



EXAMPLES FOR DOCUMENTING AND EVALUATING FACULTY SERVICE

Purpose. The purpose of this document is to provide sample rubrics for documenting and evaluating faculty service to the university, to the community, and to the profession. Two points must be emphasized: these examples are not exhaustive, and no one is expected to perform all of the activities listed. Individual departments, divisions, and schools should adapt the examples provided here to their specific circumstances. The goal of this document is to help faculty, chairs, and other administrators distinguish between satisfactory service that is expected of all faculty and service that represents a contribution of some significance. The rubrics can be used to identify individual service contributions that merit recognition and reward; they can also help faculty who wish to do so build a case for excellence in service over time. Faculty, chairs, and deans/directors are encouraged to discuss the rubrics and modify them as appropriate in order to clarify the standard expected in their units.

Service as Faculty Work. Satisfactory service is expected of all IPFW faculty, as stated in **SD 88-25** (Criteria for Tenure and Promotion). Also according to SD 88-25, section D.3., service can be the basis for promotion to professor: “Promotion to Professor is awarded to individuals recognized by professional peers as authorities in their fields. It is expected that candidates will have made important and recognized contributions in at least one of the areas: teaching, research, and service. Candidates will be recognized and respected in state, regional, or national educational and professional circles.” **SD 94-3** (Promotion and Tenure Guidelines) expands on SD 88-25: “IPFW faculty are expected to take an active role in the campus beyond teaching and research or creative endeavor; they are encouraged to contribute their expertise to the community, state, and nation and to participate in professional organizations. If service is the primary basis for promotion, it should represent a unique achievement of special value to the campus, community, or profession.” Key concepts for building a case for excellence in service are *faculty expertise* and an *achievement of special value* to the constituency/ies served.

Service as part of a Scholarly Agenda. The rubrics used in this document reflect the fact that service is often linked to or integrated with teaching and research/creative endeavor. When a faculty member’s disciplinary expertise is brought to bear on initiatives that serve the community, the profession, or the university, the work may have a scholarly dimension that is evident in the approach to the task, the results of the service (products, policies, organizations, etc.), or in work that feeds back into the discipline (new areas of research, or new approaches to teaching or scholarship, etc.).

The Scholarship of Engagement (Ernest L. Boyer, 1996) is a more specific term within the umbrella of Service that “represents. . . a commitment to sharing and reciprocity with our community partners. . . and involves the creation, integration, transfer, and application of knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences.” It is “the partnership of university, knowledge, and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship and research, enhance curricular content and process; prepare citizen scholars; endorse democratic values and civic responsibility, address critical societal issues; and, in general, contribute to the public good.” (CIC Committee on Engagement).

Institutions that value this kind of service usually give it a specific name, such as *Engagement* (Purdue), *Faculty Outreach and Extension* (North Carolina State), *Service Scholarship* (Penn State), or *Outreach* (Michigan State).

The nationally recognized term *Outreach Engagement* is perhaps the most all-encompassing. *Outreach Engagement* includes both *Outreach Research* and *Outreach Instruction*. *Outreach Research* includes applied research, policy analysis, technical assistance, technology transfer, and activities undertaken with a goal of building community capacity and competency. *Outreach Instruction* includes the transmission of knowledge to public community members as a representative of the academic community.

Standards for Scholarly Work. Boyer, in *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), expanded the term “scholarship” to include integration, application, and teaching as well as research. In *Scholarship Assessed* (1997), Glassick et al. proposed standards for evaluation of all types of scholarship; these are: **clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation** and **reflective critique** (p. 36). These standards have been adopted or adapted at various institutions that are seeking ways to recognize and reward service as part of a scholarly agenda. The National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement uses a modified version of the Glassick standards; see <http://www.scholarshipofengagement.org>.

Quality Indicators. It is clear that multiple sources of information must be used to document quality. The following quality indicators were recommended by the IU Strategic Directions task force on defining, documenting, and evaluating service.

