

**PERSONNEL COMMITTEE EVALUATIONS PROCEDURE
2021-2022**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERSONNEL EVALUATION PROCEDURES TABLE	2
PERSONNEL EVALUATION PROCEDURES	3
ATTACHMENT A STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY PROMOTION & TENURE	7
ATTACHMENT B PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS	10
ATTACHMENT C EVALUATION OF FACULTY IN SHARED POSITIONS	11
ATTACHMENT D USE OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS	12
ATTACHMENT E EVALUATION PROCESSES – NON TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	13
ATTACHMENT F FACULTY SELF-EVALUATION	14

**Personnel Committee Evaluations Procedure
Table**

Process/ Review	Materials Required													Materials Due	Pers. Com m Rec. Due	Presi- dent's Rec. Due
	Provided by Candidate				Chosen by Candidate And Requested by Academic Affairs			Chosen by Dean and Requested by Academic Affairs			Provided by Academic Affairs		Provided by Pers. Comm.			
	CV	Self - Eva l	Sylla bi & Exam	Public Presen- tation	2 non- dept. fac. letters	Optional : 1-3 student letters	Letters from 3 recent graduate s	Dept. Chair Eval.	Letter s from dept. mem- bers	2 non- dept. fac. Letter s	Student Evals.	Grade Distri- butions	Class Visit & Eval. Letter			
First Semester	X		X					X			X			Jan. 10		
First Year	X	X	X					X			X	X	X	Aug. 15	Oct. 15	Nov. 15
Pre-Tenure	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	Jan. 10	Feb. 15	Mar. 15
Tenure	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Dec. 15 ¹	Feb. 1	Mar. 1
Promotion	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Dec. 15 ¹	Feb. 1	Mar. 1
Post-tenure Optional	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	Apr. 1	Apr. 20	N/A
Continuing Full-Time NonTenure	X	X						X			X			Apr. 15	May 10	May 15
Other Full- Time NonTenure	X		X					X			X			Apr. 15	May 10	N/A
Part-Time NonTenure								X			X			Apr. 15		N/A

¹ Due date for presentation only is December 1, all other materials due by December 15.

Personnel Committee Evaluations Procedure

Review Teams:

All reviews except first-semester and non-tenure track part-time (see below) will be conducted by the Personnel Committee. A letter of recommendation will be submitted to the Dean after the review is complete.

First semester review. The candidate's Dept. Chair visits a class and includes an evaluation of that visit in his/her letter of evaluation. The Dept. Chair and the VPAA arrange to meet with the candidate to discuss his/her file. The VPAA reports his/her findings and recommendation to the Personnel Committee.

Non-tenure track, part-time. The candidate's Dept. Chair visits a class and meets with the candidate to review teaching and evaluations, and submits a letter of recommendation to the VPAA.

Explanation of Materials to be Submitted:

Not all materials listed below are applicable to all reviews. See table above and the notification of your review from the VPAA's office to determine which materials are applicable to your review.

Supplied by candidate (depending on review, check table above):

- **Current Vita** – pertinent information on the Professional Activities List (available from VPAA's office) should be included in your vita and/or self-evaluation.
- **Current Faculty Self-Evaluation** (form provided by VPAA's office).
- **Student evaluations** using the College form. Candidates should conduct evaluations for all courses since their last review. Evaluations are provided electronically to the review team.
- A selection of current **syllabi and exams** of representative courses (major upper and lower level, general education, INTG) taught since the last review.
- **Letters from 2 faculty outside** the department (names chosen by the candidate and submitted to the VPAA's office which processes the requests).
- **Letters from up to 3 current students** who have completed at least one course taught by the candidate (names chosen by the candidate and submitted to the VPAA's office which processes the requests). These letters are **optional**, and if the candidate chooses not to ask for these, it will not negatively affect the candidate's evaluation.
- **Letters from 3 recent graduates.** Names chosen by the candidate and submitted to VPAA's office which processes the requests.
- A **public presentation** (topic and time chosen by the candidate and cleared through the Chair of the Personnel Committee). See item # 6 under "Additional Information" and Attachment A for further information regarding Public Presentations.

