

**GUIDELINES FOR
EVALUATION OF FACULTY
IN
TEACHING, RESEARCH, OUTREACH and SERVICE
DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE
Revised May 2005**

This document presents guidelines for evaluation of faculty performance, including annual evaluations as well as reappointment, tenure and promotion. These guidelines should be used by individual faculty members, especially pre-tenure faculty, and by their formal mentoring committees to aid development and use of a set of performance expectations following the process described in the Department Bylaws. The guidelines describe activities, achievements, and products that constitute evidence of scholarship in each of our primary mission areas: teaching, research, and outreach. A brief description of expectations in the area of service to the Department and University is also included.

Evaluations in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife must first of all recognize that teaching, research, and outreach are equally important to the Department's mission. International activities shall be evaluated in the context of teaching, research, and/or outreach. Each of these major assignments will be evaluated in proportion to the time and effort called for in the initial letter of appointment to the Department or revisions agreed upon and documented during annual evaluations. The evidence of scholarship described in this document is intended to be used to develop expectations specifically within the context of each faculty member's actual appointment and assignment.

The Department Advisory Committee will coordinate the review by a committee of peers of the performances of candidates for reappointment, promotion and tenure. This committee shall consist of all MSU faculty that are also core faculty of the Department at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered, and it will function within the framework of the Department Bylaws (paragraph 3.2.2.1.5). Recommendations from each faculty member will be made in writing to the Department Advisory Committee chairperson, who will inform the Department Chairperson of the outcome of the faculty vote in writing. External reviews from at least three peers (not employed by Michigan State University) must be conducted for candidates being evaluated for the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor. These reviewers will be selected by the Chairperson from lists of potential reviewers prepared independently by the candidate and the Chairperson. The final recommendation from the Department to the Dean is the responsibility of the Chairperson. All candidates shall be informed in writing of the Chairperson's recommendation.

The faculty promotional process shall include a mentoring system that assists new faculty in developing formal plans in teaching, research, and extension and/or outreach, as described in the Department Bylaws (paragraph 3.4). The plans will be developed by the faculty member and an assigned mentoring committee and submitted to the Department Chairperson for approval. This

process is intended to guide new faculty in developing their career in the Department and assist the faculty and Chairperson in setting specific benchmarks for future evaluation of achievements for re-appointment, tenure and promotion considerations. Implementation of the process will be supervised by the Department Chairperson.

A conceptual framework for defining scholarship is presented in the next section, based on the premise that achievement of scholarship is central to meeting performance expectations as a faculty member. This is followed by a comprehensive set of examples of evidence of scholarship for each of the mission areas: teaching, research, and outreach. These examples are intended to provide guidance to faculty and their mentoring committees as they work together to develop expectations for performance and to document their accomplishments in anticipation of the re-appointment, promotion and tenure process. While considering the guidelines it is important to recognize that the diversity of faculty appointments in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife means that individual faculty are not expected to demonstrate scholarship in all of the areas described below – the guidelines should assist in the identification of potential areas of scholarship. It remains the responsibility of each faculty member, in consultation with her/his mentoring committee and with the approval of the Department Chair, to develop a set of specific expectations that is appropriate for their appointment and assignment.

OVERALL EXPECTATIONS FOR SCHOLARSHIP ACROSS THE FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE MISSION: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife recognizes that the key to evaluation of faculty performance for reappointment, promotion and tenure lies in determining whether candidates have achieved scholarship in each of our primary mission areas: teaching, research, and outreach. To that end these guidelines provide examples of activities and achievements that will be recognized as evidence of scholarship. For each mission area we provide a large number of examples; it is not our intention to suggest that the standard of scholarship achievement necessary for successful promotion, etc. is to provide evidence that reflects all, or even a large proportion of these examples. Rather, the examples are intended to guide faculty members and their mentoring committees in selecting a set of performance expectations suitable for the specific appointment/assignment of that faculty member. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair, with advice from the mentoring committee, to determine whether the set of performance expectations developed through an individual faculty member's mentoring process will be sufficient, if met, to ensure successful progress through the tenure system.

The examples of expectations for each mission area have been organized around a common conceptual framework for scholarship. The framework comprises four distinct but not mutually exclusive theme areas for scholarship:

- **Creation:** what products, ideas, and concepts does the candidate *create* to accomplish teaching, research, or outreach objectives? General examples would include proposals and plans.
- **Discovery:** what kinds of *discoveries* result from the candidate's teaching, research, or outreach activities? General examples would include experimental results and advancement of best practices.

- **Integration:** what does the candidate do to *integrate*, extend, interpret, or apply her/his teaching, research, or outreach? General examples would include collaborations, integrative or synthetic publications.
- **Reflection:** what does the candidate, or his/her peers, do to *reflect* on the impact and effectiveness of her/his teaching, research, or outreach? General examples would include peer recognition, awards, evidence of intellectual growth or adaptation.

The examples presented in each mission area sometimes overlap with, or arguably belong in, more than one theme area. However, the theme areas are presented to provide a common framework for organizing the examples in each mission area and to illustrate the breadth of activities and achievements that are germane to scholarship.

EXPECTATIONS FOR PERFORMANCE IN TEACHING

Quality in teaching and advising are fundamental to the Department, College and University missions. All Department faculty with teaching appointments are expected to demonstrate that quality in teaching and advising as well as a continuing commitment to scholarship that contributes to effective instruction and dissemination of knowledge. These expectations also recognize that teaching encompasses many forms, including classroom instruction advising, and mentoring activities for all levels of students, and activities that extend beyond campus, state and national boundaries. It is recognized that important contributions are also essential to the Department, College and University missions and will be considered as a part of the evaluation process. Regardless of appointment, all Departmental faculty should be committed to high standards in teaching and the scholarship of teaching, and some contributions to teaching and advising are essential components of a faculty member's responsibilities.

Examples of evidence of scholarship in teaching

A. Creation

- a. *Clear teaching goals and objectives.* The candidate's overall teaching program and each individual course should have clearly delineated goals and specific learning objectives. These goals and objectives should strongly relate to the discipline or disciplines upon which the overall teaching program or specific course is based and should connect their instructional efforts to the teaching goals of Fisheries and Wildlife, the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources and other related disciplines. These goals should enhance students' opportunities to pursue employment or additional learning within the field and reflect an understanding of student learning differences.
- b. *Adequate preparation and planning for teaching.* The course materials should indicate a comprehensive knowledge of the current content of the discipline and should clearly demonstrate expertise beyond the typical textbook level reflecting new developments in the field and utilizing current reference materials. The syllabi provided to students should communicate clearly the course goals and expectations to the students. These course

materials should give evidence to the incorporation of diverse learning methods that support the diverse learning styles of the student population. Courses offered by the faculty member should effectively utilize appropriate learning technology to enhance the learning experience.

- c. *Effective presentation.* The instructional process should utilize a diversity of educationally appropriate methodologies to accomplish course goals. Evidence should indicate that ample opportunities for questions and feedback related to the course goals, objectives and the instructional process are provided to students. The instructor should also document effective presentation structure and technique. The instructor should use language that represents the discipline, but also is understood by the student audience. Videotape of a typical class session would serve as an appropriate documentation.