1. The impact or significance of the service, indicated by:
 - an identifiable **outcome** relevant to the university’s mission and goals,
 - a measurable **impact** upon particular constituencies,
 - **relevance** of the service to the faculty member’s professional development and/or to the faculty member’s teaching and research.
2. The intellectual work required to perform the service, indicated by:
 - the application of **relevant knowledge, skills, technological expertise**, etc.,
 - **contribution(s)** to a body of knowledge,
 - **imagination, creativity, and innovation**,
 - sensitivity to and application of **ethical standards**.
3. The importance of the faculty member’s role(s), indicated by:
 - creative and responsible **leadership** that has an identifiable impact on the project,
 - increasing levels of **responsibility**,
 - consistent and sustained **quality of contributions**,
 - taking the initiative to **build consensus, solve problems**, etc.
4. Analysis of and reflection on the service, indicated by:
 - **responsible representation of work** during and after completion,
 - **communication** with appropriate audiences,
 - using audience-appropriate modes of communication and **dissemination**.

Quantity. As with the other areas of faculty responsibility, both quality and quantity of the contributions must be considered. A single outstanding service activity may play a role in a one-time merit recommendation or other recognition. A record of excellence over time is essential for building a case for promotion.

University Service vs. Service to External Constituencies. According to Driscoll and Lynton, some institutions have concluded that university service such as committee work and faculty governance “typically lacks the intellectual content and other attributes to be ‘scholarly’; that is, it is good citizenship rather than good scholarship.” (*Making Outreach Visible. A Guide to Documenting Professional Service and Outreach.* AAHE 1999, p. 6). On the other hand, the argument can be made that good citizenship also requires expertise of various kinds – leadership skills, negotiation, understanding of short and long-range planning and much more. In this document, the rubric for excellence in university service is based on effective leadership. An effective leader is defined by the impact her/his work has on the task at hand; thus, the individual may or may not have served as chair/director/coordinator of the unit or initiative for which she/he claims excellence. Documentation of impact, significance of the faculty member’s role and other quality indicators should be the deciding factors.

Category of Service	Types of Documentation	Rubrics-Satisfactory	Rubrics-Excellent
<p>University Service: Member of a committee or task force, including system-level; responsible role in university governance (e.g., Speaker of Faculty, Presiding Officer, or comparable role); projects for which a faculty member has reassigned time; contributions to programs that help the university meet strategic goals; and related activities at the department, school, campus and system level.</p>	<p>Self-report and/or report from colleague(s) knowledgeable of the activity and the candidate's role</p> <p>Report or other product generated; new policy or process created</p> <p>Third-party evaluation</p>	<p>Candidate participated regularly and contributed to the goals of the committee or other body, program, or campus.</p> <p>The candidate contributed to the efficient conduct of necessary business.</p> <p>Candidate and other colleagues involved contributed equally.</p> <p>Evaluations document the quality and impact of the work (value to constituencies served).</p>	<p>Candidate assumed a leadership role that positively affected the outcome, <u>and</u> one or more of the following apply:</p> <p>The candidate's leadership helped to solve a problem, or develop a plan for a new initiative, or implement a plan, or complete other essential work consistent with the campus mission and strategic goals.</p> <p>The candidate's leadership shaped the planning, drafting, and completion of the report/product.</p> <p>Candidate helped shape new policy, and/or negotiated satisfactory outcome of a contentious process.</p> <p>The evaluations document the significance of the candidate's contributions, based on her/his disciplinary or other expertise, to the work of the group</p>

Category of Service	Types of Documentation	Rubrics-Satisfactory	Rubrics-Excellent
University Service, (Continued):	Documents created or revised; presentations related to new or revised policies, procedures, programs, etc. Other: other evidence not covered by the above categories of documentation	Published documents or/and presentations for the university community reflect positively on the candidate's contributions to the outcome	Reports or presentations for regional or national audiences meet relevant standards of peer review Presentations or publications are cited as models for others engaged in related work.

OAA Memorandum 04-2

May 30, 2005

Page 6

Category of Service	Types of Documentation	Rubrics-Satisfactory	Rubrics-Excellent
<p>Administrative Service to the University: Department Chair or comparable administrative appointment (Chair duties are described in OAA Memorandum 98-2); Associate Dean or comparable administrative appointment; Program Director, or Director of Multi-Section Course, or comparable appointment</p>	<p>Self-report</p> <p>Evaluations from colleagues in the unit</p> <p>Evaluations from dean or other administrator</p> <p>Levels of responsibility over time</p> <p>Record of accomplishments initiated by the candidate</p> <p>Publications or presentations based on accomplishments</p>	<p>Candidate performed necessary tasks on behalf of the unit's normal operations.</p> <p>Colleagues assess the candidate as satisfactory per the unit's standards.</p> <p>Dean assesses candidate as satisfactory per the unit's standards.</p> <p>The candidate accepted responsibility at the level to which he/she was appointed.</p> <p>Accomplishments contribute to the unit's teaching, research/creative, and/or service mission.</p> <p>Publications or presentations to on-campus audiences enhance communication among units and contribute to effective delivery of programs.</p>	<p>Candidate exercised leadership on behalf of the unit's mission.</p> <p>Colleagues assess the candidate as excellent per the unit's standards <u>and</u> identify specific examples of her/his leadership.</p> <p>Dean assesses candidate as excellent per the unit's standards <u>and</u> identifies specific examples of her/his leadership.</p> <p>The candidate's exemplary performance led to her/his seeking out and/or being asked to assume increasing levels of responsibility.</p> <p>Such accomplishments contribute to the unit's mission <u>and</u> advance it in at least one of the three areas.</p> <p>Publications or presentations to regional and/or national audiences contribute to scholarly discourse beyond the campus <u>and</u> document candidate's growth in the respective area.</p>

Category of Service	Types of Documentation	Rubrics-Satisfactory	Rubrics-Excellent
<p>Service to Students: Career counseling, mentoring, serving as student organization advisor, activities with goal of recruiting and retaining students or improving the quality of campus life for students.</p> <p>Depending on emphasis, such activities may be appropriately evaluated as teaching contributions.</p>	<p>Evaluation surveys, letters of evaluation</p> <p>Self-report of accomplishments</p> <p>Publications or presentations based on accomplishments</p> <p>Other evidence of effectiveness not covered by the above categories</p>	<p>Candidate participated regularly and contributed to the outcome</p> <p>The activity contributed to the normal and efficient functioning of the department, school, campus, or student organization</p> <p>The candidate and other participants contributed equally to the outcome</p> <p>Evaluations document the quality and impact of the work (value to constituencies served)</p>	<p>Participation and contributions stand out for consistently high quality and effectiveness</p> <p>The candidate assumed a leadership role that positively affected the outcome, and one or more of the following apply:</p> <p>The candidate's leadership shaped the planning, drafting, and completion of a report or product published or otherwise disseminated to appropriate audiences</p> <p>Evaluations document the significance of the candidate's contributions, based on her/his disciplinary or other expertise</p> <p>The candidate helped shape new policy, and/or negotiated satisfactory outcome of a contentious process</p>

