

LAS STANDARDS OF ACADEME

EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

1. Philosophy	1
2. Teaching	3
3. Scholarship	7
4. Service	12

1. PHILOSOPHY

1. Philosophy

1.1 Overview

LAS subscribes to the philosophy that teaching should be the primary area of emphasis for faculty members, with scholarship and service as important but lower priorities. Faculty will be recruited, evaluated, awarded tenure, and promoted predicated on this perspective.

The academic evaluation and reward system in Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) has two purposes: (a) to provide the means by which faculty, through annual reviews, progress through the academic ranks; and (b) to certify high achievement.

1.2 Definitions of Concepts

The following section defines pertinent concepts.

Teaching: For annual reviews, teaching refers to the act of cultivating a rich learning environment, which includes sharing knowledge, nurturing critical inquiry, inspiring curiosity, and encouraging students to apply what they have learned. Teaching primary reflects instruction-related activities that directly impact student learning. Because Nevada State College is a teaching institution, offering engaging and meaningful instruction is a highly valued activity in LAS. Section 2.0 provides a detailed description of the lines of evidence used within LAS to evaluate teaching.

Scholarship: For annual reviews, LAS defines scholarship as the process of exploring a relevant question or problem, synthesizing existing knowledge, developing new ideas, and sharing the results through discipline-appropriate outlets. LAS values scholarly efforts that represent the spectrum of orientation from basic to applied, including the scholarship of teaching. Section 3.0 provides a detailed description of the lines of evidence used within LAS to document accomplishment in scholarship.

Service: LAS defines service as a faculty member's professional responsibilities to Nevada State College and its external community. Although we value all forms of service (institutional, professional, and community/governmental), LAS places most emphasis on service at the institutional level. Section 4.0 provides a detailed description of the lines of evidence used within LAS to document accomplishment in service.

1.3 Annual Review Plans

At each annual review, the faculty member and evaluator will develop an annual review plan for the following year. The annual review plan will include goals for the faculty member to achieve in teaching, scholarship, and service. At each annual review, the faculty member must provide a copy of the annual review plan agreed upon at the previous year's review and indicate which items they completed.

1.4 Annual Review Portfolios

Faculty will submit a portfolio of annual review materials each year; this portfolio will include an updated CV; syllabi; a narrative or table of no more than 12 pages summarizing accomplishments throughout the

1. PHILOSOPHY

year; and no more than 15 pages of evidence chosen by the faculty member to illustrate those accomplishments. The page limit on evidence does not include any of the following:

- CV;
- Syllabi;
- Student evaluations;
- Student papers turned in to show an example of the instructor's feedback on an assignment;
- Items or evidence specifically requested by the department chair after receiving the annual review file.

1.5 Flexibility in Annual Review Ratings

LAS sets the rating guidelines for assessing teaching, scholarship, and service on annual reviews. Discipline-specific standards and constraints should be considered when evaluating the quality and quantity of faculty contributions, and evaluators may adjust the ratings requirements accordingly. *It is the responsibility of faculty members to justify flexibility in applying LAS ratings guidelines to their teaching, scholarship, or service contributions.*

1.6 Standards of Academe and Tenure Guidelines

Both the Standards of Academe and the Tenure Guidelines utilize many of the same evaluative criteria. Initially, they were part of the same document. However, there was a strong rationale for separating the Standards of Academe from the Tenure Guidelines. The Standards of Academe require more frequent updates to reflect institutional changes, faculty concerns, modifications of service priorities, and research on best practices in pedagogy. The Tenure Guidelines, however, need to remain consistent throughout a faculty member's progress toward tenure. Therefore, in 2014, the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences separated the two documents. The Standards of Academe now apply specifically to annual reviews and the Tenure Guidelines apply specifically to tenure. Appointed faculty committees will evaluate and update the Standards of Academe as needed, and faculty will be required to follow these standards for annual reviews upon approval by the Provost. Faculty committees will also evaluate and update the Tenure Guidelines as appropriate, but faculty will be evaluated for tenure under the guidelines in place when their contract as a tenure-track faculty member at NSC began. This protects faculty from having the Tenure Guidelines change as they are progressing toward tenure.

