. (FH 3.4.4). Distinguished professor is a rank above professor and thus requires sustained performance that significantly exceeds that required for promotion to professor.

Early tenure and/or promotion require that the candidate significantly exceed performance expectations. For example, a candidate who wishes to be considered for early tenure should

generally provide evidence of excellent performance in either teaching or research and above expected performance in the other (and at least expected performance in service). Examples of excellent performance for teaching and research are provided in Section V of this document. Achievement of the necessary performance levels for tenure or promotion is not in and of itself a condition sufficient for early tenure or promotion.

Matrix for Determination of Tenure and Promotion Standards:

Points: Expected = 1; Above Expected = 2; Excellent = 3

Tenure and Promotion	Option	Teaching	Research	Service	Total Points
Tenure	A	2	1	1	4
Tenure	B	1	2	1	4
Associate Professor	A	2	2	1	5
Associate Professor	B	2	1	2	5
Associate Professor	C	1	2	2	5
Associate Professor	D	3	1	1	5
Associate Professor	E	1	3	1	5
Professor	A	3	2	2	7
Professor	B	2	3	2	7
Professor	C	3	3	1	7
Professor	D	2	2	3	7

VII. Senior Instructor

A faculty member who holds the rank of Instructor may apply for promotion to Senior Instructor after completing at least four years of full-time service at Missouri State University. Instructors must minimally meet the following qualifications for promotion to Senior Instructor.

- Receive average annual performance ratings of “Commendable” or “Excellent” in teaching as defined in the SOA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines that are currently used for annual faculty evaluation.
- Have an average annual performance rating of at least “Competent” in both research and service as defined in the Evaluation Guidelines.
- The candidate at all times during the service period must maintain “Instructional Practitioner” or “Scholarly Practitioner” qualified status as established by COB and/or the SOA.

The above qualifications are minimum expectations for promotion to Senior Instructor and meeting the qualifications is not a guarantee of promotion. The candidate must provide documentation and evidence of satisfactory performance. As instructors are hired primarily to

teach, there is a realization that research and service expectations may differ significantly from those of tenure-track faculty.

VII. AMENDMENT

Any tenured faculty member may propose amendments to this policy at any faculty meeting of the School of Accountancy. No faculty member is excluded from debate on proposed amendments, but adoption requires affirmative votes by a majority of the tenured faculty. Amendments take effect in the academic year immediately following the year of their adoption.

Last date of review/modification November 8, 2016

APPENDIX: School of Accountancy, College of Business

Matrix of Accomplishments in Accordance with SOA Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Criteria for Teaching

Evaluation of teaching must be based on a variety of evidence. No more than 50% should depend on student evaluations. Rather, student evaluations shall be used in combination with other evidence to develop a balanced assessment of teaching performance.

Required Items

Item	Faculty Member Accomplishments	Location of Documentation
------	--------------------------------	---------------------------

<p>Expected performance is achieved by meeting all <i>Faculty Handbook</i> teaching responsibility criteria, providing an expected self-evaluation portfolio and achieving expected student evaluations. An expected portfolio is one that provides substantial evidence of competence in courses taught.</p> <p><i>Self Evaluation</i> submitted by the candidate should include a portfolio containing course syllabi, policy statements, samples of assignments, samples of examinations, representative samples of work turned in by students. It may also include evidence of significant course or curriculum development, evidence of instructional methods development, evidence of instructional technology utilization, on-line course information, and evidence of academic and career advising. Finally, it may include evidence of continuing professional education, advanced study, certificates earned, and honors and awards for teaching.</p>		
<p>Expected student evaluations using the 1-5 scale of the instrument currently in use, will generally include a long-term average overall evaluation no lower than 3.80 or no lower than 0.25 below the average overall evaluations of all faculty in courses actually taught by the candidate. A candidate may rebut the presumption of unacceptability by arguments based on the facts and circumstances of his or her teaching experience.</p>		
<p>Above expected performance is achieved by exceeding expected performance in at least three ways; including, but not limited to, the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) providing a high quality teaching portfolio, achieving unusually high student evaluations, 2) substantial evidence of engagement in the scholarship of teaching, 3) substantial course development activity, 4) substantial curriculum development activity, 5) support of graduate theses, 6) substantial student advisement, 7) substantial contribution to the public affairs mission, 8) innovative use of instructional technology, and 9) development of internet courses. 10) notable peer reviews of teaching performance 11) significant learning outcome measures/scores 12) other additional self-evaluation elements not included above 		
<p>Excellent performance is achieved by exceeding expected performance in at least five ways, including, but not limited to, those listed in the last paragraph.</p>		

Status Achieved:

Criteria for Research

Required Items

Item	Faculty Member Accomplishments	Location of Documentation
------	--------------------------------	---------------------------

<p>The scholarship of discovery is recognized as an essential element of the School's mission and a valued contribution by any candidate. Examples include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Original research findings published in scholarly journals and 2) Presentations of original research findings. 		
<p>The scholarship of integration and the scholarship of application are essential elements of the School's mission to support business and economic development and a valued contribution by any candidate.</p> <p>Examples include 1) professional or applied research journal articles and 2) Cases and teaching notes.</p>		
<p>Expected Performance is minimally achieved by publishing five-peer reviewed articles in six years.</p> <p>Above expected performance is minimally achieved with at least six peer-reviewed articles in six years.</p> <p>As the quality of intellectual contributions also plays a role in tenure and promotion decisions, the publication of a lesser number of articles of high quality can provide qualitative evidence of expected or above expected performance. For example, publications in journals of the American Accounting Association might provide qualitative evidence of a given level of performance even though the total number of articles might be less than the minimum.</p> <p>Excellent performance may be demonstrated by <u>exceeding above expected performance qualitatively, quantitatively, or in combination.</u> Examples of evidence for excellent performance: (1) publication of three articles in five years, at least two of which are in AAA journals or other academic journals of similar quality; (2) a <u>diversified portfolio of at least ten publications and presentations in a five year period that includes at least seven published articles of acceptable quality;</u> (3) meeting both the qualitative and the quantitative tests for above expected performance.</p>		

Encouraged Items

Item	Faculty Member Accomplishments	Location of Documentation
<p>Additional evidence for both above expected and excellent performance includes, but is not limited to, evidence of the perceived quality of journals in which the candidate has published, and evidence of citation of the</p>		

<p>Evidence should be provided for both internal and external service activities. Each candidate is expected to participate actively ... by serving on School, College, and/or University committees and by assuming an appropriate share of requisite duties. Evidence for internal service activity may also include sponsoring active student organizations. External service activity includes participating in professional organizations and public bodies, and providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, and community organizations.</p> <p>Expected performance includes service to the School and participation in relevant professional societies.</p>		
---	--	--

Item	Faculty Member Accomplishments	Location of Documentation
<p>Above expected performance extends beyond expected performance to include significant service to the College or the University, and either significant activity in professional societies or significant community service.</p> <p>Excellent performance extends beyond expected performance to include leadership roles in internal and in external service. Internal leadership roles include holding offices in faculty governance and chairing of College or University committees. External leadership roles include holding offices in professional societies and holding office or board positions in community organizations.</p>		

Status Achieved: