

Evaluation of service for regional campus faculty

April 2008

Service plays an important role in the professional lives of all faculty at Miami. For colleagues at Hamilton and Middletown, service is especially critical because it can be used as their second criterion for tenure and promotion. More generally, the regional campuses have an important role to play in their communities that is distinct from Oxford.

The key to having service properly valued is for there to be a clear understanding of how it should be evaluated. The policies described below provide an understanding of how service should be described and measured during the promotion and tenure process for regional campus faculty who use service as their second criteria for advancement.

1. The University should formally recognize three categories/four types, of “productive professional service (MUPIM 7.3).”

- Institutional service – service to the department, division, campus or university, including for example, committee memberships, senate membership, and serving in an administrative capacity.
- Disciplinary service – service to professional organizations, scholarly societies, accreditation boards, or educator standards boards.
- Public service – two forms of public service should be acknowledged:
 - i. Outreach – service as an active representative of the campus (e.g., outreach to area high schools as a vehicle for improving matriculation to the campus, civic board membership).
 - ii. Engagement--utilizing the application of one’s disciplinary expertise to real-world issues or problems (e.g., a mathematics professor works with a local high school on math curricula).

2. The service of faculty who have service listed as their second criterion for promotion and tenure should rise to a commensurate level of intellectual rigor and quality as is expected of teaching and scholarship.

Institutional service is required of all faculty members. Regional campus faculty who list service as their second criterion must also include service in one or two areas of disciplinary, public outreach, or public engagement as part of their service agenda. The University will expect more intensive involvement if only one area of service (besides work for the institution) is selected. Faculty should

be explicit in their decision to engage deeply in one area of service or more broadly in two areas.

3. Faculty should be intentional and strategic in their service, as reflected in a service plan.

Faculty should carefully develop, in concert with coordinators, mentors, chairs and deans, an agenda, philosophy and plan of service. These plans should be tailored to the specific discipline of the faculty member, and the needs of the institution and the community. Plans will be flexible and open to revision, assuming faculty member, departmental, and campus agreement.

The regional campus deans in conjunction with department chairs should develop new mechanisms for mentoring faculty in development of service-related materials. Faculty annual activity reports will have to include greater attention to the development of the service agenda, portfolio, and assessments of quality.

4. Faculty who have service as their second criterion shall develop a service portfolio, containing:

- Service philosophy /agenda.
- Description of specific service activity (goals and objectives, time spent, what was done, extent and nature of the faculty member's involvement).
- The expertise contributed by the faculty member.
- Reports or products that resulted from the service. This may include assessments written by clients or sponsors of an activity, academic administrators or colleagues who worked together on a committee with the faculty member, and/or external experts in the discipline.
- The faculty member's self-reflection about lessons learned, surprises encountered, perceived outcomes, and impact of the service contribution.

5. Service shall be evaluated in a systematic manner

Department promotion and tenure committees, chairs, deans and the Provost shall address the quality and impact of service in their annual letters of evaluation, and in letters written for promotion and tenure. Evaluators can use criteria such as the depth of expertise and preparation, quality of the work, impact, and appropriateness of goals. Details on the evaluation of service should be worked out in a service effectiveness plan (see item eight). In addition, when service is integrated with scholarship, service may be evaluated as a component of these scholarly products (such as the quality of a journal, or the receipt of a grant).

No external evaluation of service, beyond that described in item #4, shall be required.

6. Departments and the regional campus dean(s), in concert with the

faculty member, must agree upon clear expectations for scholarship productivity when scholarship is the third criterion on a faculty members list.

It is essential that increasing the standards for service not simply become an add-on to existing criterion for scholarship. Therefore, University policy should document expectations for research/scholarship as a third priority. Departmental governance documents should explain how research/scholarship will be judged as a third priority. The intent is that regional campus faculty work will be judged according to the stated rules rather than any set of implied rules grounded in previous history. The Provost's office, as part of its regular review of departmental governance procedures will ensure that departmental documents outline appropriate expectations for scholarship when it is the third criterion.

7. Mentoring and Transition.

Upon implementation, new probationary faculty and new associate professors who choose service as their second criterion will be evaluated according to the procedures outlined in the document. Assistant professors hired before the implementation date and associate professors promoted before this date will be given the choice of whether to continue under the current procedures or to switch to the new system.

Current probationary faculty and current associate professors will be offered mentoring on how to transition to the new recommendations.

8. Service effectiveness plans.

The regional campuses should take the lead in developing "service effectiveness plans" that are analogous to departmental teaching effectiveness plans (in consultation with Oxford departments where appropriate).