2. TEACHING

2. Teaching

2.1 Overview

According to the Nevada State College mission statement, “excellence in teaching leads to innovative, technology-rich learning opportunities that promote the acquisition of interdisciplinary knowledge and skills.” To support this mission, the lines of evidence for excellence in teaching provide some comparability in evaluation while recognizing the diverse ways in which faculty may demonstrate teaching excellence.

As part of their annual review materials, faculty members shall submit a teaching narrative that provides context for the review of the individual's teaching effectiveness. The narrative will be a reflection on important teaching activities, accomplishments, and challenges experienced in the year under review.

Material evaluated for annual reviews will include a syllabus (including the standard elements discussed below), official student course evaluations (available to department chairs on the shared X drive), and evidence of student learning or accomplishment for each course taught. Faculty members should expect to provide additional evidence of teaching effectiveness as requested by their department chair during the review process.

Items submitted as evidence of teaching effectiveness should relate to the quality of the learning environment provided to students in courses at NSC. Other items that may be related to teaching, such as research or publications in the scholarship of teaching, mentoring students toward making a conference presentation, or taking a leadership role in teaching workshops, should be submitted in the scholarship or service categories, as defined in the service and scholarship sections of this document.

2.2 Required Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

The following are the minimum required lines of evidence:

- Syllabus for each course taught that incorporates the elements in the standard NSC template;
- Official student evaluations for each course taught;
- Final grade distributions for each course taught;
- Teaching observation(s) from the department chair;
- Teaching narrative of one to two pages.

Evaluators have copies of final grade distributions and student evaluations on file. Faculty need not provide these items.

The faculty member may request that the department chair exclude course evaluations with extremely low response rates from consideration, or the department chair may use independent discretion to exclude them.

2.3 Additional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may be provided by the faculty member. This evidence may include, but is not limited to:

2. TEACHING

- Exams, assignments, projects, or other assessments developed by the instructor to measure student performance;
- Lectures, handouts, and other materials used to aid instruction;
- Peer observations of teaching conducted by the faculty member;
- Video or audio recordings of teaching;
- Descriptions of innovative teaching methods used;
- Grade distributions for assignments or exams;
- Mid-semester evaluations and descriptions of how they were used to adjust or improve a course;
- Descriptions of how diversity issues were incorporated into course content;
- Examples of feedback provided on papers, projects, exams, or other assignments;
- Evidence-based assessment of the effectiveness of an assignment, activity, or instructional technique used in a course;
- Video or audio recordings of student performance;
- Teaching awards;
- Other discipline-specific evidence of teaching effectiveness;
- Acceptance of an external teaching-related grant;
- Additional evidence as requested by the faculty member's department chair.

2.4 Activities Related to Teaching

As a part of their teaching responsibilities, faculty members often participate in related activities that enrich the quality of education at Nevada State College. A description of these activities should be provided in the annual review materials. These activities may include, but are not limited to:

- New preparations or substantial revisions or improvements to a course;
- Fieldwork supervision as part of a course;
- Significant student mentoring that includes a teaching component and an assessment of student learning.

2.5 Rating Teaching in the Annual Review Process

When rating teaching, evaluators will consider the faculty member's progress toward meeting the goals in the annual review plan. The quality of contributions will be rated more highly than the quantity.

Due to the variability of the numerical ratings on student evaluations across courses and disciplines, the numerical thresholds in this section should be interpreted as guidelines and not absolute standards. Receiving numerical ratings above or below the thresholds do not guarantee that an instructor will attain the corresponding rating as they are merely one measure among many used for evaluation.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet expectations

An Unsatisfactory rating indicates one or more of the following conditions:

- Fails to produce evidence of a Satisfactory performance;
- Failure to sufficiently improve in aspects of teaching identified in previous annual reviews as essential areas for improvement;

2. TEACHING

- Existence of major student complaints about one or more of the instructor's courses. If such complaints occur, the faculty member may provide a justification or explanation of the student complaints. This explanation will be considered by the department chair when determining whether an Unsatisfactory rating is appropriate.