Category of Service	Types of Documentation	Rubrics-Satisfactory	Rubrics-Excellent
<p>Significant Project Development and Management: developing, securing funding for, managing, and assessing projects and initiatives that advance the mission and goals of the university. Such activities include, but are not limited to, leading a campus-wide initiative (e.g., FYE); administrative leadership of service-learning, internships, and other experiential learning opportunities; collaborative partnerships focused on K-12 education; academic summer camps and similar learning experiences; academic competitions or exhibits (e.g., Science Fair, Lego League), and entrepreneurial activities.</p> <p>Depending on emphasis, may be appropriately evaluated or cross-referenced as teaching or research.</p>	<p>Proposal, report, or other documentation of the activity and how it advances the mission and goals of the university</p> <p>Documentation of success in meeting project goals, e.g., student learning, student satisfaction, student success, ongoing student engagement on campus or/and in the community.</p> <p>Dissemination of results through publications or presentations</p> <p>Self-reports</p> <p>Third-party evaluations</p> <p>Other evidence not covered by the above categories</p>	<p>The candidate's participation contributed to achieving the goals of the activity.</p> <p>The candidate contributed in routine ways to the outcome.</p> <p>Student outcomes and other measures consistently meet expectations</p> <p>The candidate contributed to dissemination of results locally.</p> <p>The candidate participated in improvement efforts initiated by others.</p>	<p>The candidate provided leadership to an existing project, or developed and led a new initiative to meet university goals.</p> <p>The candidate's expertise and leadership had a significant impact on the outcome.</p> <p>Student outcomes and other measures consistently exceed expectations.</p> <p>The candidate exercised leadership in publishing or otherwise disseminating results to multiple audiences.</p> <p>The candidate's leadership in assessment and critique led to improvements.</p>

Category of Service	Types of Documentation	Rubrics-Satisfactory	Rubrics-Excellent
<p>Community Service / Outreach Engagement: Participant in a University/Community Partnership. Includes representing the university in professional service to/consulting for citizen and client groups; public and private organizations; governmental agencies; business and industry; and related services at the local, state, national, or international levels.</p> <p>Presentations to community audiences, media presentations, popular writing, and related activities</p> <p>Depending on emphasis, some activities may appropriately be evaluated or cross-referenced under research.</p>	<p>Proposal, report, or other documentation of the activity and how it links the goals of the department, school, campus, or profession to activities that meet community needs</p> <p>Self-report and/or third-party evaluation</p> <p>Dissemination of information related to the activity</p> <p>Outcome, products (e.g., technical reports, applied research; formal recommendations to a community agency or group, creative or other work commissioned, etc.)</p> <p>Reports of continuous improvement of the process/service provided</p> <p>Other evidence not covered by the above categories</p>	<p>The candidate's participation contributed to achieving the goals of an existing partnership.</p> <p>The candidate contributed in routine ways to the outcome.</p> <p>The candidate contributed to dissemination of information within the partnership and locally.</p> <p>The candidate participated in improvement efforts initiated by others.</p> <p>The group served provided evidence of the candidate's participation.</p>	<p>The candidate provided leadership to an existing partnership, or initiated a new partnership to meet university and community needs.</p> <p>The candidate's expertise and leadership had a significant impact on the outcome.</p> <p>The candidate exercised leadership in publishing or otherwise disseminating information to multiple audiences.</p> <p>The candidate's leadership in assessment and critique led to improvements.</p> <p>The community or professional organization provided documentation of the importance of the candidate's leadership.</p>

Category of Service	Types of Documentation	Rubrics-Satisfactory	Rubrics-Excellent
<p>Professional Service: refereeing of manuscripts, abstracts, or proposals; reviewing textbooks for publishers; adjudication of performances or exhibits; development of catalog or guidebook for exhibits; book reviews; journal editing; serving as external evaluator for P&T cases at other universities; serving as program evaluator at other universities, or for accrediting agencies; and similar assignments.</p> <p>N.B. Obviously, some reviews (e.g., for P&T) are confidential and cannot be evaluated directly.</p> <p>Depending on emphasis, some activities may be appropriately evaluated or cross-referenced under research/creative endeavor or teaching.</p>	<p>Invitations to review or perform other professional service</p> <p>Published reviews</p> <p>Edited volumes</p> <p>Reports to agencies or other universities</p> <p>Third-party evaluations</p> <p>Other: evidence of effectiveness not covered by the above</p>	<p>Occasional invitations to perform such service reflect competent performance.</p> <p>Reviews appear in recognized media appropriate to the discipline.</p> <p>Candidate contributed to efficient and timely publication of the volume.</p> <p>Candidate participated in the process and contributed to the final product.</p> <p>Evaluators assess the candidate's contributions as satisfactory per accepted standards.</p>	<p>Frequent invitations to perform such service reflect recognition of candidate's special expertise and high quality contributions.</p> <p>Reviews appear in media recognized for high quality and significance to the discipline.</p> <p>Candidate's leadership and creativity or special expertise contributed significantly to a high quality volume.</p> <p>Candidate's leadership or special expertise contributed significantly to the final product.</p> <p>Evaluators assess the candidate's contributions as excellent per accepted standards.</p>

