



College of Humanities, Arts & Social Sciences

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

(March 4, 2023 & April 25, 2024)

Preamble:

Promotion and tenure are at the heart of a mutually acknowledged and mutually beneficial long-term relationship between full-time faculty and the University. Promotion and tenure deserve special attention throughout the faculty member's career at the University. These Guidelines are intended to clarify the application process for promotion and/or tenure and the requirements for applicants and for all of those who participate in the review and evaluation processes at each level in the College (e.g., Department, College).

Similar to many colleges and schools today, the College comprises of a diverse array of academic programs. This diversity is a strength of the College that should be effectively leveraged. Standards of excellence be applied equitably to all academic units to ensure the collective strength of the College. Whereas there may be subtle differences in what constitutes excellence in scholarship for a minority of the College's academic units, minimal standards of excellence must apply across all academic units. One must not lower one's expectations of standards of excellence on the basis of a specific academic program and/or on the perceived differences between a particular academic program and one's own discipline since doing so creates inequities in the evaluation process and diminishes the strength of the academic enterprise.

Faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion in the 2024-2025 or 2025-2026 review cycles may choose to have their materials reviewed under these 2024 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines or the 2004 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Faculty must identify in their application materials which of these two sets of guidelines they wish to have apply to the review process of their application. The Dean's Office will create and maintain a tracking system to record each faculty member's choice during the grace period.

Guiding Values:

Promotion and tenure processes are guided by three core values: *Excellence, Integrity, and Fairness*. As such, the College Promotion and Tenure guidelines are designed in accordance with these values.

- 1) **Excellence:** Promotion and tenure exist in the academic institution to ensure excellence—excellence achieved and demonstrated by a highly competent professoriate. As such, promotion and tenure requirements and processes must clearly reflect and emphasize scholarly excellence.

- 2) ***Integrity:*** Promotion and tenure processes must conform to and reflect basic principles of integrity. This means that all aspects of the promotion and tenure process must be guided by upstanding ethical and moral conduct. It also means that all individuals participating in the promotion and tenure process in any capacity (e.g., reviewer, applicant, recommender) must act with integrity and must hold other participants accountable to do the same.
- 3) ***Fairness:*** Promotion and tenure processes must be fair and just. Fairness must be rooted in the establishment of clear and objective guidance related to criteria for promotion and tenure, and the effective and objective application of evaluation criteria in recommendations and decisions related to promotion and tenure. Clear and objective criteria align with best practices in tenure and promotion processes that intentionally advance diversity, equity and inclusion.

College-Level Promotion and Tenure Committee Conduct

Maintaining both integrity and fairness in the promotion and tenure process requires the elimination of any existing or potential conflicts of interest as well as maintaining confidentiality about all aspects of the promotion and tenure deliberations. To ensure the integrity of the Committee's conduct, committee members in the Department of a candidate whose dossier is being reviewed will be recused from all discussion and deliberation about the candidate. An additional requirement for maintaining integrity and fairness includes ensuring that only individuals holding the rank above that of a candidate are involved in the evaluation process.

For applications to the rank of Professor, when there are fewer than three Professors on the committee, the Associate Professor(s) with the highest seniority will participate in the evaluation process. It is expected that members of the Committee will hold one another to the highest standards of ethical conduct.

Levels of Review within the College

Within the College, there are four levels of review of applications for promotion and tenure. While each level of review has access to the recommendation and narrative of previous reviews and related documentation, each review is independent. The levels of review in the College in order from initial review to final review include the following: Department Promotion and Tenure Committee; Department Chair; College Promotion and Tenure Committee; Dean.