VPAA requests (depending on the review):

- Evaluation from the Department Chair (Chairs should include a class visit and the evaluation of that visit in the letter of evaluation of departmental members). If the Department Chair is being evaluated, the Associate Dean will be asked for an evaluation.
- Grade distributions from the registrar for all courses for which evaluations are

- required.
- Letters of evaluation from all full-time members of candidate's department.
- Letters from 2 faculty outside the candidate's department (chosen by the VPAA).
- Evaluation of class visit by the Personnel Committee lead reviewer.

Notes:

1. All candidates being considered for PROMOTION should include all professional accomplishments that have taken place since their last formal review.
2. All candidates should supply names as required above to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) who will ask for the appropriate materials.

Additional Information

1. Neither the candidate nor the VPAA should ask members of the Personnel Committee for letters of evaluation as non-departmental faculty. Members of the Personnel Committee who are also members of a candidate's department may write letters of evaluation as required, but may not contribute to the discussion, nor vote on the candidate.
2. Members of the Personnel Committee who are up for a post-tenure review may continue to serve on the committee, but will excuse themselves from all deliberations on their file.
3. Candidates may provide any additional information they deem fit and the Personnel Committee may ask for additional information it deems useful.
4. If applicable, faculty are expected to provide a narrative response to major concerns raised in previous evaluations.
5. Letters written for personnel files are written for a particular purpose and for a particular audience. Before a candidate uses letters in the file for other purposes, he or she would be advised to consult with the letters' writers.
6. Late materials will not be accepted except as follows:
 - Candidates will have two weeks following the deadline for submission to review materials in the file. If a required reference letter is not in the file, the candidate may request that, within this two-week period, the letter be included.
 - The Dean of the Faculty, as the chief academic officer of the College, is responsible to ensure, to the best of his or her ability, that the materials included in personnel files are free from any policy violations (e.g. HIPA, PPHDR, Title VI) or otherwise inappropriate material. This is a shared responsibility with the Personnel Committee and all members of the College community. In the particular case of letters received by Academic Affairs Office for faculty reviews, the Dean of the Faculty and the Chair of the Personnel Committee will review the letters submitted by faculty members for faculty personnel reviews prior to the letters being included in the files.

Due to the time it takes for such review to be completed, candidates should anticipate their files and the files of other candidates under review in a given year may not be viewable to them for up to two days after the deadline for submission. In every case, however, candidates will be given the full two-weeks stated in our procedures to provide any response they wish to be included in their files. Though intended as a precautionary measure, it should be understood

that the volume of materials submitted means that no review of this type could be fool-proof and, as such, cannot guarantee that all materials are completely without concern. This is one reason why candidates are allowed to consider and challenge materials as part of the personnel evaluation process.

- If a candidate requests additional letters not required or requested by the College, the candidate must place these letters in the file him or herself by the deadline.
 - The candidate may add to the file in response to material already in the file, during this two-week period.
 - The Personnel Committee may require materials (*e.g.*, reference letters and oral interviews, written summaries of which shall be placed in the file) in addition to the material in the file if it is deemed necessary for the review, even if the deadline date has passed.
 - If the Committee requests additional materials, the candidate will be notified and may offer a response within five days of the posting of the new material.
7. A faculty member is normally considered for tenure during the sixth year of teaching at Monmouth College (including constructive credit) and would take effect in the seventh year of service.
 8. A faculty member is normally considered for promotion during the sixth year of service in rank at Monmouth College. Current practice is to ask those eligible to inform the Dean of Faculty if they wish to be considered at this time.
 9. Normally all persons in their first year of teaching at Monmouth College will be evaluated using the first-year procedures, whether or not constructive credit has been given. Normally persons receiving one or more years of constructive credit will be evaluated using the third-year procedures and timeline during their second year in residence. Subsequent evaluations will be spaced within our evaluation system, based on the candidate's constructive credit.
 10. Dates in the *Manual* for notification of non-renewal of contract for untenured faculty are based on the number of actual years at Monmouth. Thus for those receiving constructive credit, due dates for materials, etc. may vary (at the discretion of the Personnel Committee or of the College) from the norm expressed above in order to comply with deadlines in the *Manual* and AAUP guidelines. The AAUP guidelines give a March 1 (or 3 months before the end of a contract) for first-year persons, December 15 (or 6 months) for second-year persons, and March 15 (or one year) for all others. In cases of conflict, these AAUP guidelines for non-continuation take precedence.
 11. As soon as possible following the Committee's recommendation, the Chair of Personnel will meet with the candidate to discuss these recommendations.
 12. If a candidate disagrees with the Personnel Committee recommendation, the candidate may request a meeting with the Personnel Committee.

