SCHOOL OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR PERSONNEL DECISIONS
(Appointment, Reappointment, Performance Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-tenure Review)
Effective January 1, 2022

Approved by IT: April 15, 2021
Approved by CFSC: December 3, 2021 .

I.   Overview

This document follows the policies stated in:

      1.   ISU Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies (ASPT) and
      2.   CAST CFSC Standards for Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure

This document is not intended to duplicate nor contradict any policy contained in either of the above policy statements. School guidelines extend and complement college and university policies. See the University and College documents for additional policies and procedures governing faculty evaluations, promotion and tenure decisions.

Each faculty member with a full-time tenured or probationary tenure appointment is reviewed annually in accordance with school, college, and university policy. Each non-tenured probationary faculty member is reviewed annually with respect to his/her progress toward tenure. In addition, a post-tenure performance review of each tenured faculty member may be completed at the faculty member's request or as mandated by university policy. The School Faculty Status Committee (SFSC) is responsible for all reviews and recommendations. (See Appendix A, Evidence and Responsibilities, for a list of evidence used in these decisions and for a list of faculty responsibilities.)

II.   Faculty Status Committee

A.   Membership

The SFSC shall be composed of three full-time tenured or probationary tenure appointment faculty in the school (those holding full time assignments in the school), and the director of the school, who is an <u>ex officio</u> voting member and chairperson of the committee. At least three of the four members must be tenured.

B.   Elections

An elected member may not serve more than two consecutive, full terms. All eligible faculty will be considered to be nominated unless they decline. An election will be conducted for all eligible faculty via secret ballot. A majority of those voting is required to elect the members. If not all open seats are filled on the first ballot, others (as needed) will be taken. In all rounds of balloting candidates receiving zero votes will be removed. All candidates with least number of non-zero votes will be removed from the ballot as long as at least two candidates remain. In case of balloting deadlock, the nominating and balloting process will start over. The balloting procedure must ensure that a majority of the membership is tenured.
In the event that a SFSC member cannot fulfill his/her term, a special election will be held to fill the vacated term.

C.   General Procedures

Faculty will be informed as to their rating in all categories in which rating is carried out. The SFSC shall also report to the CFSC its recommendations regarding performance, promotions, and tenure for IT faculty. Any committee member may submit a minority report.

A member of the SFSC will not be present or participate in any evaluation, discussion, or vote pertaining to that member or to any other member where there is a conflict of interest (such as a member's spouse or domestic partner).

Anonymous communication (aside from student evaluations) will not be considered in any evaluative activities.

Each year by March 31, the SFSC will review the current school ASPT guidelines and make recommendations for any desirable changes based on the year's evaluation processes and informal faculty feedback.

III.   Faculty Appointments

Recruitment for tenure-eligible faculty positions will be conducted by a School Search Committee appointed by the School Director in accordance with Article III, Section 5 of the School Bylaws. The search and appointment process will be conducted in accordance with university guidelines and the policies outlined in Appendix A of the School Bylaws.

IV.   Performance Evaluations

The SFSC will make a sincere effort to ascertain instances of faculty performances that deserve recognition. Faculty members should provide information to support their performance in teaching, service, and scholarly productivity, and should identify activities for which special consideration should be given. (See Appendix A, Evidence and Responsibilities)

In matters of evaluation, quality and results are more important than simple quantity. It is recognized that persons differ in their abilities and in the kinds of contributions they choose or are assigned to make to the University. The evaluation criteria stated here reflect an attempt to incorporate provisions for the variety of situations likely to be found in the school.

The evaluation in a particular category of performance is based on the professional judgment of the SFSC members using evidence the faculty member furnishes and information gathered by the SFSC. Judgments will be made devoid of favoritism and consistent with criteria given in Appendix B, Core Values That Will Guide Judgments of the SFSC.

V.   Annual Evaluation Procedure

A.   Faculty without Special Assignments

1.   The SFSC will review the performance of all faculty members to determine if any faculty member has not achieved satisfactory performance. The minimum performance criteria used for this determination are given in Appendix C, Minimum Performance Criteria.

2.   Each year, each SFSC member individually will evaluate each faculty member who has achieved satisfactory performance. The following procedure will be used by each SFSC member to produce their rating of faculty performance.

- Create three ratings for each faculty member—rate the performance of each faculty member in Teaching, Scholarly Productivity, and Service. Performance in Teaching is rated on the basis of the criteria presented for the four levels presented in Appendix D, the results of the IDEA instrument, and peer reviews, in that order of importance. For Scholarly Productivity and Service, performance is rated in accordance with the four levels described in Appendix D, Initial Rating Criteria For Faculty Who Have Achieved Satisfactory Performance.
- Refine the initial ratings to produce three ratings for all faculty members—one rating in each of Teaching, Scholarly Productivity, and Service. The rating of faculty places emphasis on quality and quantity of all relevant performance activities.

3.   The SFSC together creates one category rating for each faculty member. Where there are differences in a category rating given to a faculty member by different SFSC members, the SFSC will together review the performance of the individual to resolve the difference and provide one agreed upon rating for that faculty member in that category.

B.   Faculty on Leave, Reassignment, or with other Special Circumstances

1.   The SFSC shall normally evaluate a faculty member who is on leave or reassignment during the evaluation period in the same manner as if he/she were not on leave or reassignment with the following stipulations:

- The evaluation of performance will give consideration to the relative weight of the assigned duties.

- At least one major peer reviewed and/or competitive activity within the calendar year being evaluated is typically required for high performance evaluations.

2.   Faculty who believe that their assignment is not consistent with the usual pattern of faculty assignments and, therefore, not appropriately assessed using the other procedures stated in this policy must request a review by the SFSC. If warranted, the SFSC will develop, in consultation with the faculty member, a statement of goals, objectives, and assessment procedures prior to the faculty member undertaking the assignment. It is the faculty member's responsibility to initiate discussions with the SFSC regarding special evaluation procedures.

VI.   Determination of Salary Increment Recommendations

A. Ratings of Long Term Contributions and Equity

In addition to the rating resulting from the annual performance evaluation (see Sections III and IV) the SFSC will create two other overall ratings of faculty—one for "long term contributions" and one for "equity." Consideration is given to "long-term contributions" in situations covered by the two following categories:

- when the cumulative impact of accomplishments of a faculty member prove them to be more noteworthy than was apparent in the individual years in which annual performance was evaluated

- when a faculty member had truly outstanding accomplishments in a year when funds for salary increments were very low so that the performance could not be properly recognized

The SFSC will also rate all faculty in accordance with the "equity" of their compensation relative to faculty in their field at comparable institutions. For this purpose, the SFSC will use available national data and the current starting salaries of faculty in the field to rate faculty members relative to the difference between their current salary and parity with comparable faculty in the field.

B. Allocation of Funds to Categories

Twenty percent of the funds available to the SFSC for allocation as salary increments will be distributed as an equal percentage of base salary to all faculty members whose performance was evaluated as being satisfactory or above. The remaining 80% of the allocation will be allocated to the three review categories--annual performance, long-term contributions, and equity. At least 40% of the total funds each year will be allocated in accordance with the annual performance ratings. The SFSC will decide the apportionment of funds available to the School each year within the following ranges.

Satisfactory Performance	20%
Annual Performance Rating	40% to 64%
Long term Contributions and/or Equity	16% to 40%
Long term Contributions	0 to 40%
Equity	0 to 40%

In general, a higher percentage will be allocated to "annual performance" when the total available for salary increments is low.

C. Determination of Salary Increments

The funds in each of these three categories (annual performance, long-term contributions, and equity) will be distributed according to the rating of faculty in each category. Within each of the three categories (annual performance, long-term contributions, and equity) each individual faculty member's position will be evaluated proportionately to the person with the highest rating.

Salary increment recommendations will then be based on the total dollars available and these relative ratings. Funds in the "annual performance" and "equity" categories will be distributed on the basis of absolute dollars. Funds in the "long-term contributions" category will be distributed on the basis of a percentage of base salary.

Satisfactory Performance or Above	20%
Annual Performance	40% to 80%
Long term Contributions	0% to 40%
Equity	0% to 40%

Any money in the Long Term Contributions and/or Equity category that the SFSC determines is not needed to address inequities or long term performance contributions will be returned to the Annual Performance category pool.

To determine an overall rating for the purpose of salary adjustments only, each calendar year, each faculty member shall specify the relative weight of each of the three categories of Teaching, Scholarly Productivity, and Service by January 5. These changes will take effect in the coming year (i.e., evaluation percentage musts be set before the evaluation period). This weighting will be used for that faculty member. The weights may be in the following ranges, but must sum to 100%.

•	Teaching – may vary between 30 and 55%
•	Scholarly Productivity – may vary between 30 and 50%
•	Service – may vary between 10 and 35%

First year faculty and anyone who fails to specify weights will be evaluated based on 50% teaching, 40% research, and 10% service.

In the event of assignment changes during the calendar year, the faculty member may request a weight adjustment in writing, which must be approved by the Director and the SFSC.

The weights used for determining salary adjustments will not be considered in the tenure and promotion process.

VII.	Promotion

Faculty to be considered for promotion in rank are expected to provide evidence of a sustained record of professional competence in the areas of teaching, scholarly productivity, and service.

While individual efforts may be focused on and realized by excellence in one of the three evaluation areas, it is rarely possible to attain promotion in rank if excellence in one aspect is not supported by substantial continued efforts in the remaining areas. Faculty and School Faculty Status Committee members are encouraged to refer to the CAST CFSC *Standards* document and to Section VIII, *Promotion Policies of the Illinois State University, Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures*, for further delineation of promotion policies. As part of the consideration for promotion and tenure, a faculty member is encouraged to include a statement that explains the importance and

significance of his/her professional accomplishments. External written evaluations of the candidate are not required and will not be considered unless the reviewer waives confidentiality.

Policies for Promotion of <u>ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR</u> Rank:

1.   The candidate will possess a doctorate.

2.   University policy regarding the time of service required for promotion is stated in the University ASPT document.

3. The quality of the candidate's professional activities should be significant enough in the following areas to warrant promotion to associate professor.

    a. Performance evaluations demonstrate evidence of a high level of achievement and indicate that this level of performance will be sustained. This could be demonstrated through regular performance evaluation scores assigned by the SFSC of excellent or outstanding in both teaching and research.

    b. Demonstrated high quality teaching through evaluations, including student evaluations; recognition of colleagues for teaching; utilization of innovative materials/techniques; and/or evidence of organizational skills. Evidence can be either consistently high performance or a clear trajectory of improvement over time.

    c. Shows continuing evidence of scholarly productivity in his/her field beyond degree requirements. Evidence is expected to include publication in peer reviewed journals or conference proceedings of equivalent quality. Additional evidence may include: peer reviewed papers presented at high quality conferences and published in the proceedings, competitive grants sought and/or acquired, and other relevant scholarly activities.

    d. Consistently demonstrates service to the university community and/or profession. Examples include serving on school committees, and/or college/university committees; active involvement in professional organizations; and leading workshops and seminars.

Policies for Promotion of <u>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR to FULL PROFESSOR</u> Rank:

1. The candidate will possess the doctorate.

2. Ordinarily the candidate will have served full-time for at least four years at Illinois State University at the rank of associate professor and have completed ten years in the profession at the College or University level. Submission of a vita for the entire professional career is required. Only documentation of work completed since the last promotion will be accepted for review.

3. The candidate's professional activities as an associate professor shall be of such high quality in the following areas as to deserve the awarding of this highest rank.

    a. Performance evaluations are consistently at a high level since promotion to associate professor.

    b. Is consistently high in teaching as demonstrated by evaluations. Examples include: recognition by colleagues for teaching; student evaluations of teaching performance, development of innovative materials/techniques, evidence of class organizational skills.

    c. Demonstrates leadership in curricula related activities such as curriculum development, and being a faculty mentor.

d. Shows evidence of continuing involvement in scholarly productivity since the last promotion. Evidence must include publication in peer-reviewed journals. The candidate must demonstrate leadership in scholarly activities during his/her academic career, for example, through sole authorship. Additional evidence may include: peer reviewed papers presented at high quality conferences and published in the proceedings; significant competitive grants acquired; and other relevant scholarship activities.

e. Demonstrates leadership and outstanding continuing service to the university community and/or the profession as an associate professor. Examples include active involvement in professional organizations at committee and chair levels; serving actively on significant school, college, and/or university committees; and directing workshops, seminars and other professional activities.