Each individual participating in the review process is responsible for fully understanding the criteria for promotion and tenure set forth by the University and each constituency within (e.g., College, Vice-President for Academic Affairs & Provost) and for demonstrating competency in the application of standards to each discipline. This is essential to ensuring the integrity of the University's multi-level review process. However, it is incumbent upon the candidate and department to describe clearly and effectively how the candidate's credentials meet the standards as they are defined in the College Promotion and Tenure document. Departments are strongly encouraged to have discussions internally about these expectations and to make these expectations clear to candidates early in the tenure and/or promotion process. Departments are also encouraged to develop and maintain department-level standards and

written concrete guidance to provide to departmental faculty. However, departmental standards do not supersede or replace, nor should they conflict with, what is documented herein.

Below, the standards for teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service for the College are articulated. These standards shall drive the review process for promotion and tenure in the College. The four constituents (i.e., Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, Department Chair, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and Dean) who review applications will conduct their review using these guidelines while reviews by the Department-level committee members and Department Chair may also be informed by existing Department level promotion and tenure standards when such standards meet the minimum standards of the College.

Excellence in one area shall not compensate deficiencies for in other area(s).

I. TEACHING

Teaching is a core responsibility and a foundational activity of faculty in the College and in the University. The College's identity and mission within the Jesuit and Mercy traditions require a commitment to pedagogical strategies that seek to develop the whole person as part of an excellent student-centered education. To accomplish this, the College recognizes that outstanding teaching may take various forms and employ diverse methods, especially given the college's many disciplines. The College values rigorous academic standards and teaching that helps students to achieve those standards. Best teaching practices involve students in active learning that engages their interest and participation in the work; recognize a range of student abilities; and assists struggling students. They most often include the integration of core liberal arts skills of effective written and oral communication, critical thinking, and research in content courses taught within the College.

In preparing the teaching portion of their application, faculty are encouraged to consider the Excellence of Teaching statement from the *Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Ad Hoc Report* (2021):

Foundational to excellent teaching at Detroit Mercy is a dedication to discernment through the process of reflection. Detroit Mercy faculty and students are expected to participate in these processes regularly and in keeping with Mercy and Jesuit traditions, which include a passion for quality, an emphasis on ethics and values, care for and education of the whole person, academic excellence, and real world and life-long learning.

Excellent teaching at Detroit Mercy is also excellent learning and is therefore defined as an ongoing commitment to fostering an environment in which both instructors and students commit to their mutual responsibilities: instructors are experts in their respective disciplines as well as pedagogical professionals and students are respectful, eager, and engaged learners.

While individual disciplines may include additional goals in their definitions of excellent teaching and learning, the following includes universally accepted maxims supported by research on best practices for instruction at the college and university level:

As Excellent Teachers, Detroit Mercy Faculty:	As Excellent Learners, Detroit Mercy Students:
Model Inspired Learning	Commit to Learning
Ensure Inclusivity	Embrace Open-Mindedness
Provide Rigor and Challenge	Accept Rigor, Challenge, and Responsibility
Communicate Effectively and Consistently	Respect their Instructors and Class Colleagues
Focus on Student-Centered Mentoring	Value their Instructors' Knowledge
Foster and Engage in Reflection and Self-Reflection	Engage in Reflection and Self-Reflection

In embracing these goals, both Detroit Mercy faculty and students strive for an excellent teaching and learning community that inspires both student and instructor, demands rigor of both, and facilitates intellectual, spiritual, ethical, and social growth.

Excellent teaching will look different throughout the college's many disciplines. Thus, faculty engage in teaching excellence through a variety of activities and practices including—where applicable to their departments and programs—the following:

A. Components of Excellent Teaching and Associated Pursuits and Activities

- a. Helping students to achieve rigorous standards
- b. Advising
- c. Mentoring (including, where applicable, student research)
- d. Directing independent studies (where applicable)
- e. Using high-impact practices (e.g., capstones, learning communities, collaborative projects)
- f. Creating new projects for students
- g. Seeking out peer reviews and administrator reviews of teaching
- h. Attending to student evaluations

B. Efforts to Improve Teaching

- a. Engaging in continuous improvement and development
- b. Participating in professional development
- c. Conducting pedagogical research and bringing such research to publication, and/or presentation, as applicable

C. Responding to Changing Needs

- a. Participating in program development activities, including updating and revising
- b. Developing new curriculum and new courses
- c. Developing community engaged learning/service-learning courses
- d. Developing methods of online and/or hybrid teaching (where applicable)

D. Practices to Develop the Whole Person as Part of an Excellent Student-Centered Education

- a. Addressing and promoting inclusivity

- b. Supporting struggling students
- c. Teaching to a range of student abilities
- d. Teaching students to engage in self-reflective practices
- e. Reflecting the mission in teaching practices

Teaching responsibilities in the College should demonstrate best teaching practices. Faculty are also encouraged to participate in professional development activities relevant to attaining teaching excellence. Faculty are encouraged, when appropriate, to develop creative and innovative pedagogical strategies, as defined by discipline, and to incorporate opportunities for student reflection on their learning as part of teaching excellence. Student-centered advising and mentoring of students may also be critical dimensions of teaching and learning

Communication of Evidence of Teaching Excellence:

To achieve tenure and/or promotion, faculty must be evaluated as being excellent teachers. In order for this evaluation to take place, the following must be submitted as part of the tenure and/or promotion application:

- Teaching Philosophy Statement which includes how that philosophy is implemented in the classroom; a self-evaluation of the applicant's strengths and areas of development; evidence of efforts the candidate has taken to enhance their instructional skills and effectiveness; evidence of a range of pedagogical methods or strategies (as appropriate for the subject and/or discipline)
- Course syllabi
- Sample teaching materials (course assessments, representative exams or assignments)
- Sample student work/projects
- Evidence of professional and other development activities
- Student evaluations with reflection (As student evaluations are known to be influenced by many factors, they will not be given preferential weighting or emphasis in the evaluation process)
- Evidence of advising and/or mentoring students
- Teaching evaluations from peers and/or supervisor
- Evidence of teaching awards or other indications of teaching excellence (e.g., unprompted emails or notes from students or former students speaking to the applicant's skills), if applicable

In addition, other items may be included in the dossier that provide evidence of excellence in teaching, such as pedagogical publications (i.e., article, chapter, textbook). When including additional items in the dossier as evidence of excellence in teaching, it is incumbent upon the candidate to clearly justify how the document(s) reflects excellence.

It is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate that the applicant has achieved teaching excellence meriting tenure and/or promotion.

Candidates applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should include all materials from the time of their appointment at the university in a tenure-track position.

Applicants for promotion to Professor should present materials from the time of their appointment to Associate Professor with tenure. Candidates who have previous experience in a tenure-track position prior to joining Detroit Mercy may choose to also include teaching- related materials from their prior institution.

II. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARY ACTIVITY

Research and scholarship are fundamental to the work of the faculty and a defining feature of the university's mission. Scholarship, at its best, is continuous and organized with a stated purpose. The College expects its full-time tenure-track and tenured faculty to be fully invested in research and scholarly activity. Thus, the production of research and/or scholarly output is weighed significantly and carefully when faculty candidates apply for tenure and/or promotion.

This work is multifaceted and variable from discipline to discipline. It includes, but is not limited to, the production of peer-reviewed books and articles, scholarly monographs, scholarly book chapters, creative writing, theater productions, and external grant funding. It may be challenging to articulate standards for tenure and promotion that fit well across the many disciplines housed within the college. However, the standards provided below are designed to be broad enough to reflect the college's academic and disciplinary diversity while representing what is consistently valued and accepted across disciplines within the college and the university's peer institutions.

Scholarly production for tenure and promotion may vary given the array of disciplines represented within the College. For purposes of tenure and promotion, the College prioritizes scholarship that is the result of a peer-review process. The College recognizes that peer-review can occur in different ways at different levels. Examples of peer-reviewed scholarship may include, but are not necessarily limited, to the following: book; book chapter; creative writing; critical translation; film; journal article; monograph; theater production or major contribution to a theater production; poetry.