Category of Service	Types of Documentation	Rubrics-Satisfactory	Rubrics-Excellent
<p>Professional Service (continued): member of a committee or task force of a professional association; organizer of conference, conference sessions, or workshops</p>	<p>Self-report and/or report from the committee/task force chair</p> <p>Accomplishments of the committee/task force</p> <p>Report or other product generated</p> <p>Presentations/publications by the candidate</p> <p>Third-party evaluations</p>	<p>Candidate participated regularly and contributed to the outcome.</p> <p>The committee/task force contributed to the normal and efficient functioning of the association.</p> <p>Candidate and other committee/ task force members contributed equally.</p> <p>The presentations or publications informed the associations' membership of the outcome.</p> <p>Evaluations document the quality and impact of the work of the group.</p>	<p>Candidate assumed a leadership role that positively affected the outcome and one or more of the following apply:</p> <p>The committee/task force solved a problem, or developed a plan for a new initiative, or implemented a plan, or completed other essential work consistent with the mission and goals of the professional association and with scholarly trends in the field.</p> <p>The candidate's leadership shaped the planning, drafting, and completion of the report/ product.</p> <p>The presentations or publications had a positive impact beyond the membership of the association and are cited as models for others.</p> <p>Evaluations document the significance of the candidate's contributions.</p>

OAA Memorandum 04-2
May 30, 2005
Page 12

Category of Service	Types of Documentation	Rubrics-Satisfactory	Rubrics-Excellent
<p>Professional Leadership: office in a professional organization, or comparable role</p> <p>Depending on emphasis, some of the activities mentioned here may appropriately be evaluated as research, creative endeavor or teaching</p>	<p>Accomplishments during the years served</p> <p>Self-report and/or third-party reports of the accomplishments</p>	<p>Candidate managed the routine business of the office to which he/she was appointed or elected.</p> <p>The candidate participated in decisions that affected the future of the organization.</p>	<p>The candidate’s leadership contributed significantly to the advancement of the organization’s mission or special initiative.</p> <p>The candidate’s disciplinary expertise contributed significantly to the advancement of the organization’s mission or special initiative.</p> <p>The candidate’s leadership and/or expertise shaped decisions that affected the future of the organization.</p>
	<p>Levels of responsibility over time</p>	<p>The candidate accepted the responsibilities of the office to which he/she was elected or appointed.</p>	<p>The candidate’s exemplary performance led to recognition for positive contributions and/or to being asked to assume increased levels of responsibility.</p>
	<p>Contributions to the discipline</p>	<p>The candidate’s work was consistent with trends in the discipline at the time.</p>	<p>The candidate’s leadership and expertise influenced trends in the discipline.</p>
	<p>Status of the organization</p>	<p>The candidate’s work was consistent with the status of the organization within the discipline at the time.</p>	<p>The candidate’s leadership and expertise enhanced the status of the organization.</p>

Category of Service	Types of Documentation	Rubrics-Satisfactory	Rubrics-Excellent
Professional Leadership (continued)	Other: other evidence that is not covered by the categories above.		

Susan B. Hannah
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs