

# What Do We Mean by Service, How Much Should We Expect, and Should Compensated Service Count?

Many, if not most, institutions adopt a tri-part structure when it comes to the duties and responsibilities of a university professor: teaching, scholarship, and service. Not surprisingly the subject of “service” within the academic community has been the subject of numerous articles. However, rather than an attempt at a policy statement the following is meant to be a cursory examination of some of the challenges we all face with regard to the question of service at Stockton. There are at least three issues involved in here, the first being what do we mean by service? The second is how much service should we expect of faculty? Third, given the specific nature of the charge of the Task Force of Faculty Leadership, we need to consider how do we draw the line between service which is compensated vs. that which is not? These three are obviously all intertwined but we will begin by focusing on the first two and then examine some aspects of the compensation question. This paper is not intended to solve any of these questions but to provide a starting point for a community wide discussion.

## **Part One: How Much Service?**

The first problem we face is that while the requirements of teaching are relatively easy to identify and quantify this is less so when it comes to service. For example, full time professors in the state of New Jersey’s public colleges and universities are expected to teach 24 credits in an academic year. Furthermore, the specific types and modalities are laid out in the Master Agreement: in class, hybrid, on line, large class,

tutorial. On the other hand, a similar articulation of the quantity and types of service faculty must perform does not exist in the Master Agreement.

When we turn to the local level there is again no clear equivalent statement from the University as to how much service a faculty is responsible for.<sup>1</sup> This is not to say that the University is entirely silent on the matter of what counts as service. There are three areas which have provided some guidance in the matter: the Coordinator's Agreement, the contract each tenure stream faculty signs, and the University/School/Program standards. As the first is the item under consideration for the Task Force, Union, and Administration, we will here focus on the latter two.

Each faculty member's contract lists the following duties and responsibilities.

Note that only the fourth typically specifically references service:

- 1) Offer courses in your Program and the General Studies curriculum;
- 2) Serve as a preceptor to students;
- 3) Participate in professional activities, scholarship and/or creative activities as appropriate to the discipline;
- 4) Provide service to the University, community and profession;
- 5) Perform other duties as designated by the Dean and/or the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Although it does not explicitly state this, these are not meant to be equivalent in terms of a faculty member's responsibilities. For example, it is implausible that the University sees precepting as roughly the same level of importance as teaching classes.

Presumably the contractual service requirements were meant to be spelled out in terms of the second item: university/school/program standards. In Appendix I & II, we have listed all the University and School standards with regard to service and while they

---

<sup>1</sup> Stockton's Institute for Faculty Development has a great deal of material on teaching and scholarship but relatively little on service, nothing in terms of the quantity or types required.

are more detailed than the language in the individual contracts, they are still not particularly specific. Perhaps not surprisingly, the most detailed statement of service requirements can be found in the various program standards. Since each set of program standards has to be approved by both the School and the University at large, it is reasonable to take these to be the clearest statement of what the University sees as what *kinds* of activities might be considered as appropriate service.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, this still does not resolve the critical matter of *how much* of a faculty member's responsibilities should be service.

There is also the added challenge that neither the program standards nor any of the other documents referenced thus far, address how and to what extent the University wishes to distinguish service to the program, school, university, community (either local, state, national or international) and discipline. Nor does it give any guidance as to how to prioritize them. For example, there is no policy or University document or heuristic to guide us as to how we should weigh the service contributions of a faculty member whose duties as the president or treasurer of their professional association are cited as reasons why they decline to serve on committees on campus.

This is further complicated by the fact that the *relative* contributions of service vs. scholarship are nowhere clearly articulated. Should there be more *service* than *scholarship*? In interviews with faculty from the early days of Stockton, this seemed to be the case. When exactly this changed is not exactly clear, but now scholarship has become much more significant in the lives of Stockton faculty in terms of tenure and

---

<sup>2</sup> As these are too numerous to include in this essay, we have left the reader the opportunity to examine them by visiting the Stockton webpage where they have all been collected: (<https://stockton.edu/academic-affairs/agreements/program-standards.html>)

promotion. There were faculty in the early days who could receive tenure and promotion without publishing much, if anything at all, so long as they made significant service contributions. However, that has long since ceased to be the case. This is not that surprising since it has been clear for some time that the institution's reputation and ascension in terms of its national reputation is not built on the number of hours faculty spend in curriculum committees. Rather, the rise in reputation has been tied to the increasing number and prestige of the articles, conference presentations, artistic productions, books, grants and the like promulgated by the faculty.

The shift in culture likely occurred for many reasons:

- perhaps as the initial surge of work to build the new college decreased, there were more opportunities for faculty members to focus on their scholarly/creative work
- as the desire for increased institutional prestige—the kind that comes with excellent scholarly work, major research grants, and the like—increased, more faculty were hired to, or encouraged to, put more time into these activities. As a result the PRC, FRC, Provost, and President have put greater emphasis on scholarly output in the tenure and promotion process
- in some cases, accreditation demands require a certain level of scholarly output
- in some fields, increased competition on the job market for fewer tenure-track jobs means that people need a high level of scholarship to even be hired, which has changed how graduate students are mentored and their focus on scholarship

- the increased speed at which knowledge changes in some fields requires faculty members to remain active scholars as one way of keeping up with changes in order to be responsible faculty members
- in times of low morale at the university, faculty members may remember that time invested in scholarly work makes it easier for them to get a new job elsewhere

It is also important to note that, regardless of the reasons, the shift in Stockton culture has increased the percentage of Stockton faculty members who prize the opportunity to engage in research and scholarship. Although Stockton continues to state that teaching is the number one priority, the shift in institutional priorities toward scholarship has meant that when looking for new faculty, it is essential to seek out faculty who prize this part of academic life. That creates a circumstance where faculty coming in are likely to feel frustrated if they lose time from their scholarship to engage in service. This is exacerbated by the fact that without any guidelines on the matter it's not clear as to *who* is to settle these matters. It may be fine to say that faculty or faculty with the Dean will sort this out but it's not hard to guess what most faculty would choose given a choice between serving on a task force charged with implementing a new statewide mandate pertaining to the number of computers in classrooms or spending time in their lab or engaging in field research or working on a collection of poems. In addition, there is often a synergy between scholarship or creative work and teaching—what one does as a choreographer, poet, scientist, or scholar may inform one's teaching. It is less common that one's scholarly or creative work inform service, especially university level service—with some exceptions.

Although at one point in the late seventies or early eighties, the amount of service needed at the University might have shifted, it has shifted back—faculty are now required to do more assessment of student learning, do more documentation and report writing for accreditors—Middle States and disciplinary. Moreover, an increase in the number and percentage of hires who are contingent faculty members—both adjunct faculty members and 13D and 13 O, temporary faculty—has meant that an increased amount of work is often done by fewer full-time faculty members. All this is exacerbated by the fact that hiring, scheduling, and mentoring adjunct faculty members is more work than what was required under the traditional model. Therefore, the administration's increasing reliance on contingent faculty members has, in and of itself, increased the amount of work to be done by faculty. At the same time, while collecting data to inform decisions may improve those decisions, the amount of data faculty are collecting, analyzing, and reporting has increased substantially. Finally, there has been an uptick of institutional demands to spend time marketing the university and programs, creating new programs, institutional restructuring, and a myriad of other mandates. In short, we are in an environment in which faculty members must—and want to--spend substantive time in scholarly/creative work, but the university needs more service than it has, perhaps, since its early days.

### **Part Two: Compensation *versus* Service Or Sometimes Both?**

This leads to the second part of this essay, namely how does one address the distinction between service which is compensated and that which is not? Again, the fact that some activities carry compensation with them and others do not is not unique to Stockton. A quick survey of other colleges and universities finds similar kinds of

arrangements pretty much everywhere, although which activities fall into which category varies. The question then becomes is there any principled or systematic approach to making this distinction?

As we said at the top, this essay is not meant to settle this question; rather, it is meant to contribute to a community wide discussion. As a start we would like to consider one solution to the question that has been advocated by administrators, both here and elsewhere; any activities which carry any compensation are *ipso facto*, not service. The very fact of being paid means a faculty member is no longer engaged in service. Despite the advantages of such an approach in terms of simplicity we will conclude this essay by arguing that this proposed solution is untenable. However we ultimately to resolve the question, some activities must be both compensated and considered service.

To begin with, adopting what amounts to a stipulative definition approach is essentially arbitrary and therefore provides no meaningful guidance. After all, if the question is why does *this* activity and not *that* one warrant compensation, saying “Well, it’s because that one is service and the other is not” is blatant question begging.

It might be different if there was an *intrinsic* distinction between the kinds of activities that could be identified and then utilized to separate them into different categories. However, in our search of the literature we have not been able to find any such feature or features. In some institutions a chair is a compensated position, in others it is not. In some directors are compensated, in others they are not. In some advising is compensated and in others it is not. The list goes on. We have not even

been able to find any *reference* to such a distinguishing feature except where the documents reference “excessive” service or “burdensome”.

Even if we were to ignore these conceptual problems there is a practical reason for refusing to draw such a hard and fast line between “compensated activities” on the one side and “service” on the other. As we saw in the first part of this paper the sheer quantity of work that needs to be done has increased and is in tension with the increased demands for scholarship. However, neither of these are actually meant to be the fundamental work of faculty at Stockton. Historically the college has identified itself, first and foremost as an institution dedicated to teaching.

If we accept that the central job for any faculty member at Stockton is teaching then we must ask what that amounts to in terms of hours per week. A number of studies have determined that it takes, on average, between 2-4 hours for preparation and grading per one hour of class, thereby translating to 36 hours per week purely for the teaching aspect of the faculty member’s job.<sup>3</sup> There is a very good reason why administrators are not required to teach 24 credits in a year; namely, it would be almost impossible for them to get any of their work done.

None of this is particularly surprising. Yet, it is essential to explicitly state that the very nature of how much time it takes to teach, coupled with teaching’s role as the core mission of the university, means that this is where the faculty member’s prime focus must be. Keep in mind the studies do not take into account the time faculty spend precepting students or helping those who need extra help, or additional study sessions

---

<sup>3</sup> This is obviously a controversial and complicated question to answer. We would argue that this is on the low side of the number of what is required to be an excellent teacher, but for the purposes of this discussion even this low number conveys the point. There are a number of sites that reference these studies for example, <http://yalegtc.blogspot.com/2013/02/normal.html?m=1>



in preparation for an exam or providing feedback ahead of time on papers or essays. Once these additional elements are factored in the demands on faculty have easily crept above 40 hours per week. This leaves precious little time for service in the week even though most colleges and universities have an enormous, seemingly unending amount of service that needs to be done. We contend this is the primary reason why, purely from a practical standpoint, most colleges and universities have recognized that they need to provide compensation to incentivize faculty to pick up some of these activities.

Furthermore, as we have also seen, all this is exacerbated by the fact that a) there is no clear statement of *how much* of the faculty member's working hours should be spent fulfilling their service obligations; b) there is no clear statement of the proper *proportion* of service when balanced against the other non-teaching demand, scholarship; c) there is no universally agreed upon method for determining *who* decides the answers to a & b.

Assuming we still think it is appropriate for faculty to have a life outside of the institution, people will need to conduct their own personal cost/benefit analysis as to whether this is worth their time to take on the additional activities. However, we suspect that the factors articulated in this paper have described a set of circumstances whereby if everything that carried compensation were to be automatically labeled "non-service" there would be a strong incentive to decline such jobs. After all, faculty who took on the "non-service" compensated activities would *still* need to meet their service and scholarship duties on top of these additional projects. From a practical standpoint any position which the institution decides to compensate will most likely be highly

demanding and time consuming. However, even decent financial compensation won't change the fact that there are a limited number of hours in a week.

### **Concluding Thoughts**

As a result we contend any future system must continue to accept that many of the positions that have carried compensation must also be counted, to some extent, as service. An "either/or" approach would be both insubstantial and impractical, and most likely quickly devolve into an exploitative, abusive system. Obviously, given the limited scope of this paper we have not had been able to provide an alternative approach. Clearly it would entail negotiations with the Union as well as a robust commitment to shared governance with the faculty at large. However, how we operationalize both these factors is but one of several important conversations we must have as we move forward.