B. Discovery

- a. *Evidence of study.* Course materials should reflect the scholarship of the faculty member, such that this scholarship is evident to peers within their discipline and to peers within the Department. Peer -reviewed articles and invited presentations are desired avenues for this evidence. All faculty members should use evaluative methods regularly to monitor goals and objectives and document this self evaluation of teaching/learning activities.
- b. *SIRS reports.* The SIRS responses from students should be viewed as acceptable by the reviewing faculty and administration. The responses from various reporting systems are used by the faculty member to modify the teaching system or process to enhance student learning. Written student comments are documented and analyzed for instructional evaluation and enhancement. A trend in SIRS scores and/or comments indicating positive changes in the courses being taught should be evident.
- c. *Peer review.* The faculty member should present new or unique teaching ideas to international, national or local programs or seminars and in peer-reviewed teaching or discipline-related journals. The faculty member is recognized within his/her discipline as a leader in the instructional process as indicated by being a requested participant in teaching/learning symposia or workshops and/or is a requested author in teaching-related publications. Course syllabi, handouts, and lecture notes should be made available to peers for review and comment. In addition, peers should be invited and encouraged to attend classes and provide feedback to the instructor. Guest lectures by the faculty member and participation in team teaching can be evaluated by peers.
- d. *Significant results.* The faculty member receives extraordinary SIRS results. The faculty member receives awards and other external recognition for teaching excellence. Graduated students and alumni may recognize the faculty member's impact. Employers provide testimonials on the performance of students in their employ. Scores on national or state certification tests related to the course content are passing and beyond.

C. Integration

- a. *Evidence of study.* The course syllabus references intellectual material from other disciplines, shows evidence that the course content has been effectively integrated with other disciplines

where appropriate. Faculty member's materials and presentations utilize conceptual models or maps of topics to create student understanding. Articles, popular and peer reviewed, presentations and guest lectures give evidence to knowledge of other intellectual disciplines. The feedback given to students on written assignments assists the student to connect and integrate their knowledge with other concepts or disciplines.

- b. *Appropriate methods.* Course syllabi indicate the integration of technology, multiple forms of assessment and instructional approaches, and the integration of diversity. The faculty member should demonstrate command of a diversity of teaching/communication methodologies. A myriad of methods is used to communicate and evaluate the teaching and learning process. Teaching methods encourage students to think integratively. The class assignments encourage students to utilize references from other disciplines. The faculty member uses flexible scheduling and student groupings to accomplish course goals and objectives. The faculty member utilizes smart boards, projectors, computers and Internet connectivity to accomplish teaching objectives.
- c. *Assessment and monitoring.* The faculty member uses a diversity of evaluation methods to monitor the instructional process. The faculty member uses peers from other disciplines to attend class, review course materials and provide feedback that is utilized teaching enhancement. A record is maintained of students who become majors or succeed in graduate studies that can be related to the instructor's influence.
- d. *Evidence of transforming and extending knowledge.* Student journals reflect growth on the integration and extension of knowledge. Excerpts from student papers and projects indicate integration and extension of knowledge. Students participate in poster sessions, paper presentations, management plans or other planning strategy related to the course, its discipline and other disciplines. The faculty member participates in professional society committees and University curriculum/teaching committees. The faculty member works with other colleagues and departments in the development of course materials, improvement of instruction or the integration of curricula. Faculty participation in off-campus activities, clubs and local community groups related to teaching activities is desirable.

D. Reflection

- a. *Reflective critique.* Student evaluation forms are discussed with peers and administration to foster the professional development of the instructor. The faculty member utilizes student evaluation forms, journals or performance plans to identify their own learning needs related to content, instructional process and evaluation methodology. Modifications, recommendations and observations are kept in organized notes or a journal for contemplation and application to instructional process. The faculty member has actively pursued communication with colleagues within the department, university, and the wider academic community to improve the instructional process. The faculty member attends professional conferences and makes changes in content and teaching methods as a result.
- b. *Evaluation.* The faculty member has made an assessment of their teaching performance that results in significant change each semester. SIRS forms, midterm evaluations, journals and

other feedback mechanisms are utilized for self-evaluation. The faculty member utilizes student learner needs as well as their own to evaluate the learning system. Feedback from peers and colleagues are maintained in a systematic fashion so that they can be used for instructional evaluation.

- c. *Modification based on assessment and peer review.* The faculty member develops a systematic plan based on reflection and evaluation from students and peers to improve student learning. The faculty member documents how the course has changed as a result of student feedback and instructor growth. Instructional innovations are documented and evaluated for their effectiveness.
- d. *Peer and student recognition.* The faculty member receives awards from student groups or professional societies for their instruction. Special recognition for the publication of a instructional innovation or methodology by a peer-reviewed organizations, societies or journals is received. Graduated students, alumni and employers who provide testimonials on the impact of their instruction, recognize the faculty member.

EXPECTATIONS FOR PERFORMANCE IN RESEARCH

All departmental faculty – regardless of appointment – must be committed to maintaining high standards in research. Research activities contribute to keeping a faculty member current in their academic field and can enhance all scholarly endeavors associated with departmental and university missions including teaching and outreach. Scholarship can be demonstrated through discovery of knowledge, integration across disciplines, application to problem-solving, and dissemination of knowledge to the professional community and to society. Faculty research and scholarly activities should be guided by our departmental mission to provide benefits to our partners and to society in general. Faculty should demonstrate leadership in developing and maintaining an active and productive research program and whose impact extends beyond the University to regional, national and even international levels. Appropriate research activities may take many forms ranging from applied problem solving to fundamental discovery of disciplinary knowledge.

Quality of research and scholarly contributions is a key decision factor and will be measured as a function of impacts relative to the mission of the Department and the discipline(s) within which the research was conducted. Value is also placed on collegiality, teamwork and collaboration with other members of the Department, University and colleagues from other institutions. However, the candidate is also expected to demonstrate an individual leadership role in developing and disseminating scholarly accomplishments. Candidates must demonstrate commitment to continued improvement in intellectual and performance capabilities to ensure they remain current in their respective fields and sustain high levels of scholarly achievement.

Examples of evidence of scholarship in research

A. Creation

- a. *Program focus, well-defined goals.* A productive, high impact research program must show clear evidence of focus and well-defined goals. **All** faculty should be able to clearly describe the broad goals of their research and specific objectives related to those goals. They should also be able to clearly demonstrate how their research activities and products are related to, and focused on the achievement of those goals.
- b. *Generation of research funding.* A strong indication of scholarship in research is evidence of sustained success at obtaining extra-mural support for research, including funding that enables sustained support for graduate students. All research funding is evidence of scholarship, regardless of source, magnitude, and *contribution* to university revenues through indirect costs. It is recognized that the diversity of faculty in our Department implies a diversity of funding opportunities. Nevertheless, it is important to document the kinds and sizes of grants obtained, particularly when success is achieved at obtaining research grants from highly competitive sources.
- c. *New, innovative directions for research.* Evidence of scholarship in creativity also comes from development and pursuit of novel research ideas – ideas at the cutting edge of science in a particular discipline or set of disciplines. All faculty are expected to stay abreast of new discoveries and developments in their areas of expertise. Evidence of this can be provided by demonstrating research activities that seek advances at the forefront of a discipline or that partially shift the focus of a faculty member’s research in a new direction.

B. Discovery

- a. *Publications in peer-reviewed journals.* Dissemination of new research findings through publication in peer-reviewed outlets is the primary form of evidence of *research* productivity. All peer-reviewed publications for which the faculty member is a co-author are important to demonstrating scholarship. The reputation of the journal in which papers are published is a factor in the evaluation, although it is recognized that the nature of the research being disseminated has a large influence on the range of suitable publication outlets. It is desirable for some of the publications to be ones in which the candidate is the lead author.
- b. *Other publications.* Research findings are not always presented in peer-reviewed outlets. Evidence of scholarship in research also includes publications in non-peer-reviewed outlets – e.g., technical reports, bulletins, press-releases for new findings, progress and completion reports to funding agencies, etc. While these publications do not carry as much weight in the evaluation process, they are an important part of the evidence of scholarship in research.
- c. *Presentations/communications at professional meetings.* The sharing of research findings through oral and poster presentations of scientific meetings is an important part of the research communication process. All such presentations, including those delivered by students and colleagues collaborating with the candidate, should be documented as evidence of research scholarship.