VIII. Tenure

Tenure is not automatically attained. A decision not to award tenure does not necessarily reflect on the competencies or service of probationary faculty members. Candidates must demonstrate consistent, high-quality performance in all three categories of Teaching, Scholarly Productivity, and Service (see Appendix D, Initial Rating Criteria For Faculty Who Have Achieved Satisfactory Performance). A candidate's performance record must provide evidence of continued productivity that warrants the expectation of continued high-quality performance after tenure is granted. External written evaluations of the candidate are not required and will not be considered unless the reviewer waives confidentiality.

Candidates should consult the College and the University criteria for tenure. Under no circumstances should a candidate interpret any annual review by the SFSC or any other communiqué from the SFSC as a promise or, in any way, an assurance of tenure.

IX. Appeals Procedure

Faculty with concerns regarding evaluations are encouraged to communicate with the SFSC in order to see whether an informal resolution may be possible. The informal resolution process may be initiated by email or verbal communication with the School Director or any other member of the SFSC. If no informal resolution is forthcoming, the process to appeal a recommendation by the SFSC regarding tenure, promotion, or annual performance evaluation begins by requesting a formal meeting with the SFSC. Formal meetings with the SFSC must be requested in writing within 5 business days of the receipt of the recommendation. The faculty member must state clearly in the written request his/her reasons for the meeting. Note that an informal resolution can be reached after a formal meeting has been requested, so faculty are encouraged to request a formal meeting within the required 5 days if they believe it might be needed.

Formal meetings with the SFSC will be conducted in accordance with the policies outlined in the ASPT Guidelines.

APPENDIX A

Evidence and Responsibilities

The evaluation tools consist of at least the following.

1.   STUDENT EVALUATION
      Administered each term in all IT classes. The standardized Individual Development and
      Educational Assessment (IDEA) survey is used to gather student reactions to teaching
      performance and to the course. Results are advisory to the SFSC.

2.   FACULTY PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY REPORT
      Completed annually by all tenured and probationary faculty using the template provided by the
      School and submitted electronically and in hard copy. The report is used by the SFSC for the
      evaluation of annual performance and recommending promotion and tenure. The report must
      include a self-analysis statement in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly productivity, and
      service. Without this statement, the report will be considered incomplete.

3.   CURRENT ACADEMIC VITA
      Submitted by faculty undergoing post-tenure review.

4.   INFORMATION IN COURSE FOLDERS
      Faculty provide the school office with a syllabus for each course taught. In addition, copies of all
      assignments (e.g. homework, programming, and projects), and copies of all exams, tests, and
      quizzes will be placed in the school's on-line repository. In multi-instructor 100 and 200 level
      courses, the course coordinator provides materials which are common to all sections.

5.   PUBLICATIONS
      Faculty provide the SFSC with copies of printed books, articles, and papers. For accepted but not
      published articles and papers, faculty provide a copy of the work and letter of acceptance. The
      SFSC may also require additional documentation such as a copy of a journal or proceeding.

6.   PEER REVIEW OF CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE
      Conducted each semester for probationary faculty and once in a calendar year for tenured faculty
      by the School Director, a member of the SFSC, or another IT faculty member designated by the
      SFSC. A written report shall be provided to the SFSC for use in its deliberations regarding the
      overall qualitative teaching performance.

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to:

      1.   allow the school to administer student evaluations in each of his/her courses
            during the last quarter of each semester,
      2.   complete a Faculty Professional Activity Report annually,
      3.   keep appropriate course folders up-to-date,
      4.   provide the SFSC with adequate documentation on publications
      5.   allow visits for peer reviews to his/her classes, and
      6.   provide such other input or documentation as may aid the SFSC in its deliberations.

Each faculty member that is to receive a post tenure review will provide the following information in writing for the SFSC members on January 5th of the review year.

1. A summary of achievements since tenure, the latest promotion or the last post-tenure review.
3. A summary of long-term goals/objectives.
   (This will also be expected of every faculty member in the year recommended for promotion to Professor.)
4. A current academic vita.

APPENDIX B

Core Values That Will Guide Judgments of the SFSC

A. GENERAL

1.　It is expected that all faculty will maintain a professional bearing, be supportive of their colleagues, and exhibit a positive attitude toward the school and discipline. Enthusiasm, a positive attitude, and willingness to work for the good of the students and the school are important attributes in fulfilling the mission of the school.