APPENDIX I  
Stockton University Statement on University & Community Service

6.3 University and Community Service (Found in Faculty Evaluation Policy, 2015)

6.3.1 The faculty role includes contributions to the achievement of the University's mission through effective participation in governance activities, including leadership roles at the Program, School, or University-wide levels. These contributions may require the capacity to work collaboratively with other members of the University community, including activities related to alumni and the University Foundation.

6.3.2 Faculty may also contribute in broader arenas such as State or regional organizations and disciplinary associations or their activities. In addition, faculty may contribute to the University's public mission through service to our community, region, state or nation.

6.3.3 Normally the University expects probationary faculty to serve the University and community in selected activities, while faculty who are tenured and/or of senior rank would be expected to have more substantial records in this area, as demonstrated by achievements in leadership on campus, to their disciplines, and professional organizations.

6.3.4 Evaluation of achievements in this area focuses on the significance of participation, the impact of service, the scope of responsibilities, and the effectiveness of participation. Clear goals, adequate preparation and appropriate methods of providing service, significant results of the service, and reflection on the contribution and its use to improve the quality of future service are all aspects of documenting achievement in campus and community service.

6.3.5 Evidence of effectiveness in University or community service may include such items as:

6.3.5.1 One or more instances when one has used one's professional skills or knowledge for the benefit of the University, or of a non-University group or individual.

6.3.5.2 Contributions to professional organizations that are focused on service or professional responsibility as opposed to scholarship, research, or artistic/creative work. For example, an officership or service on a professional board may be more appropriately listed here, whereas editing a special issue of a journal may be more appropriately listed under the section on scholarship.

6.3.5.3 General civic or community activities to which one has contributed one's professional skills or a significant amount of time, talent, energy, and involvement beyond that which might be expected by the usual citizen or member

## APPENDIX II School Standards

### *School of Arts and Humanities Standards for Faculty Evaluation*

#### Preamble

A uniform set of standards for the evaluation of teaching, scholarship and community services in the School of Arts and Humanities must be fair, flexible, and provide reasonable goals and expectations for those who seek tenure and promotion in the School.

Such a set of standards designed to evaluate all faculty in fields as diverse as Visual Art, Communications, History, Philosophy and Religion, Language and Culture Studies, Literature and the Performing arts must also be broad enough and flexible enough to support a wide range of artistic approaches and scholarly activities. School standards should not be restrictive and the School should provide the resources necessary for the faculty to achieve reasonable goals.

6.0 The Arts and Humanities faculty have adopted the College standards as a desirable set of School Standards for the Arts & Humanities faculty with the understanding that Program guidelines and judgment should be paramount.

#### College and Community Service

6.3 The criteria for College and community service are located in 6.3 of the College guidelines.

### *The School of Business Standards for Faculty Evaluation*

#### Preamble

The School of Business faculty recognizes the need for a uniform set of standards for the evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and community service that is fair, flexible, and that provides reasonable goals and expectations for those who seek tenure and promotion in the Business School.

School standards need to be broad enough and flexible enough to support a range of teaching methodology, and scholarly activity in a new and growing School. At this time BSNS, HTMS, and CSIS are the only programs in the School with faculty (the MBA program uses faculty from other programs). As new program(s) join the business School, these standards will be amended with input from those program(s).

In general, after reviewing the College Faculty Evaluation Standards, we recommend adoption of the College Standards as a desirable set of School Standards as the detailed sections below will show.

This College policy is occasionally elaborated upon to reflect the unique efforts of faculty in the School of Business which may distinguish them from faculty in other Schools. Individual Program guidelines within the School will be more specific.

### 6.3 College and Community Service

6.3.1 The faculty role includes contributions to the achievement of the College's mission through effective participation in governance activities including leadership roles at the program, School, or College-wide levels. These contributions may require the capacity to work collaboratively with other members of the College community, including activities related to alumni and the College Foundation.

6.3.2 Faculty may also contribute in broader arenas such as state or regional organizations, disciplinary associations. In addition, faculty may contribute to the College's public mission through service to our community, region and the State or the Nation.

6.3.3 Normally the College expects probationary faculty to serve the College and community in selected activities, while faculty who are tenured and/or of senior rank would be expected to have more substantial records in this area, as demonstrated by achievements in leadership on campus and to their disciplines and professional organizations.

6.3.4 Evaluation of achievements in this area focuses on the significance of participation, the impact of service, the scope of responsibilities, and the effectiveness of participation. Clear goals, adequate preparation and appropriate methods of providing service, significant results of the service, and reflection on the contribution and its use to improve the quality of future service are all aspects of documenting achievement in campus and community service.

6.3.5 Evidence of effectiveness in College or community service may include such items as:

6.3.5.1 One or more instances when one has used one's professional skills or knowledge for the benefit of the College, or of a non-college group or individual.

6.3.5.2 Contributions to professional organizations that are focused on service or professional responsibility as opposed to scholarship, research, or artistic/creative work. For example, an officership or service on a professional board may be more appropriately listed here, whereas editing a special issue of a journal may be more appropriately listed under the section on scholarship.

6.3.5.3 General civic or community activities to which one has contributed one's professional skills or a significant amount of time, talent, energy, and involvement beyond that which might be expected by the usual citizen or member.

effectiveness of participation. Clear goals, adequate preparation and appropriate methods of providing service, significant results of the service, and reflection on the contribution and its use to improve the quality of future service are all aspects of documenting achievement in campus and community service.

6.3.5 Evidence of effectiveness in College or community service may include such items as:

6.3.5.1 One or more instances when one has used one's professional skills or knowledge for the benefit of the College, or of a non-college group or individual.

6.3.5.2 Contributions to professional organizations that are focused on service or professional responsibility as opposed to scholarship, research, or artistic/creative work. For example, an officership or service on a professional board may be more appropriately listed here, whereas editing a special issue of a journal may be more appropriately listed under the section on scholarship.

6.3.5.3 General civic or community activities to which one has contributed one's professional skills or a significant amount of time, talent, energy, and involvement beyond that which might be expected by the usual citizen or member.

*School of Education  
Standards for Faculty Evaluation*

Adopted on 3/5/08  
Approved, March 6, 2008

This policy covers all members of the School of Education faculty, including tenure-track faculty, nontenure track faculty, and part-time faculty.

Preamble:

The School of Education recognizes the importance of teaching, scholarship, creative activity, and service as important conditions for tenure and/or promotion.

While learning and teaching are important to all Schools within the College, they are central to our mission. The School of Education faculty teaches undergraduate and graduate courses to a variety of audiences, with courses that include both disciplinary content and pedagogy.

In the School of Education, we recognize that scholarship informs and enriches teaching. Appropriate scholarship takes many forms, including but not limited to: disciplinary, interdisciplinary, applied, and pedagogical research, as well as grant acquisition.

The School of Education values service to its programs, the School, and the College at large.

Distinctive to the School of Education is its level of commitment to community service through partnerships with local institutions and agencies within the community.

## 2.3 College and Community Service

2.3.1 The faculty role includes contributions to the achievement of the School and College's mission through effective participation in governance activities including leadership roles at the program, School, or College-wide levels. These contributions may require the capacity to work collaboratively with other members of the College community, including activities related to alumni and the College Foundation.

2.3.2 Faculty may also contribute in broader arenas such as state or regional organizations or disciplinary associations. In addition, faculty may contribute to the College's public mission through service to our community, region, and the State or the Nation.

2.3.3 Normally the School expects probationary faculty to serve the College and community in selected activities, while faculty who are tenured and/or of senior rank would be expected to have more substantial records in this area, as demonstrated by achievements in leadership on campus and to their disciplines and professional organizations.



2.3.4 Evaluation of achievements in this area focuses on the significance of participation, the impact of service, the scope of responsibilities, and the effectiveness of participation. Clear goals, adequate preparation and appropriate methods of providing service, significant results of the service, and reflection on the contribution and its use to improve the quality of future service are all aspects of documenting achievement in campus and community service.

2.3.5 Evidence of effectiveness in College or community service may include such items as:

2.3.5.1 One or more instances when one has used one's professional skills or knowledge

for the benefit of the College, or of a non-college group or individual.

2.3.5.2 Contributions to professional organizations that are focused on service or professional responsibility as opposed to scholarship, research, or artistic/creative work.

For example, an officership or service on a professional board may be more appropriately listed here, whereas editing a special issue of a journal may be more appropriately listed under the section on scholarship.

2.3.5.3 General civic or community activities to which one has contributed one's professional skills or a significant amount of time, talent, energy, and involvement beyond that which might be expected by the usual citizen or member

*School of General Studies  
Standards for Faculty Evaluation*

December 3, 2007

Preamble

According to the new policies and procedures negotiated between the Stockton Administration and the Stockton Federation of Teachers, each academic school of the college is to develop a set of standards for evaluating faculty members housed in that school. In particular, the task is to “. . .develop standards interpreting the College standards within the context of its own disciplinary traditions.” (Richard Stockton College Policy # TBD, p. 10.)

The School of General Studies at Stockton is distinctive, both beyond and within the College.

Recognizing the many differences between general and disciplinary education, Stockton offers a separate general studies curriculum. This approach stands apart from that found at most institutions where introductory courses in the various disciplines are expected to serve the disciplines and general education. Moreover, General Studies differs from all other Schools at the College in that all students and faculty from throughout the College come together here to participate in the study of intellectual common ground.

The faculty of the School of General Studies is distinctive, as well. The school includes no programs with majors. Faculty members teach in the Basic Studies (BASK) program, the Writing program, which offers a minor, and other interdisciplinary minors.

The recently adopted policies include college-wide expectations for faculty regarding teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and college and community service. Given the diversity of the faculty of the School of General Studies, we propose that the statement of faculty responsibilities (pp. 2-3) and the description of college standards for faculty evaluation (pp. 4-9) contained in the aforementioned policy document be adopted as the School of General Studies standards for faculty evaluation.

### 6.3 College and Community Service

6.3.1 The faculty role includes contributions to the achievement of the College's mission through effective participation in governance activities including leadership roles at the program, school, or College-wide levels. These contributions may require the capacity to work collaboratively with other members of the College community, including activities related to alumni and the College F

6.3.2 Faculty may also contribute in broader arenas such as state or regional organizations or disciplinary associations. In addition, faculty may contribute to the College's public mission through service to our community, region, and the State or the Nation.

6.3.3 Normally the College expects probationary faculty to serve the College and community in selected activities, while faculty who are tenured and/or of senior rank would be expected to have more substantial records in this area, as demonstrated by achievements in leadership on campus and to their disciplines and professional organizations.

6.3.4 Evaluation of achievements in this area focuses on the significance of participation, the impact of service, the scope of responsibilities, and the effectiveness of participation. Clear goals, adequate preparation and appropriate methods of providing service, significant results of the service, and reflection on the contribution and its use to improve the quality of future service are all aspects of documenting achievement in campus and community service.

6.3.5 Evidence of effectiveness in College or community service may include such items as:

6.3.5.1 One or more instances when one has used one's professional skills or knowledge for the benefit of the College, or of a non-college group or individual.

6.3.5.2 Contributions to professional organizations that are focused on service or professional responsibility as opposed to scholarship, research, or artistic/creative work. For example, an officership or service on a professional board may be more appropriately listed here, whereas editing a special issue of a journal may be more appropriately listed under the section on scholarship.

6.3.5.3 General civic or community activities to which one has contributed one's professional skills or a significant amount of time, talent, energy, and involvement beyond that which might be expected by the usual citizen or member.

*School of Health Sciences  
Standards for Faculty Evaluation*

Note: The School Standards for Health Sciences were drafted and approved at a time when the unit was known as "Professional Studies." The Standards have been reendorsed by the Health Sciences Faculty. The following text has been revised only to the extent necessary to acknowledge the new name; there have been no substantive changes.

Approved by Faculty November 29, 2007

Approved by Dean of Professional Studies December 10, 2007

Re-Affirmed by Faculty and Dean of Health Sciences November 18, 2010

This policy covers all members of the Health Sciences School faculty, including tenure track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and part-time faculty.

**Preamble**

This policy specifies school-wide considerations for faculty evaluation in the School of Health Sciences (HLTH). This policy has been developed to elaborate upon the unique efforts of faculty in the School of Health Sciences which may distinguish them from faculty in other college schools.

Such distinctions should be incorporated into the faculty evaluation procedure.

5.2 The college-wide Faculty Evaluation (Policy # ) shall serve as the standard for faculty evaluation.

**6.3 College and Community Service**

6.3.1 The faculty role includes contributions to the achievement of the College's mission through effective participation in governance activities including leadership roles at the program, school, or College-wide levels. These contributions may require the capacity to work collaboratively with other members of the College community, including activities related to alumni and the College Foundation.

6.3.2 Faculty may also contribute in broader arenas such as state or regional organizations, disciplinary associations or their activities. In addition, faculty may contribute to the College's public mission through service to our community, region and the State or the Nation.

6.3.3 Normally the College expects probationary faculty to serve the College and community in selected activities, while faculty who are tenured and/or of senior rank would be expected to have more substantial records in this area, as demonstrated by achievements in leadership on campus and to their disciplines and professional organizations. This may include program development, curriculum design, and program assessment.

6.3.4 Evaluation of achievements in this area focuses on the significance of participation, the impact of service, the scope of responsibilities, and the effectiveness of participation. Clear goals, adequate preparation and appropriate methods of providing service, significant results of the service, and reflection on the contribution and its use to improve the quality of future service are all aspects of documenting achievement in campus and community service.

6.3.5 Evidence of effectiveness in College or community service may include such items as:

6.3.5.1 One or more instances when one has used one's professional skills or knowledge for the benefit of the College, or of a non-college group or individual.

6.3.5.2 Contributions to professional organizations that are focused on service or professional responsibility as opposed to scholarship, research, or artistic/creative work. For example, an officership or service on a professional board may be more appropriately listed here, whereas editing a special issue of a journal may be more appropriately listed under the section on scholarship.

6.3.5.3 General civic or community activities to which one has contributed one's professional skills or a significant amount of time, talent, energy, and involvement beyond that which might be expected by the usual citizen or member.

*School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics  
Standards for Evaluating Faculty*

Preamble

These standards were created in order to clarify the College policies as they relate to the faculty of the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. The faculty of the School Natural Sciences and Mathematics recognizes that the liberal arts college environment offers unique challenges and opportunities. In the following standards, we elaborate the definitions of teaching, scholarship, and service. We encourage each candidate for reappointment, tenure and promotion, and their program to give careful consideration to constructing a feasible and rigorous plan of individual goals. We also encourage the programs and the candidates to explicitly address the College, School, and Program standards for personnel evaluation in the program letter and the candidate's self evaluation and file, respectively.

### 6.3. College and Community service.

6.3.1. The NAMS faculty's role in contributing to the achievement of the College's mission may include participation in governance activities, such as taking on a leadership role at the program, School, or College-wide level. These contributions may require the capacity to work collaboratively with other members of the College community, which may include activities related to alumni and the College Foundation or other agencies.

6.3.2 – 6.3.5. Same as the College Standards (6.3.2-6.3.5)

### *School of Social and Behavioral Sciences Standards for Faculty Evaluation*

This policy covers all members of the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences faculty, including tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and part-time faculty

#### Preamble

The faculty of the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences support the College standards and intend for the elements of this document to further elucidate the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service from the perspective of the social and behavioral sciences.

### 6.3 College and Community Service

6.3.1 Because the social and behavioral sciences are necessarily entwined with ongoing changes and challenges in society, policy, and culture, community service can be an important aspect of faculty development.

6.3.2 Multiple modes of community engagement are valued and consistent with the obligations of faculty members in the school. Service can take many forms and may include

6.3.2.1 the development, enrichment, or leadership of the academic program,

6.3.2.2 service to the college and school through participation or leadership in committees or other formal or informal college initiatives,

6.3.2.3 service to the campus community through the development of engagement or enrichment opportunities for our students,

6.3.2.4 broader community service with local, regional, or national organizations, and

6.3.2.5 professional service of many types.

6.3.3 Service which brings a faculty member's skills, analytical abilities, or academic expertise to bear on a social challenge or objective is particularly valuable; similarly, general social engagement that enriches the community, tightens the bonds between campus and community, helps fulfill the college's responsibilities as citizen, or allows the faculty member to form a richer understanding of community issues and bring that understanding to their teaching is also of value.

6.3.4 The centrality of community and professional service to the applied research and teaching of many school faculty members may link service with teaching and research in important and indelible ways, and thus enrich multiple aspects of the faculty member's contribution to the college, community, and society.