- d. *Patents, etc* Occasionally faculty may produce other research products, such as patentable inventions, that also constitute important evidence of scholarship in the area of discovery

C. Integration

- a. *Knowledge of subject and context for research program.* All faculty should be able to demonstrate leading-edge familiarity with their research area. They should be able to describe their research in a broad context, demonstrating how the science they pursue fits into a larger context, and how findings within their own area of interest might be integrated into other science in a way that advances the broader discipline.
- b. *Synthetic and integrative publications and presentations.* Evidence of scholarship in the area of research integration can come from publications and presentations that synthesize an area of science, including review papers, modeling analyses, state-of-science reports, etc. Scholarship in this area is important, particularly as a faculty member's research program matures and she/he becomes recognized as an expert in a particular subject area.
- c. *Collaborations with other disciplines.* The Department views synthetic, integrative, cross-disciplinary science as a critical area of research, particularly in the disciplines relevant to fish and wildlife science and management. The extent to which individual faculty are involved in multi-disciplinary collaborations is expected to vary depending on the kind of research they do and on their appointment/assignment. Nevertheless, evidence of productive collaborations with researchers from other disciplines should be documented whenever it occurs.

D. Reflection

- a. *Peer recognition.* Recognition by one's peers is a clear indication of the achievement of scholarship in research. Acknowledgments from journal editors and conference organizers for valued research communications should be documented. For more senior/experienced faculty examples of peer recognition would include the receipt of awards from professional societies and invited presentations, especially keynotes and opening addresses at professional meetings.
- b. *Service in research.* All researchers are expected to contribute to the scientific community providing services, particularly by contributing to the peer-review process for funding agencies and journals. Service in this area demonstrates scholarship in research because demand for such service is a reflection of a faculty member's standing in her/his peer community.
- c. *Impact of research.* All faculty are expected to reflect on the impact that their research is having, both on the advancement of their discipline(s) and on the conservation and management of natural resources. Being able to clearly demonstrate how one's research is contributing to these goals is a very important aspect of scholarship in research.

EXPECTATIONS FOR PERFORMANCE IN OUTREACH

Outreach and Extension are important to the Departmental, College and University mission and fundamental to the Land Grant philosophy. For Departmental purposes, we accept the MSU definition of outreach as a form of scholarship that involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions (MSU Provost's Committee on University Outreach 1993). Outreach is an umbrella term describing the full array of potential communications activities the Department provides to interact with varied stakeholders. MSU Extension (MSUE) is a specific subcategory of outreach; Extension programs extend research-based knowledge through the formal network of MSU Extension community-based offices or in other forms using MSUE delivery systems, approaches, or organizational structures such as Area of Expertise (AoE) teams.

Traditionally, outreach programming has required the identification of clientele needs, development of partnerships with researchers to address unanswered needs, and the dissemination of knowledge, technology and research results to enable clientele to make better informed decisions. This view of outreach scholarship is still relevant. Yet today, outreach is designed to foster individual, social group, and organizational transformation, and outreach practices are designed around ever-growing theoretical and practical research bases. As our notions of outreach have evolved, so too have our definitions of scholarship. For example, a 2003 MSU document defines Extension scholarship as "the systematic generation, integration and application of knowledge based on both concepts and practice with the intent of improving peoples' lives. Scholarship of Extension takes place through an interactive, dynamic, and expanding process in which both concepts and practice are advanced through a continuing process for improved knowledge that is validated by peers" (MSUE Work Group, 2003).

All Department faculty are expected to demonstrate competence in and commitment to outreach. Departmental expectations recognize that outreach and Extension encompass many forms, including activities and programs that extend beyond campus, state and national boundaries. In general, though, outreach refers to scholarship that contributes to effective information transfer to clientele, engagement with social groups and organizations, and/or documentable change and impacts for individuals and/or social systems. Our Department recognizes that outreach is performed by faculty without specific outreach or Extension appointments. In the reappointment, tenure and promotion processes, scholarship in outreach will be evaluated for all faculty members regardless of assignment, but specific expectations will vary depending on the candidate's appointment, subject matter specialty, explicit agreements and the goals, needs and resources of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife.

In considering the role of faculty without formal appointments in outreach or Extension, CANR policy states: "All College faculty should be committed to maintaining standards of excellence in outreach, and some contribution to outreach is an important and essential component of a faculty members' responsibilities regardless of assignment." (Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, CANR, 1995). Faculty without formal MSU Extension or outreach appointments are expected to actively participate in the transfer of their research results to appropriate clientele groups.

Numerous useful sources provide valuable background for criteria and evidence to demonstrate outreach scholarship. Most useful in deciding on evidence of quality and beneficial impact of outreach is the MSU publication “Points of Distinction: A Guidebook for Planning & Evaluating Quality Outreach” (<http://www.msu.edu/unit/outreach/pubs/pod.pdf>). As this guidebook demonstrates, successful peer reviewed publications, acquisition of grants, and presentations to peers, are not the only criteria appropriate in establishing a record of effective scholarship in outreach and Extension.

Examples of evidence of scholarship in outreach

A. Creation

- a. *Program/activity organization.* All faculty should be able to describe the broad goals of their outreach work. Outreach programs and activities should reflect a high level of organization; examples of evidence of this include objectives, content that demonstrates the individual’s command and knowledge of subject matter relevant to the outreach, and/or plan for implementation using particular pedagogical techniques. Programs/activities should demonstrate the faculty member’s process for making decisions (perhaps with stakeholders) regarding program/activity objectives, content, implementation and evaluation. An outreach or Extension program or set of activities that achieves meaningful impacts must show evidence that systematic, research-based thought has provided the base for action. Even ongoing, routine and reactive outreach activities (such as replying to phone calls and email inquiries) may be summarized and documented to show how scholarly thought is the basis for action. Documentation should provide a reviewer with a thorough understanding of the outreach program/activity.
- b. *Generation of outreach funding and in-kind support.* One indication of scholarship in outreach is sustained success in obtaining internal MSU and extra-mural funding and in-kind support (e.g., services, donated goods/supplies, financial gifts, endowment donations). Evidence should demonstrate the kinds and sizes of funding and support acquired, and where appropriate, the engagement processes for including stakeholders and partners in funding procurement processes. As with research support, all outreach funding provides evidence of scholarship, regardless of source, magnitude, and contribution to university revenues.
- c. *Needs assessment and stakeholder engagement.* Prior to and throughout design and delivery of outreach programs/activities, scholarship entails the use of at least some activities such as needs assessment, environmental scans, SWOT analyses, situation analysis, continuous quality improvement (CQI), LOGIC models, community engagement, or one of many other processes. Evidence of scholarship must include documentation of such processes and of how the data gathered influenced decisions regarding outreach programs/activities.
- d. *Facilitation of stakeholder groups and engagement within an outreach context.* Nearly all faculty have the opportunity for creation of outreach innovations or application of

research. Some faculty have responsibilities or opportunities to convene new groups representing, for example, an Area of Expertise team, a new committee, or an assemblage of partners. Others have opportunities to engage with learners in community-based contexts as they facilitate visioning, planning, or action processes to stimulate individual or organizational change. Regardless, the process of facilitation leads to scholarly creation of outreach efforts. Evidence of facilitation scholarship should include documentation of systematic group processes used, results of facilitated processes, and impacts of facilitation and leadership on individuals, social groups, or organizations.

- e. *New, innovative outreach.* Evidence of scholarship in outreach creation emerges from *developing* new outreach endeavors. All faculty should stay current with new communications tools and processes related to their specific form(s) of outreach work. Evidence of innovation can be demonstrated by showing how one's programs/activities recombine or realign existing outreach efforts, or are unique among state, national or international outreach in a particular technical subfield. Faculty should also effectively utilize the capability of individual and program-oriented internet resources, particularly up-to-date, informative web pages, to achieve outreach communication objectives.

B. Discovery

- a. *Outreach research questions.* Faculty should be able to demonstrate scholarship in pursuing avenues of inquiry through their outreach work. This can range for example, from simply posing questions related to outreach audience characteristics and needs, to investigating immediate post-program feedback on audience satisfaction, to in-depth outreach research studies considering questions about program/activity/materials design, delivery, and impacts. Documentation of these questions can occur along a spectrum from brief project report narratives to detailed theses, dissertations, reports, and peer-reviewed papers.
- b. *Innovation and discovery in outreach design, delivery, or pedagogy.* Outreach activities may lead to new discoveries in program/activity/materials design, outreach implementation strategies, and even in basic approaches to and methods of teaching/instruction. These discoveries should be documented through reports, articles or other products, and where possible, peer-reviewed, shared with partners, and/or disseminated to peers through conferences/symposia.
- c. *Discovery through evaluation of processes, outputs, outcomes, impacts.* All faculty conducting outreach work should consider evaluation methods and results appropriate to the nature and scale of the program/activity. Clientele/learner satisfaction is only one measure that can be used in assessing the scholarship of outreach; in addition, process evaluation (recording outreach processes and their suitability), output documentation (e.g., numbers of clientele reached, resources generated through outreach), and assessment of outcomes for clientele, and investigating of longer-term impacts on individual's behaviors or social systems are all scholarly endeavors that can be documented to display scholarship (see C.a. and C.c. below). Evidence should be provided on the discovery of effects of an individual's outreach in terms of clientele

impacts such as enhanced understanding, behavioral change, and subsequent performance and accomplishment when applicable. Evidence should also be presented to show that outreach inspires, stimulates, fosters, and changes attitudes facilitating life-long learning, leadership development, and achievement by individuals and clientele groups.

C. Integration

- a. *Publications in peer-reviewed journals.* Ample opportunity exists for faculty to demonstrate their outreach scholarship both in journals focused on outreach as well as in technical, discipline-specific journals. All publications for which the faculty member is a co-author are important to demonstrating scholarship. The reputation of the journal in which papers are published is a factor in the evaluation, although it is recognized that the nature of the outreach being disseminated and the individual's appointment and assignment will have a large influence on the range of suitable publication outlets.
- b. *Materials, publications, curricula (with peer-review).* All faculty should display efforts to generate and/or mentor students in the generation of outreach products. Ways of accomplishing outreach scholarship include: visual materials such as slide sets, computer-based audio-visual presentations, web sites, written materials such as articles, papers, reports, bulletins, handbooks, fact sheets, newsletters, notebooks, compiled curricula, and popular journal articles; provision of informational resources to policy makers and other audiences through print or other forms (list based on MSUE Work Group, 2003). If possible and appropriate, peer-review, stakeholder and audience review or pilot testing of such materials will enhance scholarship.
- c. *Presentations with stakeholders, clientele, partners, internal outreach groups/committees/teams.* All faculty should demonstrate their outreach work by documenting scholarly presentations. Oral presentations and stakeholder involvement may include oral presentations such as talks, speeches, seminars, workshops, radio and TV programs; working with clientele groups including boards, councils, committees, task forces, workgroups, or other partners (list based on MSUE Work Group, 2003). Faculty should document when and where these presentations or meetings occurred, number and types of stakeholders served, the extent of their own leadership in convening such meetings, and any evidence of participant feedback or impact.
- d. *Collaborations and partnerships.* The extent to which faculty foster outreach collaborations and partnerships will vary depending on the program/activity and the nature of the individual's appointment and assignments. Scholarship includes demonstration of continued progress to develop partnerships with researchers and other stakeholders to address unanswered needs and disseminate knowledge, technology and research results to target audiences.
- e. *Peer acceptance, adoption, application, dissemination.* Demonstrated peer acceptance or adoption of outreach contributions and methods can be used as evidence of quality. When possible, evidence of scholarship can be demonstrated through letters or other indicators that an individual's outreach work has received peer acceptance, has been

adopted by other outreach or resource management systems, has been applied in new contexts, or has been disseminated through conferences, symposia, meetings, printed or other materials, etc.

- f. *Professional service to professional outreach organizations, internal and external outreach or Extension bodies.* All faculty are expected to contribute to professional bodies in at least one area of their work. Ample opportunities exist to participate in professional service in outreach venues, especially if the individual has a large outreach or Extension appointment or assignment. Examples of such service encouraged include serving on regional and national outreach committees, serving as a reviewer, and serving in a leadership role in MSU Extension AoE teams or other similar outreach programming bodies.

D Reflection

- a. *Portfolio.* It is recommended, although not required, that faculty members with outreach responsibilities maintain a portfolio. Portfolios provide a means of archiving and organizing evidence which demonstrates desirable improvements and innovations in outreach. “A diversified portfolio of scholarly products, educational works, and outcomes may include some of the following indicators...: workshop and conference materials, educational manuals and teaching guides, new curricula and courses, computer programs, simulations, problem analyses, informational databases, newsletters, newspaper articles, fact sheets, bulletins, reports, magazine articles, books, proceedings of seminars, conferences and professional meetings, abstracts, grant proposals, educational games, videotapes, audio cassettes, CDs, results of partnering efforts with clientele organizations” (MSUE Work Group, 2003). A portfolio should also reflect scholarly outreach goals of the individual, examples of processes used to achieve these goals or produce outreach products, and the individual’s reflection on change in approaches, revisions of materials or activities, and professional development.
- b. *Academic peer evaluation and recognition.* Peer evaluation through local, state, national or international recognition of outreach activities, products, programs, program materials, and delivery methods is highly desirable. Recognition by one’s peers is a clear indication of the achievement of scholarship in outreach. Examples of this include awards, invited presentations, letters of commendation or thanks, and invitations to serve on outreach bodies such as panels, committees, task forces, etc.
- c. *Clientele leadership, learning, recognition.* In outreach work, it is sometimes important to foster individuals’ or social systems’ capacity for facilitation and leadership in order to sustain the outreach effort. This is done through community engagement processes, “train-the-trainer” programs, volunteer development efforts, and leadership training institutes. Evidence that our outreach audience members and partners receive awards or recognition can also demonstrate scholarship and impact.

- d. *Clientele and partner performance input.* Finally, given the Land Grant *mission* of MSU and CANR, it is vital that clientele and partner performance input be sought, used for improvement, and documented. Informal evidence of scholarship might be displayed through clientele letters offering feedback or thanks for programming activities, or many other forms. Examples of formal input from clients and partners regarding outreach performance include feedback from management and other governmental and non-governmental agencies regarding an individual's outreach work, or comments submitted by MSUE field staff regarding a faculty member's performance. When this performance input is appropriate to the faculty member's appointment and assignment, it should be included to document outreach scholarship.

EXPECTATIONS FOR UNIVERSITY CITIZENSHIP PERFORMANCE

It is expected that all faculty shall exhibit appropriate conduct in professional activities related to their employment. This includes, but is not limited to, responsible fulfillment of administrative duties, appropriate management of grant funds, following proper rules and procedures and maintaining professional relationships with colleagues. Rules of professional conduct pertaining to research, teaching and other academic responsibilities of faculty members exist at the College and University levels and it is expected that faculty will conduct themselves in accordance with these guidelines.

It is also expected that faculty will initiate a continuing program of service through committee, administrative and public service activities. Such activities include but are not limited to service on academic committees and administration responsibilities. For example, evidence that candidates have been contributing members of standing and ad hoc committees at the Department, College and University levels would demonstrate service acceptable for re-appointment, tenure and promotion considerations.

Evidence of effective completion of administrative responsibilities assigned to faculty for which there is no special salary adjustment shall be considered service of equal value to committee assignments.

Service to the public beyond the University shall be evaluated as Outreach as discussed in the previous section of these guidelines.