2.　In evaluating teaching, consideration will be given to any special circumstances about the course (e.g., large lecture, new course). It is also recognized that providing adequate feedback is an essential part of most IT courses and that this load can vary tremendously, depending on the course, number of students, and student help available.

3.　Each faculty member has a responsibility to participate in the operation and governance of the School and University. External service which is directly related to the profession is also valuable to the School. In committee work, the quality and amount of contribution will be considered rather than mere committee membership. Unusual innovation, leader-ship and consistent quality performance will be rewarded. Standing committees which meet regularly will be weighted more heavily than those that meet only occasionally. Consideration will also be given to a lower level of service being expected of new faculty.

4.　In the area of scholarly productivity, consideration will be given to the types of journals in which articles are published, the types of conferences in which papers are presented, and the quality of other scholarly activities. For post-tenure reviews and for recommendations for tenure or promotion, consideration will also be given to senior authorship and to the contribution of each work to the faculty member's research agenda.

5.　In judging the contributions of a faculty member who is not full-time in the school, expectations will be adjusted in proportion to the time spent within the school.

6.　The evaluation system will distinguish between scholarly productivity and service activities that are accomplished over and above the normal teaching load vs. those for which reassigned time is granted. Greater quality and/or quantity would generally be expected if the project were done under reassigned time. The reward system will also take into account the contributions of faculty who are given an assignment equal to or greater than .25 FTE in any category other than direct instruction.

B. TEACHING

1. Concepts, generalizations, and skills are effectively taught in the course.
2. Students have been challenged to think and have been required to work up to their capabilities.
3. The instructor has clear objectives for each course and develops a workable plan to meet these objectives and assist student accomplishments.
4. Students have been required to synthesize and to apply concepts, generalizations, and skills in the solution of problems.
5. Classroom presentations provide the motivation and basis for learning.
6. Appropriate academic standards and expectations of student performance are established.
7. Students receive adequate and timely feedback to assist in learning.
8. Courses are kept up to date with current information.
9. Faculty remain up to date and develop the background and ability to teach a range of courses at different levels within the school.
10. Faculty maintain acceptable personal/professional relationships with students, faculty, and staff and willingly perform responsibilities in a professional manner.
11. Faculty show professional responsibility and resourcefulness in developing new ideas or concepts and in applying them to teaching.
12. The instructor makes himself/herself reasonably available to provide appropriate help for each student.
13. Faculty willingly and effectively guide students in independent study, creative activities, master's projects/theses or special projects.
14. Faculty engage in professional development activities to improve teaching effectiveness.

C. SERVICE

1. A faculty member willingly accepts responsibilities and positively contributes to the daily operations of the school, college and university.
2. A faculty member willingly accepts responsibilities and contributes to appropriate professional or related organizations.
3. A faculty member contributes professionally to the community and industry via committees, councils, boards, and commissions.

D. SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY

1. The publication of books and articles.
2. The presentation of papers and talks.
3. The receipt of peer-reviewed competitive grants.
4. The demonstration of professional expertise through such things as refereeing, serving on panels, etc.
5. Professional growth through formal and informal study (such as workshops, seminars, etc.).

APPENDIX C

Minimum Performance Criteria

The University recognizes two classifications for the purpose of performance evaluations; faculty who achieve overall satisfactory performance in a given year and are thereby raise-eligible and those that do not achieve overall satisfactory performance.

Decisions to Distinguish Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory Performance

In order to achieve "overall satisfactory performance" a faculty member must submit complete and accurate documentation on time and must meet the minimum expected in each of the following three categories (teaching, service, and scholarly productivity). Failure to submit appropriate documentation by the deadline or failure to meet minimum expectations in any category will result in an overall rating of unsatisfactory.

