

# Boise State University Department of Mathematics Promotion and Tenure Policy Procedures and Criteria

11/20/2017 DRAFT

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this document is to specify procedures and criteria that will govern promotion and the awarding of tenure within the Department of Mathematics after July 1, 2018. The guidelines set out in this document are intended to provide department-specific criteria and procedures consistent with those specified in the Boise State University tenure and promotion policies, namely, “Faculty Tenure and Promotion Guidelines” (BSU policy 4340, latest version April, 2015) and “Clinical Faculty” (BSU policy 4490, latest version January, 2012: this policy includes a discussion of promotion of clinical faculty). These guidelines are also intended to be consistent with the COAS policy “College of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Policy”, (AS-4340, approved 3/20/17)]. The Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee is a personnel committee that meets the requirements for peer review described in policy 4320, “Faculty Tenure and Promotion Progress Review” (July 1, 1995).

We state that where college or university policy conflicts with this document, college or university policy must be followed, with (one hopes minimal) adaptations of procedures or criteria described here as required to meet policies with higher precedence.

# 1 Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Progress Review

1. We enumerate the sorts of review that may need to be undertaken:
  - (a) **Annual Tenure Progress Review:** An annual tenure progress review of each untenured tenure-track faculty member in the Department shall be carried out by the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee.
  - (b) **Promotion to Professor Progress Review:** A promotion to professor progress review of a tenured associate professor in the Department shall be carried out by the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee when requested by the faculty member. Such request must be made in writing to the department chair by September 1 of the academic year in which the review is to be conducted. Associate professors who intend to submit an application for promotion to professor are advised to request a promotion progress review for each of the three years prior to submitting their application, and must submit a Prospectus for review by the Tenure Progress Review Committee and the chair not fewer than three years prior to applying for promotion to Professor (for applications submitted in Fall 2021 or later). A template for such a Prospectus appears in the college policy document as Appendix A.<sup>1</sup>
  - (c) **Promotion of Clinical Faculty Progress Review:** A promotion of clinical faculty progress review of a clinical faculty member in the Department shall be carried out by the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee when requested by the faculty member. Such request must be made in writing to the department chair by September 1 of the academic year in which the review is to be conducted. Clinical faculty who intend to submit an application for promotion are advised to request a promotion

---

<sup>1</sup>In our discussion of the prospectus requirement in the college policy, we have chosen to follow the exact description in the college policy. The department is required to have a support process for candidates for promotion to Professor approved by the college, but it is not required to have this exact process (see the college policy); so discussion of alternative approaches can be entertained in the future.

progress review for each of the two years prior to submitting their application.

2. The composition and duration of the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee are as follows:

- (a) **appointment:** The members of the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee will be appointed by the department chair. The chair may take into account the academic specialties of the faculty members to be reviewed, with an eye to choosing those best qualified to evaluate their work.
- (b) **qualification:** The members of the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee shall be tenured members of the department. When a promotion to professor progress review has been requested by September 1, then the committee must include at least one tenured professor. When a promotion of clinical faculty progress review has been requested by September 1, a clinical faculty member may be added to the committee. If a clinical faculty member is appointed to the committee, that committee member is added solely for the purpose of reviewing the performance of other clinical faculty.
- (c) **composition and duration:** The committee will usually have three members, appointed to three-year terms. One new member will be appointed each year at the beginning of the Fall semester. The longest-serving member of the committee will serve as chair of the committee.
- (d) **fourth member:** If there are enough faculty members to be reviewed that an extra member of the committee is needed, the department chair may appoint an additional member. This will be done by appointing two members in the same year to serve the same three-year term. There will not be more than four members in the committee. If there are two longest-serving members of the committee, the department chair will select one of them as chair of the committee.