Factors to Consider in the Evaluation of Peer-Reviewed Scholarly and Creative Products: Quality Guidelines

Authorship: First and/or single author is normally the highest level of authorship of a scholarly product followed by equal co-authorship, followed by order of contribution (e.g., third author). Note that in cases when authorship does not follow this order due to journal type (e.g., medical), this should be clearly described by the candidate in the application for tenure and/or promotion, and it should be further delineated by the department. In addition, in cases where the scholarly product has more than one author, the candidate or another co-author should explain the role the candidate had in the research, in presentation of the research, and in the context of disciplinary standards and values. Edited peer-reviewed volumes are also recognized scholarly products.

Other Factors Related to Scholarly Books/Monographs: When evaluating books written by a candidate, reviewers should consider the following: the reputation and quality of the publisher or press, the length of the work, the amount of research required, citations of the work, reviews of the book/monograph, and testimonials in the form of reader reports.

Other Factors Related to Journal Articles: When evaluating peer-reviewed journal articles, reviewers should consider the following: journal impact factor; journal indexation (for scientific journals); journal acceptance rate; journal audience; journal reach from largest to smallest potential impact: international, national, regional, state. If this data is publicly available, the candidate should provide it in some appropriate location in the dossier.

Other Factors Related to Creative Writing: When evaluating creative writing projects, reviewers should consider the following: role of the candidate in the work (i.e., author, coauthor), the reputation and quality of the publisher, press, or print/digital journal, reviews of the work, testimonials in the form of reader reports, the length of the work (where applicable), the amount of research required (where applicable), and other relevant details.

Other Factors Related to Performing Arts: When evaluating scholarship in the performing arts, reviewers should consider the following: standards described by relevant professional organizations; role of the candidate in the work (director, performer, designer, technician, playwright, dramaturg, or other specialist criteria), reviews and/or other press related to the work, awards/nominations/honors associated with the work, the scope of the work, and other relevant details.

Factors to Consider When Evaluating External Research Funding:

When evaluating external research funding, reviewers should consider the following:

- a) Role on the funded project with Principal Investigator/Project Director occupying the highest level, followed by Co-PI/PD, followed by specific role and significant details related to the individual's participation on the project;
- b) Official percentage of time allocated to the grant per the grant award (with a typical minimum of 15%/.15 FTE) for consideration of sufficient contribution;
- c) Funding source in order of recognition: Federal, international/national foundation, state or municipal government, state or local foundation;
- d) Amount of funding award: Evaluations of funding amount should include amount of funding allocated to directly support the time and effort of the faculty member per year of the funding award and total amount of funding allocated to support the activities directly accomplished by the faculty member.

Scholarly Productivity for Promotion and Tenure – Peer-Reviewed Publications and Major Creative Works – Quantity Guidelines

(A) Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor – Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

It is expected that a faculty member's body of scholarly work is consistent with the rank being sought and that there is evidence of sustained, self-initiated research and production of high quality.

Peer-Reviewed Scholarly Publications

For the disciplines in which the production of scholarly books/monographs, journal articles, and book chapters is the expectation, the general standard is a minimum of four (4) articles/chapters, or the equivalent of four, published on a consistent basis in peer-reviewed scholarly outlets, and a record of continuous productivity for promotion to Associate Professor. The equivalency of a sole-authored peer-reviewed book and a co-authored peer-reviewed book depends upon several variables (e.g., the discipline, the scope of the work, the length, the publisher, etc.). However, typically, a substantive scholarly book/monograph would be the equivalent of at least four journal articles or book chapters.

In addition, a candidate must demonstrate evidence of scholarly initiative through the publication of at least two first-authored articles/chapters and others involving an equitable or significant contribution, or the equivalent of two as outlined in the descriptions of scholarly works presented above.

