TENURE AND PROMOTION EVALUATION GUIDELINES
School of Construction
College of Science and Technology
The University of Southern Mississippi

I.   Introduction

As a master's degree granting unit, the mission of the School of Construction is to provide effective engineering technology and construction management education for its graduates to serve needs in the construction, architectural and industrial sectors. To achieve its mission, the School of Construction strives to create a learning environment to nurture the development of critical thinking skills; develop knowledge and technology expertise; and support innovation and technology transfer.

Research, including the training of graduate students, and undergraduate education represents a core objective of the School of Construction at The University of Southern Mississippi to address the mission. The School strives to

- Provide high quality undergraduate and graduate education that prepares students to pursue professional degrees and/or to enter the workforce with skills necessary for life-long professional achievement,
- Advance the body of scientific knowledge through the scholarship of discovery, integration and application, and
- Offer technical and educational expertise through formal and informal outreach locally, regionally, nationally and internationally.

The School of Construction expects its faculty members to contribute to its mission by fostering the intellectual growth of students through effective teaching and by advancing knowledge through productive research activity.   The School also expects its faculty to render professional service to the University, their profession, and the public. Service activities, whether compensated or not, draw on professional expertise, relate to the teaching and research missions of the University, and, typically, imply a connection to the University. Activities in which faculty engage that do not involve their professional expertise (e.g., activities centered on the family, neighborhood, church, political party, or social action group) are commendable, but are not components of the workload of a member of the faculty.

In evaluating faculty performance, the School expects demonstrated achievement in all three areas of teaching, research, and service, while recognizing that the central criteria for tenure and promotion in rank are teaching and research productivity regardless of whether a faculty member's appointment is on the Hattiesburg campus, the Gulf Coast campus, or other locations.

* Faculty Handbook supersedes this document: (see http://www.usm.edu/pubs/factbook/Faculty_Handbook.pdf)

II. Criteria for Appointment to Faculty Rank

A. Professors are expected:

1. To hold the doctorate or other approved terminal degree of the discipline
2. To be accomplished teachers
3. To have sustained an extramurally funded research program that involves participation of graduate and undergraduate students
4. To have achieved a nationally recognized professional record of scholarship
5. To have participated significantly in the professional work of the discipline, in ways other than teaching and research
6. For typical time served as an associate professor see Faculty Handbook

B. Associate Professors are expected:

1. To hold the doctorate or other approved terminal degree of the discipline
2. To be good teachers
3. To have established an extramurally funded research program that involves participation of graduate and undergraduate students
4. To have produced a recognized professional record of scholarship
5. To have participated with promise in the professional work of the discipline, in ways other than teaching and research
6. For typical time served as an assistant professor see Faculty Handbook

C. Assistant Professors are expected:

1. To hold the doctorate or other approved terminal degree of the discipline
2. To show promise as teachers and scholars, and to have begun a definitive program of research (i.e., one that generates scholarly activity, extramural funding, and opportunities for undergraduate and graduate student research)

D. Instructors are expected:

1. To hold an approved Master's degree and have practical experience appropriate to the particular appointment
2. To show a demonstrated ability in good teaching

In all of these ranks, concerned and effective student advisement and responsible service to the University are understood to be part of the normal task of a faculty member as is a collegial working relationship with colleagues and students

III.   Performance Assessment Criteria

A. Annual Performance Evaluation

1. Faculty members are expected to contribute to the mission of the School in the three areas of teaching, research, and service, while recognizing that the central criteria for tenure and promotion in rank are teaching and research productivity.

2. The basis for assignment to one of five merit categories in the three areas of teaching, research and service (described in Appendix A, section 0.3).

3. Supporting the system described for making merit group assignments, the School of Construction employs a "points" system to assess performance (See Appendix A: Annual Activities Report). It is critical that a point system accurately reflect the relative importance and worth of activities; activity points are annually reviewed. The School of Construction points system is applied to analysis of annual reports of faculty scholarly activities, and rankings are made within each category (teaching, research, service). These rankings are used as corroborative evidence of the validity of merit group assignments as reported to the Dean in each faculty member's Annual Evaluation Report (See Appendix B).

B. Requirements for Tenure

1. Criteria for tenure normally will be identical with those required for promotion in rank to Associate Professor.

2. The School will formally evaluate progress toward tenure during the third year of University employment as a full-time, tenure-track faculty member.

3. See the University's Faculty Handbook.

IV.   Policy and Procedures

A. Annual Evaluation

1. Evaluation of calendar year performance is conducted annually between January 15 and March 15 of the year following the period under review.

2. Faculty on sabbatical leave or professional leave: See Faculty Handbook.

3. School Director: See Faculty Handbook.

4. Annual Activities Report: On of before January 1, faculty members submit their Annual Activities Report (see Appendix A) to departmental Personnel

Committee. Faculty members include in their report how their activities during the year under review met their goals and objectives.

5. Annual evaluation conferences are held between January 15 and March 1 to ascertain and discuss professional accomplishments during the period of evaluation and to discuss and establish goals and objectives to be pursued during the next period of evaluation.

6. Annual Evaluation Report: The departmental Personnel Committee prepares a written report summarizing the essential content and result of the evaluation, including recommendations arising from the evaluation of performance. (See Appendix B: Annual Evaluation Report).

7. When funds are provided for merit pay increases, the departmental Director assigns amounts of increases according to merit group classification. The departmental Director submits departmental recommendations to the Dean of the College of Science and Technology.

8. Departmental evaluation reports are forwarded to the Dean on or before the date specified by the University's Academic Calendar. Copies of evaluation reports are transmitted to faculty members being evaluated and retained within departmental personnel files.

B. Promotion [See Faculty Handbook]

1. Faculty members prepare and submit promotion dossiers to the Director of the School no later than the last day of the first full week of the fall semester. (See Appendix C: Promotion and Tenure Documents). Candidates for promotion may supplement their dossiers with additional relevant information, including a response to negative recommendations, at any level of the promotion process.

2. Departmental Promotion Committee: This committee consists of members of the faculty holding academic rank equal to, or higher than, that being sought by the candidate. The departmental Director sits as a nonvoting ex officio member. The Committee is chaired by a member elected by a simple majority vote of other members.

3. External Referees: Evaluation for promotion to the rank of Professor includes the assessment of the candidate's credentials by at least three external referees deemed qualified by the Promotion Committee (i.e., nationally recognized leaders in their respective fields).   The candidate may assist the Committee in their selection of external referees by suggesting a list of potential referees.   The Chair of the Promotion Committee solicits and receives letters from external referees selected by the Committee.

4. The Promotion Committee prepares and submits to the departmental Chair a written document, signed by committee members, recommending or declining to recommend promotion in rank. The written document includes (a) narrative detailing the rationale for the recommendation and the vote of the Committee prepared by the chair of the Committee and (b) the Promotion Evaluation Form (see Appendix C).

5. Duties of the Departmental Director: See Faculty Handbook.

   a) Review written reports of the Promotion Committee

   b) Prepare an independent recommendation either concurring or disagreeing with the recommendation of the Promotion Committee

   c) Submit both recommendations to the Dean of the College of Science & Technology

   d) Retain copies of documents within departmental personnel files

   e) Notify in writing candidates for promotion of the recommendations

C. Tenure [See Faculty Handbook]

   1. Tenure Review Proceedings

   a) Formal review of progress toward tenure is conducted during the third year of University employment as a full-time, tenure track faculty member.

   b) The review is normally conducted in conjunction with annual review.

   c) Faculty to be reviewed submit a tenure review dossier (see Appendix C) to the departmental Director.

   d) The departmental Director convenes the departmental Tenure Committee and sits as a nonvoting ex officio member. The Committee, chaired by a member elected by a simple majority vote of other members, conducts the review and submits a review report, which includes the Recommendation Form for Third-Year Review (See Appendix C), to the chair.

   e) The departmental Director, if tenured, prepares and submits an independent tenure review report either concurring or disagreeing with the report of the Tenure Committee.   Both committee and chair reports are forwarded to the Dean and the faculty member being reviewed is notified of the results of his/her review by the departmental Director.

2. Tenure Proceedings

   a) Eligible candidates for tenure prepare and submit tenure dossiers (see Appendix C) to the departmental chair no later than the last day of the first full week of the fall semester.

   b) The departmental Director convenes the departmental Tenure Committee, provides the committee with the tenure dossier, tenure review reports and annual evaluation reports of the candidate, and sits as a nonvoting ex officio member.

   c) Members of the tenure Committee vote either to recommend or to decline to recommend candidates for academic tenure. The Committee, chaired by a member elected by a simple majority vote of other members, conducts the review and submits a review report, which includes the Tenure Recommendation Form (see Appendix C), to the chair.   The written report, signed by committee members, that provides the rationale for the recommendation and the vote count of the committee.

   a) In addition, the Tenure Committee prepares and submits to the departmental Director a written document, signed by committee members, recommending or declining to recommend tenure. The written document includes the following:

        i.   Narrative detailing the rationale for the recommendation and the vote of the Committee prepared by the chair of the Committee.
        ii. Tenure Recommendation Form (see Appendix C).

   e) The departmental Director reviews the written report of the Tenure Committee and, if tenured, prepares an independent report either concurring or disagreeing with the recommendation of the Tenure Committee.

   f) The departmental chair submits the written report of the Committee and, if applicable, the Director's report to the Dean, and provides written notification of the departmental recommendation(s) to the candidate.

APPENDIX A:
Annual Activities Report

0.1. Explanation of the Annual Activities Report Document

    A. Its origin: this document includes, to the best of our knowledge, the net result of additions, modifications, and deletions to the Governance Model since its inception.

    B. Recommendation: Prior to future modifications of the Model, it is recommended that this document be accepted as the starting point and that past deliberations no longer apply. This will eliminate endless discussion by each of us who may remember past details differently.

    C. Content: In addition to the items which will be given points to be used in the evaluation process, the complete basis upon which the final evaluation is made is shown, including all calculation methods and rating in each category (T/R/S). The only subjective areas are in the determination of applicability and verification of the items claimed and the awarding of variable item points.

0.2. Instructions for use of the Annual Activities Report Document

    A. Please notice that every item which may receive points shows the awarded points in brackets [ ].

    B. Please do not alter the numbering sequence or the descriptive prose of the items given as this information is vital to use by the Governance Committee.

    C. If an item does not apply to you simply leave it blank, but do not delete the heading. It makes the committee's job less error prone.

    D. Include supporting documents for all publications and for the items specifically requesting documentation, especially the variable point items.

0.3. Determination of Overall Performance Rating (OPR)

Partial ratings (*p*OPR) in teaching, research/scholarship and service activities lead to overall performance ratings (OPR) which establish merit group categories.

0.3.1. Merit group categories (1-5)

Faculty input in the teaching, research/scholarly and service activity categories establish partial overall performance ratings (*p*OPR). These partial ratings in activity categories are weighted and summed to establish the overall performance rating (OPR). The OPR determines the final merit group category using the following scale:

Category 5: Excellent (Far Exceeds Expectations)
Category 4: Good (Exceeds Expectations)
Category 3: Satisfactory (Meets Expectations)
Category 2: Needs Improvement
Category 1: Unsatisfactory

0.3.2. Factors considered in establishing merit group category (1-5) for each evaluation category

0.3.2.1. Teaching

Merit group assignment is based on a number of factors, including among others quality of teaching, teaching load, and successful participation in training of graduate students.

0.3.2.2. Research

A productive research program in an academic setting is characterized by:

    a) Student involvement,
    b) Dissemination of findings by way of publication in refereed journals and presentations at scientific meetings, and
    c) Pursuit and acquisition of extramural funds to support that program.

Faculty will develop a research program that will permit the publication of at least one refereed publication in a national or international journal or industry recognized proceedings each year (on average). Individuals not meeting this expectation must show strong evidence by other means of an ongoing research or scholarly program that may reasonably be expected to lead to refereed publications or reflect other types of scholarly activity. These means might include publication of books or technical manuals or chapters in such publications, editing of books, presentations at scientific meetings, unrefereed publications, etc.

0.3.2.3. Service

Service activities considered in making merit group assignments include a variety of activities within the University as well as professional activities outside the University. Within the University service activities include but are not limited to Department, College or University committee memberships and/or chairships, service as an undergraduate advisor, service on graduate committees (exclusive of service as chair of such committees, which is considered primarily a teaching activity), and various forms of administrative service (including service as a Director or Coordinator of various aspects of academic programs). Professional service outside of the University includes but is not limited to service as an officer in professional organizations (including service as Session Chair at professional meetings), editorial service for professional journals, and evaluation (refereeing) of manuscripts or proposals. Professional service includes the conduct of workshops offering

professional training, or the acquisition of external funds to support such workshops. All faculty members are expected to serve on ad hoc or standing committees as called upon through appointment or election, and are expected to seek out and pursue service opportunities of potential interest as part of their professional development and obligation. The requirements for assignment to higher merit groups increase as one's career develops and progresses. Junior faculty members, especially newly appointed faculty members, may "Meet Expectations" simply through service on departmental committees, but they are expected to increase the extent and the level of service involvement as they develop professionally and opportunities present themselves.

Each faculty member's contribution in each of the three categories of Teaching, Research, and Service is evaluated as objectively as possible, but subjective evaluation necessarily plays a part because of the complexity of the types of activities in each category and differences in stage of professional development of those being evaluated. For example, in the service category some committee assignments are inherently more time consuming and demanding than others, in the teaching category some student groups may traditionally provide lower evaluations (e.g. in lower division service courses), and in the research category, some journals are of generally recognized higher quality and are more selective than others.

0.3.3. Basis for assigning overall group ranking

Each faculty member is placed into one of the five merit groups in each of the three categories of teaching, research, and service based on the considerations summarized in the sections above using the following formulas and procedures.

In the teaching category (section A), points [P] awarded as a result of student evaluations are determined by:

$$[P] = 8 * \frac{\sum_i N a_i n_i c_i}{\sum_i N n_i c_i}$$

Where: P = points awarded for teaching evaluations
a = Course evaluation average
c = Credit hours for course
n = Number of students responding in course
N = Number of courses evaluated

Points [P] are then multiplied by a scaling factor 1.25 for later conversion to 5-point scale. The sum of teaching sections A-C forms the raw point rating for the total teaching activity category.

The sum of research and scholarly activity sections forms the raw point rating for the total research activity category and are not modified to this point. The sum of

service activity sections forms the raw point rating for the total service activity category and are not modified to this point.

Adjusted activity ratings (ADJ-100) are determined from the raw point activity category totals (using a 100 point scale), are normalized to 77.5 (centroid of GOOD category), and are capped to a maximum of 100 points by:

$$ADJ\text{-}100 = minimum[((CPT * N * F)/CPTT), 100]$$

Where: CPT = Category point total
N = Number of faculty
F = Normalization factor (77.5)
CPTT = Total of all faculty activity raw points in category

Category Rating	Activity % Range	
	Min	Max
Excellent >=	85	
Good	70.00	84.99
Satisfactory	55.00	69.99
Needs Improvement	40.00	54.99
Unsatisfactory <=	39.99	

The adjusted point totals are then multiplied by 0.05 to convert to 5-point scale.

The following teaching-research-service evaluation weighting factors (which indicate percentage of effort) are then used as determined by the Personnel Committee to the advantage of the faculty member; the result is the partial overall performance rating (*p*OPR) for each category:

Teaching range   0.2-0.6
Research range   0.2-0.6
Service range   0.1-0.2

Sum of combined weighting factor ranges equals 1.0.