The candidate may choose to meet with the Personnel Committee Chair along with the Candidate's Department Chair (or other faculty member of the candidate's choosing) or with the entire Personnel Committee. At least 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting, the candidate must provide (in writing to the Personnel Committee Chair) a specific list of areas of disagreement.

During the meeting, the candidate should plan to offer evidence and rationale of why s/he feels the Personnel Committee recommendation is wrong.

After the meeting, the Personnel Committee will meet to discuss the candidate's situation. Within two weeks of the Personnel Committee deliberations, the Personnel Committee Chair will inform the candidate what action (if any) the Personnel Committee will take.

Note: It is the Personnel Committee's understanding that since their input into the College's decision-making process is a recommendation, there is no formal appeal process beyond the above. If a faculty member feels that a College decision on continuation, tenure, or promotion is wrong, a faculty member may file a formal grievance. A description of the grievance process is found in Section 1.7.9 of the Faculty Manual.

Statement of Expectations for Faculty Promotion and Tenure – Personnel Committee

Quoted below is all of the information directly relevant to tenure and promotion that can be found in the Faculty Manual, sections 1.2 (Definition of Academic Ranks), 1.4.2 (Criteria for Evaluation), and 1.5.3 (Criteria for Tenure). *In italics, following each section are comments, clarification and elaboration of expectations from the Personnel Committee.*

Teaching (Faculty Manual 1.4.2.1)

“Teaching excellence is the sine qua non for tenure and promotion. It includes but is not limited to such elements as scholarly competence, awareness of current developments in the discipline and inclusion of such insights in courses taught, development of new courses or modification of current courses taught in one’s discipline, thoroughness of preparation for teaching, academic advising, general care and concern for students and their learning, and the ability to gain the interest and respect of students and to help them become effective learners.”

Excellent teachers show that they have engaged students in learning while setting high expectations for achievement. They also provide support for students while empowering students to be independent learners. Excellent teachers provide frequent, timely and appropriate feedback. They also demonstrate respect and rapport in appropriate ways with their students.

Professional Development and Scholarly Activities (Faculty Manual 1.4.2.2)

“These include but are not limited to formal study (graduate school, workshops, institutes) and/or individual study, development of a course or courses beyond one’s current breadth of expertise, continuing research, publication or presentation of scholarly and educational materials to professional audiences, art exhibited or performed, participation in professional organizations (presentation of papers, organizing symposia/workshops, chairing sessions, holding office), serving as a professional consultant to organizations beyond the College and other activities intended to improve professional competence in one’s field and in teaching.”

The aim of professional development and scholarship ultimately should be to improve the teaching and learning environment at the College. While research is beneficial in its own right for the professor and the larger community of scholars, candidates would benefit from articulating the goals of their research and its benefits to the College community as a whole (e.g. involving students in research, contributing to the discipline beyond the College in a public way, etc.). In disciplines where engagement in research is a vital part of the student’s learning, presentation and publication of original research, especially co-authored with students is encouraged. In other disciplines where producing original research is not practical in our environment, use of other venues for engaging in scholarly work is expected, such as developing, testing and sharing (via presentations and/or publication) new pedagogies or developing new skills through training or formal education. In particular, to be promoted to full professor, candidates should have achieved some recognition for their scholarly work such that they are known for this work beyond the College either regionally or nationally. A variety of evidence beyond publication or presentation, including external letters and additional internal letters of reference (supplied by the candidate), may be used to demonstrate such recognition. All materials not required or requested by the College must be submitted directly by the candidate.