As judgment of the above equivalencies is made based on what is presented in the dossier, it is incumbent upon the candidate, the department, and external reviewers to document the quality of the candidate's work and its impact of the work in the field.

Although the equivalent of four (4) quality peer-reviewed articles/chapters is the general standard for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, if an individual has fewer than four, decisions may be made based on the quality of the work. Promotion and tenure with less than four peer-reviewed articles/chapters or the equivalent would require that the work be of especially high quality and standing. Again, , it will be incumbent upon the candidate, the Chair, and Department to articulate in the clearest terms possible how or why the quality of this work and its merits would be equivalent to the minimum requirement of four publications.

Peer-Reviewed Major Creative Works

For disciplines in which a major creative work (i.e., play, novel, poetry, film, critical translation) is the expectation, two (2) major creative works is the general standard for promotion to Associate Professor. A major creative work includes, but is not limited to, a play, a film, a critical translation, a novel, a book of poems, a collection of short stories or more than 5 short stories published individually, a collection of poetry, or 20 or more poems published individually.

As judgment of the above equivalencies is made based on what is presented in the dossier, it is incumbent upon the candidate, the department, and external reviewers to document the quality of the candidate's work and its impact of the work in the field.

Although the equivalent of two (2) quality peer-reviewed major creative works is the general standard for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, if an individual has fewer than two, decisions may be made based on the quality of the work. Promotion and tenure with less than two major creative works or the equivalent would require that the work be of especially high quality and standing. Again, it will be incumbent upon the candidate, the Chair, and Department to articulate in the clearest terms possible how or why the quality of this work and its merits would be equivalent to the minimum requirement of two major two creative works.

(B) Promotion to Professor – Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Peer-Reviewed Scholarly Publications

For the disciplines in which the production of peer-reviewed books, monographs, journal articles and peer-reviewed book chapters is the expectation, the general standard for promotion to Professor is a minimum of six (6) articles/chapters, or the equivalent of six, since attaining the rank of Associate Professor. The equivalency of a sole-authored peer-reviewed book and a coauthored peer-reviewed book depends upon several variables (e.g., the discipline, the scope of the work, the length, the publisher, etc.). However, typically, a substantive scholarly book/monograph and one other major piece of scholarship (such as an article or book chapter) would be the equivalent of at least six journal articles or book chapters.

In addition, a candidate must demonstrate evidence of scholarly initiative through the publication of at least three first-authored articles/chapters and others involving an equitable or significant contribution, or the equivalent of three as outlined in the descriptions of scholarly works presented above. Moreover, scholarship must reflect consistent distinction in the field; a comprehensive body of scholarship that reflects depth and significant rigor; and a record of continuous productivity.

As judgment of the above equivalencies is made based on what is presented in the dossier, it is incumbent upon the candidate, the department, and external reviewers to document the quality of the candidate's work and its impact of the work in the field.

Although the equivalent of six (6) quality peer-reviewed articles/chapters is the general standard for promotion to the rank of Professor, if an individual has fewer than six, decisions may be made based on the quality of the work. Promotion and tenure with less than six peer-reviewed articles/chapters or the equivalent would require that the work be of especially high quality and standing. Again, it will be incumbent upon the candidate, the Chair, and Department to articulate in the clearest terms possible how or why the quality of this work and its merits would be equivalent to the minimum requirement of six publications.

Peer-Reviewed Major Creative Works For disciplines in which a major creative work (i.e., play, novel, poetry, film, critical translation) is the expectation, a minimum of three major creative works and/or scholarly products (e.g., book chapter, article, major role in a production) since attaining the rank of Associate Professor is the general standard for promotion to Professor.

A major creative work includes, but is not limited to, a play, a film, a critical translation, a novel, a book of poems, a collection of short stories or more than 5 short stories published individually, a collection of poetry, or 20 or more poems published individually.