The sum of *p*OPR for each category of teaching, research and service then forms the overall performance rating (OPR). The table below places the OPR in rating categories from Excellent to Unsatisfactory for reporting to the dean's office using the Annual Evaluation Report document found in Appendix B:

Category Rating	OPR Range		
	Min	Max	
Excellent >=	4.2500		5
Good	3.5000	4.2495	4
Satisfactory	2.7500	3.4995	3
Needs Improvement	2.0000	2.7495	2
Unsatisfactory <=	1.9995		1

SCHOOL OF CONSTRUCTION

ANNUAL ACTIVITIES REPORT

January 1, 20XX through December 31, 20XX

NAME:
DATE:
RANK:
YEARS IN RANK:
TENURED (Years):
YEARS AT USM:
YEARS FULL-TIME TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

I. TEACHING ACTIVITIES

A. Student Review

Please list evaluation averages per course below:

COURSE #   # RESPONDING   EVAL. AVE.

Please list total enrollments, etc., below:

COURSE #   ENROLLMENT   CRED. HRS.   SEM. CR. HRS.

Spring:
Summer:
Fall:

B. Special Contributions

1. New Course Preparation, first offering [2.0]

2. First Time to Teach a Course [1.0]

C. Extra-Classroom

1. Director, Thesis Committee, once per thesis or project [2.0]

2. Member, Thesis Committee, once per thesis or project [0.5]

3. Service on Special Panels/Commissions on Teaching [2.0]

4. Project Funded by external agency, each; the faculty member may elect to place project either here or under Research [1] + [1] for each $4,000 funded, divided by number of PI's. Each proposal should be fully documented (show funding source, funded amount, principle investigators, and USM log number).

5. Other, fully documented each activity, depending on scope (maximum this category is 6 points total) [0-2.0].

6. Subjective Evaluation of Teaching Performance by Governance Committee. If desired, include statement of special situations which may apply to you. [0-4.0]

II. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES/CREATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS

  A. BOOKS

   1. BOOKS

       a. SINGLE AUTHOR [30]

       b. MULTIPLE AUTHORS [30, divided]

       c. EDITORSHIP OF BOOK [10]

   2. CHAPTERS IN BOOKS   [5 per chapter]

   3. MONOGRAPH OR GUIDES

       a. SINGLE AUTHOR [15]

       b. JOINT AUTHOR [15, divided]

  B. REFEREED JOURNAL/PROCEEDINGS ARTICLES

   1. INTERNATIONAL JOURNALS [8]

   2. NATIONAL [6]

   3. REGIONAL OR STATE [4]

  C. UNREFEREED JOURNAL/PROCEEDINGS ARTICLES

   1. INTERNATIONAL JOURNALS [4]

   2. NATIONAL [4]

3. REGIONAL OR STATE [3]

D. OTHER PUBLICATIONS

1. ABSTRACTS [1]

2. OTHER[1]

E. PRESENTATIONS

1. PROFESSIONAL AUDIENCE, (International or National) [2]

2. PROFESSIONAL AUDIENCE, (Regional or State) [1.5]

3. PROFESSIONAL AUDIENCE, (Local) [1]

4. LAY AUDIENCE, (Academic Subject) [1]

F. BOOK OR SOFTWARE REVIEWS

1. REFEREED [2]

2. UNREFEREED [1.5]

G. PATENTS [15]

H. OTHER CREATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS

1. Generating New Knowledge New products, tools, software (each major accomplishment, five (5) or more man-days of preparation, fully documented) [2]

2. Design Awards and Competitions

a. International, won [5.0]

b. International, accepted [2.0]

c. National, won [4.0]

d. National (entered) [1.5]

e. State/regional/local (won) [1.0]

f. State/regional/local (entered) [0.5]

g. Designs published nationally or regionally in professional media [0.5]

h. Design awards given by professional organizations or journals at the national or regional level [2.0]

i. Design awards given by professional organizations or journals at the state or local level [1.0]

I. OTHER. (Fully documented) Value determined by the governance committee: [0-2.0]

III. FUNDING/RESEARCH

A. Proposals (when approved by all administrative levels) [1]. Provide complete information including USM log number, funded amount, funding source, and principle investigators.