Teaching

Each faculty member must:

1. achieve an acceptable level of classroom performance as evidenced by:

   a. numerical student evaluations; and
   b. student comments (written or oral); and
   c. peer review of teaching

2. perform all teaching duties in a timely fashion as evidenced by:

   a. meeting scheduled classes; and
   b. meeting office hours; and
   c. providing timely feedback

3. meet objectives of courses taught as evidenced by:

   a. syllabus given to students
   b. student comments (written or oral)
   c. classroom material

4. demonstrate currency in subject taught as evidenced by:

   a. syllabus given to students
   b. student comments (written or oral)
   c. classroom material

Service

Each faculty member must:

1.   contribute to the service mission of the school as evidenced by:

        a.   demonstrating willingness to accept responsibility for service assignments
        b.   completing required reports in a timely fashion
        c.   attending faculty and committee meetings
        d.   volunteering for activities such as committee membership, attending graduation, having lunch with recruiters, meeting with potential students, etc.

Scholarly Productivity

Each faculty member must:

1.   maintain currency in the discipline as evidenced by:

        a.   attending and participating in seminars, workshops, or tutorials that will enhance their scholarly performance
        b.   attending and participating at scholarly meetings
        c.   submitting scholarly/research papers, manuscripts, or grant proposals
        d.   documenting works in progress, or otherwise demonstrating the acquisition of knowledge of new technology

APPENDIX D

INITIAL RATING CRITERIA FOR FACULTY WHO HAVE ACHIEVED SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE DURING ANNUAL REVIEW

RATING	TEACHING (for self report data)	SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY	SERVICE
Acceptable	1)Meets objectives of courses as defined by the curriculum committee; 2) regularly observes office hours; 3) provides support for students; 4) does not miss excessive classes; 5) provides timely and appropriate feedback; **and** 6) maintains an acceptable level of performance.	1) Demonstrates currency in field and 2) demonstrates at least one scholarly productivity activity or activity leading toward future scholarly productivity (in the judgment of the ASPT committee).	Regularly attends required functions; and accepts responsibility for service assignments.
Meritorious	Meets acceptable conditions and at least one of the following: 1) makes necessary changes to keep course current; 2) works with students on honors projects; 3) serves as a member on graduate project or thesis committees; **or** 4) engages in professional development activities.	Meets acceptable conditions and 1) is the author of at least one national, peer-reviewed paper; 2) is the author or co-author of multiple peer-reviewed regional papers; **or** 3) is awarded a URG.	Meets acceptable conditions and actively participates on school. college or university committees. Demonstrates a contribution to the School of IT strategic plan activities (i.e., works at least one action plan).
Excellent	Meets meritorious conditions and 1) develops new course and/or significantly update an existing course; 2) applies creative teaching technique; 3) serves as a major advisor on master's projects or independent studies; **or** 4) receives an IT teaching award.	Meets meritorious conditions and 1) is the author of at least one national, peer-reviewed journal article or 2) is the author or co-author of a high-quality, national, peer-reviewed paper, book or book chapter; 3) is the author or co-author of multiple national, peer-reviewed papers; **or** 4) is awarded an external peer-reviewed competitive grant.	Meets meritorious conditions and provides significant contributions to campus committees. Significant contributions could take the form of 1) chairing the curriculum committee, 2) chairing the assessment committee, 3) chairing a search committee; 4) serving on the SFSC **or** 5) leading a significant community engagement effort that involves improving our students' experiences.
Outstanding	Meets excellent conditions and: 1) demonstrates outstanding classroom performance; 2) develops effective, new teaching technique; **or** 3) receives a significant award for teaching.	Meets the excellent conditions and 1) is the author or co-author of multiple works including at least one high-quality, national, peer-reviewed journal article **and** either one national, peer-reviewed paper or authored or co-authored a high-quality peer-reviewed book; 2) is awarded a major external peer-	Meets excellent conditions and 1) demonstrates multiple significant contributions (see above) through campus service and service to professional organizations; 2) receives a significant award for service; **or** 3) performs significant public or community service related to the field.

		reviewed competitive grant; **or** 3) receives a significant award for research.	

NOTES:

The ASPT committee will make a judgment on the classification of teaching, scholarly productivity, and service.

These criteria are <u>prime</u> examples but are not inclusive of all activities that could contribute to a faculty member being rated at a given level. However, <u>several activities</u> must generally be exhibited at a level in order for a faculty member to be rated in that level (scholarly productivity is an exception). It follows from the nature of the areas of Teaching and Service that achievement at one level implies that the faculty member has also achieved at the lower levels as well.