As judgment of the above equivalencies is made based on what is presented in the dossier, it is incumbent upon the candidate, the department, and external reviewers to document the quality of the candidate's work and its impact of the work in the field.

Although the equivalent of three (3) quality peer-reviewed major creative works is the general standard for promotion to the rank of Professor, if an individual has fewer than three, decisions

may be made based on the quality of the work. Promotion with less than three major creative works or the equivalent would require that the work be of especially high quality and standing. Again, it will be incumbent upon the candidate, the Chair, and Department to articulate in the clearest terms possible how or why the quality of this work and its merits would be equivalent to the minimum requirement of three major two creative works.

Continuous Scholarly Productivity for Promotions to Associate Professor and Professor - Other External Funding, Conference Presentations, and Internal Funding

In addition to the above, scholarly productivity is expected to be continuous and organized with a stated purpose. Besides producing and publishing peer-reviewed scholarship, other professional accomplishments of merit, and other scholarly activities should be conducted that reflect productivity and will be evaluated as part of the candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion. Depending upon the discipline, these may include such activities as participating in conference presentations, acquiring small amounts of external funding that may serve as seed funding to begin an area of inquiry, and acquiring external non-research funding.

While not equivalent to scholarly publications, conference presentations are an important form of scholarship. They are often essential to scholarly publishing activities, and may serve as a precursor to publication as well as testifying to the continuity of the scholarly agenda. When evaluating conference activities, the following guidelines will be utilized to weigh the merit of such activities:

1. *Conference Type* – International, national, state, regional
2. *Presentation Status* – Invited, refereed, other
3. *Presenter Role*: First and/or single facilitator, followed by order of facilitation and level of contribution
4. *Non-Peer Reviewed Scholarly Presentations*

Internal funding for research and scholarly projects does not constitute scholarship required for promotion and tenure, and as such, is not evaluated as such. Internal funding constitutes additional support and a critical resource provided by the institution to faculty members that may serve to assist faculty members in launching an area of inquiry.

Communication of Evidence of Research and Scholarly Activity:

The information provided below offers the general criteria utilized by the college for the evaluation of research and scholarly activity. The information provided here is specific to the college but is also consistent with the university's guidelines. Candidates shall provide evidence of all research and scholarly activity as part of the dossier. Furthermore, candidates are expected to provide external letters of support per the *Handbook*.

Include copies of external review letters from reviewers consistent with your School/College reviewer selection criteria. For promotion to Associate Professor, a minimum of two external review letters are required. For promotion to Professor, a minimum of three external review

letters are required. External evaluators should be asked to assess the candidate's standing in the field, commenting on the impact of the candidate's work in the field, explaining ways in which the candidate has added to or modified existing knowledge in the field, addressing candidate's development of new ideas or application of existing theories and evaluating the extent to which the candidate has established him/herself as an independent scholar in the field. Each College, School, or Unit will determine the process by which external reviewers are identified and contacted. Each letter must be accompanied by a brief biography or CV of the reviewer. Untenured faculty will not ordinarily be invited to serve as reviewers. Editors of volumes in which a candidate has published an essay may be considered as reviewers. External review letters must be solicited from individuals "at arm's length" from the candidate. That is, the following may not be chosen to serve as reviewers: the candidate's doctoral or postdoctoral directors/mentors; individuals with whom, in the last three years, the candidate has worked as a co-author, collaborator, or co-investigator on scholarly, research, or artistic projects; close friends from graduate school; or anyone with whom the candidate has had a personal relationship.

(UDM Faculty Handbook, p. 24)

Within the College, candidates for Associate Professor and Professor shall submit to the Office of the Dean, in order of preference, a list of five names of possible external reviewers that includes the name, rank, contact information (email addresses), and the proposed reviewer's relationship to the applicant by May 31 in the year of application. These external reviewers must meet the "at arm's length" criterion established in the *Handbook*. The Dean will identify the external reviewers, in consultation with the department chair, and the Dean's Office will forward the applicant's materials to the external reviewers. The Dean's Office will then add the external letters from the reviewers to the applicant's dossier. A minimum of two (2) external letters shall be collected for candidates seeking promotion to Associate Professor and a minimum of three (3) external review letters shall be collected for candidates seeking promotion to Professor.

III. SERVICE

Faculty in the College are expected to participate in service at various levels throughout their professional life and also within the community in ways that are congruent with the overall life and mission of the university.

Within their department or program, faculty are expected to demonstrate substantial service activities including participation in various departmental and program committees, activities, and initiatives as well as, for example, curricular assessment and review-related activities, serving as an advisor to a student organization or society, serving as a liaison to alumni advisory boards, work on program and/or department-level accreditation self-studies, and/or student recruitment efforts. Service at the program and/or departmental level may also include serving in a leadership position as Department Chair or Program Director, or serving in a leadership role in short-term departmental activities (e.g., developing a proposal for new programming).

At the college level, service may include activities such as serving on shared governance committees or ad hoc Dean-appointed committees, participating in college-wide recruitment activities and participating in other college-level activities. At the university level, forms of service may also include serving on shared governance committees, serving as an advisor to a student organization or society, serving in faculty union leadership, serving as part of the union negotiating team, and participating in interdisciplinary activities or programs at the university level.

Service to the discipline at the local, regional, state, national, and international levels, includes but is not limited to: Service or leadership in a professional organization, serving as a program liaison, peer reviewer or board member with an accreditation body, reviewing federal or philanthropic grant applications, serving on an editorial board or serving as a referee or peer-reviewer for a professional journal.

Unpaid service activities provided outside of the university may also be considered. Some examples of this include, but are not limited to, unpaid/volunteer service to religious institutions, social service organizations, and the media. Employment outside of the university/work for which a candidate is remunerated does not constitute service. Faculty who teach or work in another capacity with other colleges or universities may not use that service or work commitment toward their application toward tenure and/or promotion (e.g., adjunct faculty).

Communication of Evidence of Service:

There are many methods by which service can be communicated in the tenure and/or promotion dossier. Candidates should, however, include a statement that describes their service and that provides clear information about the type of service provided, length of service, role in service, and any other important details about the service activity. In addition, candidates should provide evidence of the service, where appropriate.

Often, when such service is provided, there is a record or documentation of such service, including its scope and level of commitment and participation. For instance, the record of service at the department, college and university level should be included on annual reports and in many cases, may be remarked upon by the dean. In other cases, acknowledgment of service activities may be provided by letters from individuals who served alongside the candidate, thank you notes for service, and/or in the form of email communications acknowledging the work.

Service to the discipline may also be acknowledged in writing as well as being evident in written documents illustrating the service (e.g., leadership role in national professional association, peer reviewer/editor; awards committee member).

A) Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor - Service

Candidates applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to be involved in service activities as described above at some, if not all, of the following levels: department, college, university, profession, and community. The relative distribution and

allocation of service expectations within and across the levels may vary from department to department, but nevertheless should be reflective of significant engagement.

B) Promotion to Professor - Service

Candidates applying for Professor are expected to demonstrate a significant and ongoing engagement in service at the departmental, college, university, profession, and community levels and service that also includes leadership positions. Attention will be given to the depth, serious engagement, and substantial leadership of a single commitment as well as to the breadth of commitments.

**NOTE ON PAY FOR PUBLICATIONS: Articles published in journals requiring payment for publication will require that the candidate identify this fact and the candidate and department should justify the scholarly legitimacy of the journal. Articles being published in journals deemed predatory are not counted for review in the tenure and promotion process. Applicants need to be mindful of predatory journals when submitting their scholarly work for publication and are encouraged to investigate carefully the journal prior to submitting their work for publication there.*

Similarly, self-published books are typically not counted for review in the tenure and promotion process.