B. Project Funded by external agency, each; the faculty member may elect to place project either here or under Teaching [5] + [1 for each $10,000 funded, divided by number of PI's].   (For credit under teaching, projects must be directly related to the improvement of teaching. List uses of project funds/donations in actual classroom or laboratory applications.) Provide complete information including USM log number, funded amount, funding source, and principle investigators.

C. Proposals Funded by internal agency, external to department [2]. Provide complete information including USM log number, funded amount, funding source, and principle investigators.

D. Publication of completed final document for funded research [3]. For credit in this category, final project reports or other project results must be published in professional media but not in those reported in the scholarly activities section.

    List full description of project.

E. University/Industry/Government Agency Cooperative Efforts, consulting arrangements, etc. based on effort required, fully documented, with formal agreement and should advance knowledge in discipline. [1-5]

F. Other Research Activities, fully documented. [1-2]

IV. SERVICE

A. Professional Service

    1. International Officer [20]

2. National Officer [15]

3. Regional or State Officer [10]

4. International Committee Member [6]

5. National Committee Member [3]

6. Regional or State Committee Member [1.5]

7. Professional Journal Editorship, national [20]

8. Professional Journal Editorship, region or state [10]

9. Article Reviewer, international/national, per article [2]

10. Article Reviewer, regional/state, per article [1]

11. Workshop or Seminar, official organizer, international/national [10]

12. Workshop or Seminar, official organizer, regional or state [5]

13. Workshop or Seminar, chair [2]

14. Workshop or Seminar, panel member [1]

15. Accreditation Team, chair [5]

16. Accreditation Team, member [2]

17. Grant Proposal Reviews, each [1]

18. Host or Sponsor of a meeting, workshop, event lasting 0.5 to 2 days [1]

19. Miscellaneous, fully documented [1-10] depending on effort.

B. University Service

1. University-wide committee, elective
      [5] + [1 point for officer or 2 points for chair]

2. University-wide committee, appointive
      [2] + [1 point for officer or 2 points for chair]

3. College-wide committee, elective

[3] + [1 point for officer or 2 points for chair]

4. College-wide committee, appointive
    [1] + [1 point for officer or 2 points for chair]

5. Academic advisor to campus wide student group [2]

6. Other, fully documented [1-2]

C. Community Service

1. State-wide committee as a representative of the university
    [2] + [0.5 if serving as an officer].

2. City-wide committee as a representative of the university
    [2] + [0.5 if serving as an officer].

3. Community-wide committee as a representative of the university
    [1] + [0.5 if serving as an officer].

D. School of Construction Service

1. Each SOC committee [2] + [1 for chair]

2. Ad hoc committee (no inactive committee counted) [1.0]

3. Faculty advisor--student organization [1.0]

4. Recruiting (visit to each school) [1.0]

5. Active efforts in placement of graduates in jobs [1.0 max.]

6. Active efforts to place students in co-op or internship positions. [0-1]

7. Academic Program Management. [0-2]

8. Professional Memberships/Active Participation. [0.5]

9. Other, fully documented. [0-2]

V. STATEMENT OF GOALS

Date: _____

Faculty Name: _____

Year   _____

A. Self-Evaluation of Goal Attainment for Last Year

B. Goals and Priorities for This Year

C. Perceived Barriers to Attainment of Goals

APPENDIX B:

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

SCHOOL OF CONSTRUCTION
REPORT OF ANNUAL EVALUATION

For Calendar Year _____

Faculty Member: *Sample*
Date of Annual Evaluation:
Rank:
Years in Rank:
Tenured (Years):
Years in Service at USM:
Years Full-Time Teaching:

	Teaching	Research	Service	OPR
Excellent/far exceeds expectations: 5				
Good/exceeds expectations: 4				
Satisfactory/meets expectations: 3	3.2		3.0	
Needs improvement: 2				
Unsatisfactory/far below expectations: 1		0.1		
PERCENTAGE OF EFFORT	0.7	0.1	0.2	
*p*OPR	2.23	0.01	0.6	2.84

* OPR = Overall Performance Rating; *p*OPR = partial OPR

NARRATIVE REPORT OF RESULTS OF ANNUAL EVALUATION

TEACHING
Relative to tenure-track faculty, on a 5-point scale, your rating in this category is ( ).