3. The charge of the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee

is as follows<sup>2</sup>:

- (a) To evaluate and review the progress of each untenured faculty member toward tenure and promotion in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The report on each candidate will state whether he or she is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service, and whether he or she is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion overall. For untenured faculty, the review in the third year of employment should be regarded as especially significant.
- (b) To evaluate and review the progress of tenured associate professors toward promotion to professor in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The report on each faculty member will state whether he or she is making satisfactory progress toward promotion in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service, and whether he or she is making satisfactory progress toward promotion to professor overall. This responsibility includes evaluation of the Prospectus which must be submitted not fewer than three years before application for promotion to full Professor<sup>3</sup>: see Appendix A of the college policy for a model.
- (c) To evaluate and review the progress of clinical faculty toward promotion to either clinical associate or clinical professor in the areas of teaching and service. Based on the workload assignment for a particular clinical faculty member, the review may also include the area of research.
- (d) To request documentation from the faculty for these purposes (items 1 through 3).
- (e) To invite input from other faculty in the department on the qualifications and progress of faculty members being reviewed.
- (f) At the option of the committee, to solicit input from other people suggested by the faculty member being reviewed in order to better evaluate his or her qualifications and progress. The committee

---

<sup>2</sup>Note that the charge of this committee does not include anything to do with actual applications for tenure or promotion.

<sup>3</sup>for applications in fall 2021 and later.

shall not solicit evaluations of the faculty member's publications by external reviewers.

- (g) The committee is to complete its evaluation process by reporting to the department chair by March 1 each year.
4. A concrete indication of the suggested schedule of activities for the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee each year follows:
- (a) **fall meeting:** The committee shall meet with the faculty under review early in the fall semester to discuss procedures for classroom observations and requirements for submission of Progress Review Portfolios. The department chair shall attend this meeting. A faculty member who is a candidate for eventual promotion to Professor who wishes to submit a Prospectus should submit it for approval by the committee and the chair at or soon after the first meeting, in order that the Prospectus can be forwarded to the Dean for college level approval by the deadline of October 15 stated in college policy.
  - (b) **observation of teaching:** Each member of the committee (or at least three members of the committee if there are four members) shall observe at least one class session taught by each faculty member under review. Classroom visits shall be arranged in advance. After the visit, the observer shall discuss his or her observations with the observed. Either the observed or the observer is entitled to request another visit.
  - (c) **portfolio submission:** Each faculty member under review shall make a Progress Review Portfolio available to the committee by the first Friday after the first day of classes in the spring semester. This portfolio shall include any documents that would be required to be included in the eventual Application (either for tenure or promotion, or both): this includes but is not restricted to a statement of date of eligibility for tenure or promotion, past annual performance evaluations of the faculty member by the department chair, past evaluations of the faculty member by the the committee, a current curriculum vita, summary of activities that address criteria for promotion and/or tenure, and summary of numerical student evaluations. The department strongly recommends the

inclusion of narrative components of student evaluations as well. Candidates for tenure are encouraged but not required to provide the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee with a statement describing their current research interests and plans; papers, monographs or advanced textbooks they are studying in the course of pursuing their scholarly interests; ongoing collaborative arrangements with colleagues at Boise State or elsewhere, and so forth. The committee may require additional content (such as teaching portfolios); faculty under review should be notified of any such requirements at the fall meeting. These portfolios shall be made accessible to all faculty in the department. <sup>4</sup>

- (d) **definition of punctual submission:** A Progress Review Portfolio shall be deemed to have been submitted on time if it has been personally delivered to a member of the office staff or of the committee on or before the day it is due. The faculty member under review is entitled to a receipt documenting on-time submission if he or she requests it. This clause is designed to protect the faculty member under review, not the committee: it describes a sufficient condition, not a necessary one.
- (e) **later additions to portfolio:** The committee may request additional material from the faculty member under review but is never required to do so. The committee may accept material submitted by the faculty member after the deadline for submission of portfolios, but is never required to do so.
- (f) **first spring meeting:** On or about January 20, the committee shall meet to discuss classroom observations and to assign the drafting of reports on faculty members under review to individual committee members.
- (g) **second spring meeting:** On or about February 7, the committee shall meet to evaluate draft reports. Final versions of reports shall be written and submitted to the chair of the committee as soon as possible after this meeting.
- (h) **reports shown to reviewed faculty:** As soon as final versions are written and signed by the committee members, they are to be

---

<sup>4</sup>a committee member asks whether we want to talk about the possibility of some or all components of portfolios being electronic

shared with the faculty members under review. One week is allowed after this for the faculty member to apply in writing to the chair of the committee for a meeting with the committee to discuss the report and/or request revisions in the report. Each faculty member under review is entitled by university policy to one such meeting on request. A further week is allowed for the scheduling of such meetings and carrying out of any revisions which are agreed upon. In the case of a candidate for promotion to Professor, a report is written by the committee and forwarded to the Chair for their information, but it should be noted that this report is not an essential part of the candidate's application as in the case of a candidate for tenure and promotion, but is more of an advisory nature; however, the candidate certainly may include such letters in their promotion application. There is an important exception to this remark: the Prospectus which a candidate for promotion to Professor must submit not fewer than three years before applying for promotion must be formally approved by the committee and the department chair and submitted in a timely manner for college level review, and is a required component of their eventual application<sup>5</sup>: see the college policy.

- (i) **letter of reply:** The faculty member being reviewed is permitted but not required to write a letter responding to the report of the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review committee, which will be included in the candidates progress review portfolio.
- (j) **submission to department chair:** The final version of the report of the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee on each faculty member under review shall be signed by each member of the committee and by the faculty member (to acknowledge receipt), returned to the committee, and submitted by the committee to the department chair on or before March 1. Per college policy, the Prospectus to be submitted by a candidate for promotion to Professor not fewer than three years before their application for promotion<sup>6</sup> is on a different time table: this fairly brief document must be submitted for review by the Tenure and

---

<sup>5</sup>unless the department eventually adopts an alternative approach to mentoring candidates for promotion to Professor.

<sup>6</sup>for applications submitted in fall 2021 or later

Promotion Progress Review Committee and the chair in a timely manner in order to be submitted to the dean for college level review by October 15.

- (k) **continuing availability:** The Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee shall be available for consultation with reviewed faculty at other times during the academic year if this is requested.

## 2 Procedures for Departmental Tenure and Promotion Recommendation

1. We begin by specifying the department committee responsible for this recommendation and describing its responsibilities:
  - (a) **responsible committee:** The departmental recommendation of faculty for tenure and/or promotion will be part of the charge of the Personnel and Budget Committee. The Personnel and Budget Committee is a standing, elected committee. Composition and election is described in the Department bylaws. For this purpose, only the tenured members of the Personnel and Budget Committee participate in its activities. With regard to tenure and promotion recommendation, the responsibilities of the Personnel and Budget Committee are now described.
  - (b) **recommendation letters:** The prime responsibility of the committee shall be to write the departmental recommendation for each candidate who is applying for tenure (and promotion to Associate Professor), for promotion to full Professor, for promotion to clinical assistant, to clinical associate, or for promotion to clinical professor.
  - (c) **receive and review applications:** The committee shall receive the Tenure or Promotion Application from each candidate, review each application and take it into account in the final report of the committee. <sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>a committee member asks whether we want to talk about the possibility of some or all components of portfolios being electronic.

- (d) **definition of punctual submission:** A Tenure or Promotion Application shall be deemed to have been submitted on time if it has been personally delivered to a member of the office staff or of the committee on or before the day it is due. The applicant is entitled to a receipt documenting on-time submission if he or she requests it. This clause is designed for the protection of the candidate, not the committee: it describes a sufficient condition, not a necessary one.
- (e) **make applications available:** The committee shall make the Tenure or Promotion Application submitted by each candidate available for examination by all faculty of the department.
- (f) **conduct advisory ballot:** The committee shall conduct an advisory vote by secret ballot on the question of whether they support or reject the awarding of tenure and/or promotion to each candidate.
- (g) **number of questions:** The questions of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor for a candidate are to be separate questions on the ballot. Though these are notionally separate, we do note the language of the COAS policy: “Except under extraordinary circumstances and with Dean approval, the review for awarding tenure and for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor in COAS shall be one and the same, and they shall be approved or denied jointly.”
- (h) **opportunity for comment:** The ballot should solicit and provide space for additional written comments from members of the department on the merits of each candidate for tenure and/or promotion.
- (i) **voter eligibility:** The eligible voters for questions regarding tenure or promotion of tenure-track faculty are the tenured faculty in the department. The eligible voters for questions regarding promotion of clinical faculty are the tenured faculty in the department and the clinical faculty with rank of associate or higher. A candidate is not included in the electorate for their own promotion vote.
- (j) **contents of report:** The report of the committee to the department chair (a separate report for each candidate) shall summarize

the results of the advisory vote of the department and summarize the additional written comments received (it is not necessary to include all written comments verbatim), and state the recommendation of the committee on each question before it. Additional relevant content might be included.

2. The primary responsibility of the candidate in this process is the submission of the Tenure or Promotion Application by September 1.
3. For tenure-track faculty, the required contents of this application include but are not limited to:
  - (a) **annual reports:** All annual performance evaluations of the department chair and all reports written by the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee (in the case of candidates for tenure) shall be included in the application. In the case of applications for promotion to Professor, only annual performance evaluations written since the awarding of tenure are required. Reports written by the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review committee since the awarding of tenure may be included, at the discretion of the applicant; the Prospectus submitted at the beginning of the review process prior to an application for promotion to Professor should be included in the application.<sup>8</sup>
  - (b) **student evaluations:** Numerical student evaluations must be included in the application. Inclusion of narrative components of student evaluations is strongly recommended. In the case of applications for promotion to full Professor, only numerical evaluations since the awarding of tenure are required. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness may also be included.
  - (c) **evidence of research activity:** Evidence of research activity, including but not necessarily restricted to a list of refereed publications, shall be included in the application. An abstract of the required colloquium should be included in this section (see the last section of this document under research for a description of this requirement).

---

<sup>8</sup>unless the department adopts an alternative mentoring process for applications for promotion to Professor which does not include a Prospectus.

- (d) **list of reviewers:** Each candidate for tenure and/or promotion is required to provide a list of four reviewers knowledgeable in the candidates research area. The department chair shall solicit letters from these reviewers about the candidate's research and include them in the candidate's folder. This list must be made available to the department chair by May 15th, along with a research portfolio, as described in the COAS policy document Appendix C.
  - (e) **evidence of service:** Evidence of service to the profession and to the institution shall be included in the application.
  - (f) **external funding:** While not required, evidence of an active effort to seek external funding (for teaching, research, or service) is important for promotion to full Professor.
4. Candidates holding tenure-track appointments should consult the precise description of required components of the application and order of these components in the COAS policy and also consider any requests regarding format communicated from the Provost.
  5. For clinical faculty, the required contents of this application include:
    - (a) **annual reports:** All annual performance evaluations of the department chair and all reports written by the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee shall be included in the application.
    - (b) **summary of activities:** A concise summary of activities that address the promotion criteria.
    - (c) **position description:** A copy of the position description for the applicant.
    - (d) **student evaluations:** Numerical and narrative components of all student evaluations must be included in the application. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness may also be included.
    - (e) **letters of support:** Letters of support from at least two colleagues holding clinical or tenure-track appointments at the university must be included in the application.
    - (f) **evidence of service:** Evidence of service to the institution shall be included in the application.

6. The timeline for this process is described.
- (a) **external reviewers:** By May 15, the candidates holding tenure-track appointments will supply the Department Chair with a list of four names and addresses of potential outside evaluators, and an electronic copy of a research portfolio. For details of what is expected of the candidate and the chair under this point, see the COAS policy Appendix C.
  - (b) **application:** The applicant shall submit the Tenure or Promotion Application by September 1. The committee may solicit additional content from the candidate (e.g., to amend the omission of required content), but is never required to do so, and the committee may accept additional submissions from the candidate after the deadline but is never obliged to do so.
  - (c) **solicitation of letters:** The department chair shall solicit letters from reviewers about the candidates research as soon as the list of reviewers is available. The department chair shall place copies of these solicitations in the candidates applications and replace them with reviewer letters, statements, and curriculum vitae as they become available. The department chair shall be responsible for removing the external letters from the portfolio before returning the portfolio to the applicant.
  - (d) **later additions to portfolio:** The committee may request additional material from the faculty member but is never required to do so. The committee may accept material submitted by the faculty member after the deadline for submission of application, but is never required to do so. Under no circumstances will the committee accept material submitted by the faculty member after the advisory ballots have been distributed.
  - (e) **availability of applications to faculty (note on colloquium requirement):** Applications shall be made available to the official faculty (tenured and untenured) of the department by September 15.

We note that if the applicant has not met the requirement described elsewhere that they give a colloquium talk to the department within a three-year period before the application, that this requirement should have been met by September 15 when the

applications become publicly available to members of the department.

- (f) **election:** The election shall be conducted over a period of at least five working days, in a timely manner to allow the committee to prepare its final report to the department chair by October 8.
- (g) **report to the department chair:** The committee shall report to the department chair by October 8.
- (h) **department chairs report to the dean:** The department chair shall forward the recommendations of the committee and his or her own recommendations to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee by October 15.

## 3 Remarks on the Areas of Evaluation

### 3.1 Tripartite success

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion in the Department of Mathematics is expected to exhibit satisfactory to outstanding performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research and service. The candidate for promotion to Professor is expected to exhibit some distinction above the level of performance expected of any tenured faculty member in at least one of the three areas.

### 3.2 Teaching

The Department of Mathematics expects candidates for tenure and/or promotion to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness. The department has similar expectations of both tenure-track and clinical faculty in this area. Among the characteristics valued by the department is “up-to-date knowledge of the subject”. The department does not expect each of its members to be an expert in each of the (numerous) subfields of mathematics. However, it does consider an in-depth knowledge of the subjects being taught to be an essential component of effective teaching. The degree to which that knowledge must be “up to date” varies with the course taught. Some areas of mathematics are quite classical and well-established, with few recent changes which are relevant or accessible at the undergraduate level. Other areas of

mathematics have seen recent changes in content, philosophy, or approach which are of considerable significance for undergraduate education, and faculty teaching courses in those areas are expected to keep abreast of such changes and incorporate them into their teaching. All faculty in the department are expected to keep in touch with current innovations in pedagogical techniques which are relevant to their teaching.

Students in each of our classes are given the opportunity to fill out online student evaluations of the course, which include questions developed by the department and the opportunity to write their own comments. Faculty are required to submit numerical summaries of the department standard questions for their student evaluations in courses taught in the Fall, consistent with the university policy 4300 which states that each faculty member shall be evaluated by students at least once a year; they are encouraged to submit all student evaluations, including comments, for all courses taught.

In relation to assessment of student evaluations as a component of the evidence for teaching, we quote the COAS policy: “Because there are myriad influences affecting the quality and reliability of student evaluations, they must be regarded as raw data in need of further analysis for proper interpretation and subsequent action. Relevant activities may include:

1. Critical reflection on course evaluations to extract actionable information;
2. Documenting changes to course content or structure in response to student evaluations;
3. Documenting changes to assessment strategies in response to student evaluations;
4. Documenting changes to pedagogy in response to student evaluations.”

The department chair and the members of the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee shall have the right to sit in on classes taught by candidates in order to make constructive suggestions and gather evidence of teaching effectiveness. The department chair may do this on his or her own initiative or at the request of the candidate. The Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee has the charge of doing this yearly for each untenured faculty member under review, as described above. Candidates may also invite other colleagues to observe their classes for the same purpose.

Department faculty are encouraged to discuss all aspects of their teaching with interested colleagues – content, approaches, tests, assignments, notable student difficulties and successes, innovative techniques, and so forth. Such discussions should be of value in both fostering and documenting effective teaching practices.

The department encourages its members to seek opportunities for training or carry out initiatives of their own in the areas of improved assessment and pedagogy. Members who are under review for tenure and/or promotion are encouraged to submit evidence of such activities, including evidence of participation in such training or carrying out of such self-directed initiatives, and where possible evidence that such training or initiatives have had positive effects on instruction. This paragraph does not articulate a required component of evidence of good teaching, but the department does encourage this and will take it into account if it is present.

### **3.3 Research and Scholarship**

The Department of Mathematics expects candidates holding tenure-track appointments to be engaged on a continuing basis in significant research activity in mathematics, mathematics education, statistics, or other mathematical sciences. The department recognizes that adequate time for concentrated thought is a resource essential to such activity, and intends to support research and scholarship through appropriate teaching loads.

The most important evidence of research consists of publications and grants. As a starting guideline it is recommended that faculty produce an average of one peer reviewed published research article per year. It is also recommended that faculty submit competitive grant proposals for research funding.

As justification for the sufficiency of this guideline, we refer to AMS publications on the culture of research and funding in mathematics. In brief: many of the most recognized mathematicians publish an average of two or fewer articles per year, and; there is substantially less federal funding available for mathematics research than there is for the sciences as a whole.

In assessing the above guideline, we note that in mathematics coauthorship and authorship are often not distinguished, and candidates may specify whether authors are listed by contribution or alphabetically. The department recognizes that not all research articles have equivalent impact, that is, articles with a greater impact may also take more time to produce than

average.

Moreover, we recognize that many other types of research products may complement or substitute for traditional research articles. It is difficult to specify exactly what should be considered equivalent to one peer reviewed published research article per year, and this document does not attempt to do so. We refer instead to the judgment of the members of department committees evaluating the individual's progress toward tenure and/or promotion for making final recommendations. Products for the committee to consider may include, and are not limited to:

1. Funded internal and external research grants
2. Research monographs
3. Textbooks and educational software
4. Internet resources of value to the research community
5. Software and hardware projects of value to the research community
6. Delivery of colloquia, seminars, institutes, mini-courses, and workshops
7. Delivery of invited or contributed talks at professional meetings
8. Technical reports and other unrefereed publications
9. Published reviews of professional literature

This list is intended to be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. All evidence provided must be directly related to professional activity within the discipline.

Consulting activities may be counted as research or scholarship in some cases; the candidate will determine in consultation with the departmental Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee whether a given consulting activity is more appropriately regarded as scholarly activity or professional service.

A candidate for tenure is required to present a colloquium on his or her research to the department at least once between the beginning of his or her third year of service and the submission of his or her application for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Clinical faculty with workload allocation for research should negotiate the expectations for evidence in this category with the department chair.

A candidate for promotion to Professor should adhere to the above guidelines for research and scholarship just as an Associate Professor should. A candidate for promotion to Professor is required to have presented at least one colloquium on his or her research to the department during the three-year period before the submission of their application. Furthermore, according to University Policy #4340: “The rank of professor represents the highest academic achievement and should be reserved for individuals who are truly and demonstrably outstanding among their peers. Thus, a candidate for professor is expected to have achieved additional distinction clearly above that of an associate professor, including clear national and international recognition for his/her work. Evidence supporting this distinction might include letters of support, national and international journal publications and conference proceedings, and/or academic and professional awards and recognitions. Criteria for promotion to the rank of professor include all of the criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor, as well as five full years of service as Associate Professor at an accredited institution of higher learning. (Note that promotion to professor is not assumed to be automatic after any time period.)”

It is recommended that a candidate for Professor establish research and scholarship expectations in consultation with the Chair, and develop a plan for meeting the expectations in consultation with the Tenure and Promotion Progress Review Committee. As noted above, the college policy requires that the candidate for promotion to Professor submit a Prospectus describing in general terms the achievements they intend to present to support an eventual application for promotion, not fewer than three years before the actual application for promotion.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>in the case of applications submitted in fall 2021 or later.

## Service

The Department of Mathematics expects candidates for tenure and/or promotion to engage in service activities that benefit the Department, the College, and the University. Candidates in tenure-track appointments are also expected to engage in service to the discipline. Service activities that benefit the community as a whole are encouraged, where appropriate, but are not required.

All candidates for tenure and/or promotion are expected to provide evidence of service in each of two broad categories: professional and institutional. The distribution of service activities between these two categories will vary with the individual candidate, and the appropriate balance will be determined in consultation with the department chair. It is acceptable for an individual's service load to be heavily weighted to one side or the other, if the chair so approves, but all candidates for either tenure or promotion are expected to have made positive, high-quality contributions in each of the two categories.

Tenure and promotion to associate professor requires that the candidate demonstrate satisfactory performance in the area of service. For promotion to full professor, COAS T&P policy allows for service to be considered as the candidate's area of particular distinction, or one of them. The departmental policy therefore also allows for this, but with the following stipulations: 1) The distinction in service may only apply when the candidate is not adequately compensated financially for the service duty<sup>10</sup>; 2) The candidate must demonstrate that the service has a direct measurable impact on the institution [*MARKED FOR DELETION (on the basis of discussion at the department meeting):*]; and 3) *The workload distribution of the candidate in the three categories of teaching, research, and service is not overly skewed toward the latter.*

Professional service includes such activities as holding office in local, state, national, or international organizations, or chapters thereof. A non-exhaustive list of such organizations appropriate to the mission of the department would include the American Mathematical Society, Mathematical Association of America, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics,

---

<sup>10</sup>note in this connection that it was the clear intent of the framers of the COAS policy that service as Department Chair or in other administrative positions which might provide additional income commensurate with additional duties could be taken into account positively in an application for promotion to Professor.

American Statistical Association, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Association for Mathematics Teacher Educators, and the Association for Women in Mathematics. Professional service also includes involvement in the organization or administration of conferences and workshops, or the organization of minisymposia at these events. Another very important form of professional service is work as a referee, reviewer, or editor for professional journals, conference proceedings, textbook or monograph publishers, government or foundation granting agencies, etc. Such activities involve an element of scholarship and hence were also listed in the previous section. They are to be regarded as secondary evidence of scholarly activity, but primary evidence of professional service.

Institutional service includes committee work at all levels: University, College, and Departmental, for example, Faculty Senate and its standing committees and other ad hoc committees. It also includes service as the departments Library representative; supervision of student internships, student paper-grading activities, and the student computer lab tutors; writing departmental reports; helping with administrative activities; involvement with Science Competition Day, Bronco Day, and the Engineering and Science Festival. While much of this work is non-glamorous, every member of the department is expected to make some contribution in this area.

The department does not require that every candidate engage in service activities that are most appropriately construed as “public” or “community” service rather than professional or institutional service. However, examples of such activity that might legitimately be taken into account in the service category in decisions about tenure or promotion include consulting (if not appropriately considered research), service as an expert witness, discipline-related activities with local schools or youth groups (if not more properly considered teaching), and workshops for teachers, local school students, or the public at large. These activities may only be taken into account if they do not involve a substantial monetary compensation for the individual.