Satisfactory: Meets expectations

At the Satisfactory level, faculty members are expected to be competent teachers, as evidenced by the creation of a classroom climate that respects students and welcomes diversity, the absence of major problems or student complaints related to an instructor's courses, and by quality contributions in all of the following areas:

- A well-developed syllabus with adequate expectations and rigor that includes a course description, course objectives, evaluation criteria/methods, a course schedule, and office hours;
- Availability to students outside of classroom hours;
- Content that is relevant to the course as evidenced by adequately rigorous readings, texts, and updated course materials that demonstrate a systematic effort by the instructor to convey course material;
- Student evaluations include written comments that are generally satisfactory and numerical ratings typically above 4.0 on a 5-point scale, with 5 being the highest (where faculty members do not meet these criteria, they may explain mitigating circumstances they believe led to unreasonably low scores);
- Major assignments, projects, exams, or other assessments developed by the instructor;
- Evidence of substantive feedback given to students regarding performance on major assignments or exams;
- Final grade distributions not significantly skewed in a persistent manner (faculty members may submit a rationale explaining cases in which grade distributions are skewed, which will be considered by the department chair).

Commendable: Exceeds expectations

Faculty members are expected to meet the following criteria:

- Meets Satisfactory performance standards;
- Evaluations with positive written comments and numerical ratings typically above 4.25 on a 5-point scale, with 5 being highest (where faculty members do not meet these criteria, they may explain mitigating circumstances they believe led to unreasonably low scores);
- Quality contributions in some of the following major areas of teaching effort or equivalent:
 - Development and use of innovative course materials, teaching and active-learning techniques, or technologies;
 - Adapting and improving teaching based on feedback from students, peers, and the department chair;
 - Grading assignments and providing effective feedback in a reasonable timeframe such that students are aware of their progress throughout the course;
 - Assessment of the effectiveness of teaching endeavors;
 - Meeting goals set in the annual review plan for the year or new goals that developed during the year;
 - Application of appropriate rigor for the level of the course;
 - Assessment of student learning;

2. TEACHING

- Supervision of an independent study or experiential learning activities that include assessment of student learning;
- Incorporating or significantly addressing diversity issues in courses or course materials.

Evaluators may also consider the following as evidence of teaching effectiveness:

- Receipt of a teaching award;
- Acceptance of external teaching-related grant.

Excellent: Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner

Faculty members are expected to meet the following criteria:

- Consistently meets and exceeds Commendable performance standards;
- Evaluations should have positive written comments and numerical ratings typically above 4.5 on a 5-point scale, with 5 being highest (where faculty members do not meet these criteria, they may explain mitigating circumstances they believe led to unreasonably low scores);
- High-quality contributions in some of the following major areas of teaching effort or equivalent:
 - Consistent integration of active learning strategies in the classroom;
 - Consistent use of highly-engaging and appropriate learning materials that are targeted toward the respective course and student learning outcomes;
 - Efforts to design and revise courses based on evidence from published literature on teaching effectiveness;
 - Earning external certification in teaching practices;
 - Effective integration of written work and use of evidence-based strategies that improve student writing skills;
 - Being highly attentive to classroom dynamics and working to ensure the participation of all students;
 - Consistent and well-researched innovation in pedagogy (e.g., technologies, teaching techniques) that is practically applied and successful most of the time.

3. SCHOLARSHIP

3. Scholarship

3.1 Overview

Evidence of productive scholarship can be supported by published records and other original discipline-specific peer-reviewed and editor-reviewed work of a professional nature, including research on the scholarship of teaching, creative works (for those in the arts), and the mentoring of substantial student research projects. Categories of evidence of scholarship are presented in Section 3.2 below.

In annual reviews, departmental and school-level evaluators judge the quality of scholarship done. Quality refers to the extent to which scholarship contributes to advances in knowledge and/or the enrichment of teaching. This concept of quality places more importance on the process and effect than on the quantity of products.

Faculty should provide a short narrative statement in their annual review to provide a context for their scholarly efforts. Collaboration on products is encouraged and supported by the faculty of LAS, although it is expected that a share of the products will reflect sole or principal authorship.

3.2 Evidence of Scholarship

Lines of evidence related to scholarship might include, but are not limited to:

Research and Professional Publications. The quality of the candidate's research and professional publications or reports will be evaluated within the context of norms for the candidate's discipline. Juried outlets are accorded more significance than publications that do not undergo peer review.

Chapters in Books. Book chapters will be evaluated in terms of the inherent quality of the piece and scope of impact or dissemination within the context of norms for the candidate's discipline. Refereed chapters are accorded more significance than non-refereed chapters.

Books. Scholarly books that broaden a disciplinary knowledge base with original research or produce novel applications of existing knowledge to professional problems are accorded the most significance within this subcategory. Textbooks that compile and organize existing knowledge are weighted less than an author's unique work. Readings, edited books, and conference proceedings shall, in turn, be given less significance than standard textbooks.

Artistic Production. Nevada State College respects the work of artistic scholars and supports their efforts. For those in fields where artistic production is standard, works that are creative in nature (fine art, production of films, creative writing, poetry, and others) will be evaluated within the context of norms for the candidate's discipline.

Undergraduate Research. Faculty members are encouraged to mentor student research and research projects. Mentorship and supervision of student research will be evaluated in terms of the length of project, dissemination of research, and peer-reviewed professional publications. Projects that are more time-intensive (over several semesters) will be accorded more significance than those where faculty take a more

3. SCHOLARSHIP

peripheral role in mentoring students or research projects. Student work accepted for publication in a professional, peer-reviewed journal will be accorded the most significance within this subcategory.

Professional Reports, Technical Reports, Informational Reports, Monographs, and Lab Manuals. Professional publications will be evaluated in terms of their quality, with reference to the intended audience. As with books and book chapters, the scope of dissemination will be considered.

Conference Papers and Poster Presentations. The value attributed to paper and poster presentations is variable, and will be evaluated by the following six factors (listed here in no particular order of importance): (a) the quality of the paper or poster, (b) the quality of the conference, (c) the scope of the conference - international, national, regional, or local, (d) the scope of the dissemination of the paper, (e) whether the item was refereed, and (f) whether the paper or poster was invited. Generally speaking, formal presentations will be granted more weight than poster presentations. Evaluators may also grant more weight to papers or presentations that include significant student involvement.

Scholarship-Based Grants and Contracts. Funded grants and contracts provide evidence of the capacity to organize scholarly activity judged meritorious by external funding agencies. Therefore, external funding will be accorded more significance than internal (college) funding. Grant and contract proposals should be evaluated in terms of the funding agency and the scope of the funded research.

Scholarship Production in Progress. Evidence of scholarship in progress, particularly the continuation of funded endeavors, manuscripts under review, exhibitions under development, and formal working papers serves as an indicator of the candidate's intent to complete projects. Completing a prospectus, literature review, or data collection, and writing individual parts or chapters of a project, are examples of production in progress. Statements of scholarship in progress should be supported by artifacts such as working drafts or notes.

Other Peer-Reviewed Creative Endeavors. Evidence provided for scholarship production in other forms (lectures, creative work, unique equipment, computer software/program design, video productions) will be evaluated in terms of (a) scope of dissemination, (b) character of receiving audience, and (c) prestige of validating authority, institution or agency. External validation of quality is essential.

Refereeing Peer-Reviewed Books and Journal Articles. Reviewing the contributions of other scholars is an important service. This achievement will be evaluated based on the time and effort it takes to referee the publication, as well as the overall impact of the publication.

Shorter Works that Advance Public Knowledge. This may include short articles published in the bulletins of academic organizations and various forms of public media (newspapers, legitimate web magazines, etc.) that advance the general public knowledge. Such activities have less significance than original peer-reviewed contributions such as journal articles. Therefore, two works that fall into this subcategory count as *one* item for annual review. This category cannot be counted more than once in any review year, regardless of the total number of items published.

3.3 Academic Leadership in Scholarship

Lines of evidence related to the demonstration of academic leadership in scholarship might include, but are not limited to:

3. SCHOLARSHIP

- Identifying, developing, funding, designing, implementing, and completing research, development, dissemination, or evaluation projects of significant scope. Evaluations will consider the extent to which such projects enhance one's recognition and involve other faculty, students, and staff.
- Developing regional, national, or international conferences, symposia, or the like for the dissemination of research findings;
- Active membership on editorial boards of scholarly journals.

3.4 National Recognition in Scholarship

Lines of evidence related to the demonstration of national recognition in scholarship may include, but are not limited to:

- Development of a model or practice that is widely adopted;
- Extensive publications in primary scholarly outlets;
- Record of high accomplishment in creative endeavors of relevance to the field;
- Frequent citations in literature;
- Obtaining funding through competitive proposal writing;
- Number and quality of invited addresses, symposia, colloquia, and presentations.

3.5 Rating Scholarship in the Annual Review Process

Each year, all faculty members shall present evidence of scholarly progress that outlines their scholarly contributions over the year in review. Evaluators will then assess each faculty member's scholarly output by applying the categories in 3.6 to the ratings requirements in 3.7.

3.6 Categories for Rating Evidence of Scholarship in the Annual Review

The following categories provide general guidelines for assessing an individual's work. Contributions not listed here, as well as those contributions listed in 3.3 and 3.4, should be considered. As LAS values quality over quantity, evaluators should adapt these categories where necessary, especially when dictated by the standards or requirements of a particular field or discipline.

Level A - Includes the following items or equivalent:

- Develops, conducts, and/or supervises research with students;
- Evidence of preparation of scholarly work with a clear timeline for completion (e.g., pilot testing; data collection, literature review);
- Submission of scholarly work for presentation at a conference;
- Completion of other scholarly products (e.g., software or conference proceedings);
- Refereeing an article for a peer-reviewed journal;
- Presentation of a new poster at professional conference;
- Publication of a research note or book review;
- Publication of a peer-recognized field-specific encyclopedia article;
- Submission of an external grant (level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers). Note: Submission of external grant applications that require significant research and preparation may be considered as a level B item at evaluators' discretion;
- Management of an external grant (level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers). Note: The acceptance of a management role of a large external grant may be considered a level B item at evaluators' discretion;

3. SCHOLARSHIP

- Two (2) short discipline-specific published works that advance public knowledge (non-refereed).
Note: Two works that fall into this category together count as *one* item for the purposes of annual review. This item cannot be counted more than once in any review year.

Level B - Includes the following items or equivalent:

- Submission of a manuscript to a refereed publication for initial peer-review;
- Resubmission of an article to a peer-reviewed journal that required revisions. (A resubmission could be considered a Level A achievement based on the amount of work it requires. The faculty member must provide evidence to show that the resubmission is equivalent to other Level B achievements.)
- Presentation of a new scholarly paper or a research presentation at a professional conference;
- Substantial role in mentoring a student or students toward the successful presentation of a scholarly paper or poster at a professional conference;
- Mentoring a student to publish work in an undergraduate research journal or creative outlet.
- Presentation as keynote or invited speaker at a conference, symposia, colloquium, or other significant academic event;
- Publishing a book chapter (editor- or peer-reviewed);
- Refereeing a book for an academic press;
- Receipt of a local or regional external grant (level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers);
- Completion of two or more chapters of an accepted book that is a synthesis of previously compiled knowledge;
- Completion of final draft of an accepted book that is a synthesis of previously compiled knowledge;
- Peer-reviewed exhibition or release of a single, discipline-specific, stand-alone piece of creative work (for those in the arts);
- Completion of a scholarly technical/professional report or monograph;
- Publication of a laboratory work book;
- Publication of an accepted book chapter that required substantial revisions or further research as documented by evidence;
- Acceptance of book prospectus;
- Serving as Editor of a peer-reviewed journal.

Level C: Includes the following items or equivalent:

- Acceptance of a peer-reviewed journal article for publication;
- Substantial role in guiding an undergraduate research project that is accepted for peer-reviewed publication;
- Acceptance of a national-level external research grant (level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers);
- Acceptance of a scholarly peer-reviewed or editor-reviewed book chapter;
- Completion of two or more chapters of an accepted editor- or peer-reviewed book that is scholarly and based on original research and thought;
- Completion of final draft of an accepted book that is scholarly and based on original research and thought;
- Exhibition, publication, or release of a substantial creative work in a peer-reviewed venue (for those in the arts);
- Exhibition or publication of a major discipline-specific nationally- or regionally-recognized peer-reviewed creative work(s) (i.e. a major exhibition or film or novel release for those in the arts).

3. SCHOLARSHIP

3.7 Scholarship Ratings for Annual Review

LAS set the following rating guidelines for assessing Scholarship on the annual review. These benchmarks serve solely as a guide. Evaluators can be flexible in the ratings where faculty members have undertaken forms of scholarship or scholarly leadership not listed here.

Note: A consistent rating of Satisfactory on annual reviews is not equivalent to a rating of Satisfactory on the tenure review. Tenure-seeking faculty should plan out their scholarship agendas so they have time to complete the required expectations listed in the Tenure Guidelines.

Rating	Definition	Criteria
Unsatisfactory	Fails to meet expectations	Fails to produce evidence of a Satisfactory performance
Satisfactory	Meets expectations	Active program of quality research or creative activity which contributes to the discipline's body of knowledge and includes either: Two (2) items at Level A or equivalent OR One (1) Level B item or equivalent.
Commendable	Exceeds expectations	Evidence of quality peer-reviewed research accomplishment as evidenced by either: Two (2) Level B items, or equivalent OR One (1) Level B item <i>and</i> two (2) Level A items, or equivalent.
Excellent	Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner	Distinguished by the quality and quantity of contributions which advance knowledge, as indicated by: One (1) Level C item, or equivalent OR Two (2) Level B <i>and</i> two (2) Level A items, or equivalent.

4. SERVICE

4. Service

4.1 Overview

As a developing institution, NSC values the service contributions of its faculty. It is one of the many ways that faculty work together to fulfill our mission. Service encompasses three areas: (a) institutional (b) service to the profession (c) service to the community. First and foremost, faculty are expected to demonstrate how they contribute significantly to meeting the needs of the institution, followed to a lesser degree by contributions to the profession and community or government agencies.

When evaluating faculty contributions in service, both the quantity and quality of service are important considerations. Quantity in the absence of quality is insufficient to earn high ratings in service. As part of their annual review materials, faculty members shall submit a brief narrative description of their service activities. Faculty members are encouraged to submit relevant evidence (e.g., documents created, revisions or edits made) that reflects particular service contributions and may be asked to provide additional evidence of service contributions as requested by their department chair during the review process.

4.2 Evidence of Service

Lines of evidence related to the demonstration of accomplishment in service are listed below, but these are examples only and do not exhaust the range of possibilities. Additionally, the case may be made for any service contribution in one level that, due to a particular time commitment or other requirements, might be considered as qualifying for another level.

4.2.1 Institutional Service

Level A - Substantive involvement in a single meaningful event (e.g., college fair) or participation in an endeavor that requires a relatively low time commitment.

Examples of Level A Service Items:

- Leading a campus presentation;
- Serving on the Travel and Incentive Grant Committee or another committee with infrequent meetings;
- Actively recruiting at college fair events;
- Acting as a faculty advisor to a student organization;
- Presenting at a faculty development workshop;
- Serving as a Faculty Senate representative.

Level B – Substantive involvement in a meaningful endeavor that requires a moderate time commitment and/or reflects the faculty member’s contribution to the accomplishment of an important institutional goal.

Examples of Level B Service Items:

- Holding office in Faculty Senate (vice chair, secretary, or parliamentarian);
- Chairing a Faculty Senate committee, or actively serving on a Faculty Senate committee that holds regular meetings;

4. SERVICE

- Serving as a search committee member;
- Serving as a Curriculum Committee member;
- Serving as NFA president;
- Substantially developing or revising curricula or programs (e.g., redesigning a program or making substantial degree revisions);
- Providing individual mentorship to students that goes well beyond the advisory role expected of faculty.

Level C – Substantive involvement in or guidance of a meaningful endeavor that requires a significant time commitment, involves an important leadership role, and reflects the faculty member’s contribution to the accomplishment of an essential institutional goal.

Examples of Level C Service Items:

- Serving as Faculty Senate chair;
- Serving as a search committee chair;
- Serving as Curriculum Committee chair;
- Serving as the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair.

4.2.2 Community and Professional Service

Contributions to the profession or community that serve the mission of Nevada State College may be counted as service items if they *contribute to the mission or promote the objectives of NSC*. The examples below are not exhaustive.

Level A - Substantive involvement in a single meaningful event (e.g., participating as a speaker at a community event) or participation in an endeavor that requires a relatively low time commitment.

Examples of Level A Community and Professional Service Items:

- Serving as an officer in a local, state, regional, or national professional or learned society;
- Providing *pro bono* consultation to individuals or local, state, regional, national, or federal organizations;
- Contributing in a significant way to a committee for a governmental, academic, or community organization;
- Writing a grant for a community organization;
- Establishing partnerships with external organizations (e.g., creating student internship opportunities);
- Volunteering with a private or public organization that directly relates to the faculty member’s discipline, position, or skills.

Level B – Substantive involvement in a meaningful service endeavor in the community that requires a moderate time commitment.

Examples of Level B Community and Professional Service Items:

- Participating in a significant humanitarian endeavor that directly relates to the faculty member’s discipline, position, or skills;

4. SERVICE

- Playing a significant role in planning a conference.

Level C activities are typically reserved for internal service. However, a faculty member may argue that a particular external service activity goes beyond Level B and deserves a higher rating. For example, a faculty member who plans an entire national conference in Las Vegas that directly benefits the College may contend that the effort justifies Level C status.

4.3 Rating Service in the Annual Review Process

The following are selected, non-comprehensive examples of how service to the institution and community/profession might be evaluated for annual reviews. Evaluators should converse with evaluatees to determine the quality of service, considering the time and effort required and the substance of the contribution. The quantities indicated below are general guidelines, not fixed designations. The quantity required may vary based on the quality of the contribution. Failure to meet designated service obligations may diminish a faculty member's annual review ratings, regardless of other service contributions.

While the emphasis is on institutional service, faculty members may propose including significant forms of academic leadership in service or service to the profession or community as part of the performance rating. Such service should be demonstrably related, directly or indirectly, to the mission of NSC or LAS or to the faculty member's discipline or department.

To acknowledge various service contributions, the three service levels equate to this point scale:

- 1 Level A activity = 1 point
- 1 Level B activity = 2 points
- 1 Level C activity = 4 points

To achieve a **Satisfactory** rating in service, the faculty member must receive 4-5 points.

To achieve a **Commendable** rating, the faculty member must receive 6-7 points, and must include at least one B or C level activity.

To achieve an **Excellent** rating, the faculty member must receive 8 points or more, and must include at least one B or C level activity.

4. SERVICE

Rating	Definition	Criteria	Examples
Unsatisfactory	Fails to meet expectations	3 points or less	1. Two Level A activities = 2 points
Satisfactory	Meets expectations	4-5 points	1. One Level C activity = 4 points 2. Four Level A activities = 4 points 3. Two Level B activities and 1 Level A activity = 5 points
Commendable	Exceeds expectations	6-7 points, including one Level B or Level C.	1. One Level C activity and two Level A activities = 6 points. 2. Five Level A activities and one Level B activity = 7 points.
Excellent	Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner	8 points or more, including one Level B or Level C.	1. Two Level C activities = 8 points 2. Three Level B activities and two Level A activities = 8 points

Importantly, a faculty member who completes six or more Level A activities would not meet the standards for Commendable, because it requires at least one Level B or C activity.