RESEARCH/FUNDING
Relative to tenure-track faculty, on a 5-point scale, your rating in this category is ( ).

SERVICE
Relative to tenure-track faculty, on a 5-point scale, your rating in this category is ( ).

THE SCHOOL OF CONSTRUCTION faculty chose a governance option with two departmental faculty members and the department chair as the departmental personnel committee.

_____   ____/____/____
Director   Date

_____   ____/____/____
Committee Member   Date

_____   ____/____/____
Committee Member   Date

I have received a copy of the evaluation report:

_____   ____/____/____
Faculty Member   Date

ORIGINAL: Departmental Personnel File
COPY: Faculty Member

APPENDIX C:

PROMOTION AND TENURE DOCUMENTS

I. Instructions for preparation of dossiers

A. Each promotion or tenure dossier may consist of no more than two volumes. If two actions are under consideration (e.g., promotion to associate professor and tenure), a single dossier is acceptable but two separate transmittal sheets are required. Documents in both volumes must be easy to remove so that copies can be made. Do not use plastic document sleeves or spiral binding.

B. VOLUME I must be a standard, three-ring binder with spine no thicker than one inch and materials organized into three sections separated by dividers. The applicants name and the action (e.g., tenure, promotion to associate professor, promotion to professor) must be indicated clearly on both the front cover and spine of the binder.

   1. Section A consists of promotion and /or tenure transmittal sheet, a copy of which is attached.

   2. Section B should include a current curriculum vitae. The candidate may include an essay highlighting special accomplishments in front of the curriculum vitae.

   3. Section C consists of evaluations originating at the various levels of review. Letters from external reviewers should also be included in this section.

C. VOLUME II must also be a standard, three-ring binder with a spine no more than three inches thick. It should contain all supporting documentation and be divided into three sections. The method of presentation of this material is left to the discretion of the candidate, but care should be taken to ensure that it can be reviewed easily by persons involved in the evaluation process.

   1. Section A- TEACHING. This section includes documentation of teaching effectiveness and should contain at least the printed summaries of the mandatory student evaluations administered during the fall semester. Additional student evaluations, student comments, course syllabi, etc., may also be included.

   2. Section B- RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, & CREATIVE ACTIVITIES. This section includes items such as reprints of journal articles, copies of book chapters, successful grant applications, summary of citations, etc.

   3. Section C- SERVICE. This section will include a summary of university, professional, community service activities, as well as the economic development activities. Also include the documentation supporting the value and effectiveness of the service.

IF APPLICANTS RECEIVE A NEGATIVE REVIEW, DOSSIERS MAY BE
RETAINED IN THE PROVOST'S OFFICE INDEFINITELY. HENCE, ALL
APPLICANTS ARE ADVISED TO MAKE COPIES OF ANY MATERIALS
THAT MAYBE NEEDED FOR FUTURE REFERENCE. DOSSIERS SHOULD
NOT CONTAIN MATERIAL THAT CAN NOT BE RETRIEVED OR
REPRODUCED FROM THE APPLICANT'S OWN FILES.

II. Location of documents to be submitted with dossiers

http://www.usm.edu/provost/forms.htm

1. Recommendation Form for Third-Year Review
2. Promotion Evaluation Form
3. Instructions for Promotion Evaluation Form
4. Tenure Recommendation Form
5. Instructions for Tenure Recommendation Form

III. Location of faculty handbook

http://www.usm.edu/pubs/factbook/Faculty_Handbook.pdf