Service (Faculty Manual 1.4.2.3)

“This includes but is not limited to working with students and other College constituents, participating in the faculty governance system, administering the curriculum (e.g. program coordinator, chair), presentations (convocations, gallery talks, workshops/colloquia) to student and/or faculty groups, contributing to campus and alumni publications, presentations in one’s field to community and other nonprofessional groups as well as professional service through other community outreach activities, serving as advisor to ACM programs and generally participating in campus life outside the classroom and fulfilling the normal responsibilities of a faculty member.”

The Personnel Committee expects that faculty will do more than fulfill the minimum participation in assigned committee work. In particular, faculty should contribute and be involved in their department by supporting its collective work. There are multiple ways faculty may contribute both within their department and across the College as listed above. Finally, faculty should be able to work with other college constituents (students, faculty, staff and administrators) with a spirit of respect for divergent views in a collegial fashion. We do not interpret “collegial” nor “respect” to imply passive acceptance of others’ views nor reticence to articulate one’s own opinions, especially those strongly held. We respect and encourage the sharing of divergent views and opinions of the faculty, but expect such views to be articulated in a productive, collegial manner.

Tenure (Faculty Manual 1.5.3)

“A tenure decision shall include a rating of superior or potentially superior performance in the general criteria for faculty evaluation in section 1.4.2.”

Faculty should pay special attention to the feedback they have received from Personnel Committee and the Dean in their prior reviews, especially the pre-tenure (normally 3rd year) review to see if they are meeting expectations in all three criteria.

Promotion to Associate Professor (Faculty Manual 1.2.2) “Persons appointed to the rank of associate professor have ordinarily earned the highest degree in their special field of learning or have an equivalent accomplishment, such as the publication of recognized scholarly work. They have demonstrated promise of becoming distinguished teachers and scholars. They are respected by colleagues and students and they are effective contributors to the life of the College.”

Associate professors have established that they have the capability to develop into distinguished teachers. They are already strong, effective teachers but will continue to focus on further development of their teaching skills and perhaps broadening of their expertise. They have a clearly articulated program of professional development or scholarly activity and have made some significant progress in achieving their own goals in this area. Associate professors have established a solid record of effective, collegial service to their department and the College.

Full Professor (Faculty Manual 1.2.1) “Persons appointed to the rank of professor have ordinarily earned the highest degree in their special field of learning or have an equivalent accomplishment, such as the publication of recognized scholarly work. They are distinguished teachers and scholars. They are respected by colleagues and students and they are effective contributors to the life of the College. Their work over many years has made them influential beyond their department and they are respected beyond the College.”

The candidate’s teaching ability should have progressed from the time they achieved associate professor such that they are truly distinguished in all or most aspects of teaching. Likewise, their record of service to the College and their department should be consistent, effective and collegial. For professional development, the emphasis for this level of promotion is on the last statement, the influence and recognition of the professor outside of the College community. Some examples of evidence of

becoming a distinguished scholar might be publications in respected, peer-reviewed regional or national journals, publication of a book or books, grant writing, work drawing the attention of regional or national press, exhibits, plays, or performances that are recognized beyond the local community, etc.

It is the responsibility of candidates, through dialogue with their colleagues, chair and Personnel, to communicate to the Personnel Committee how they meet or exceed the general expectations outlined above in their specific discipline and specific circumstances. The Personnel Committee is likewise obliged to provide feedback through their letter of recommendation as well as through at least one meeting of the Personnel chair with the candidate during the years they are under review to answer any questions and clarify expectations and consequences.

Public Presentations
Statement of Expectations

During the Personnel Committee's evaluation process (pre-tenure, tenure, post-tenure, promotions), faculty members are asked to give a faculty colloquium. This document clarifies the format and goals of the talk.

Rationale: The Personnel Committee views this colloquium as a chance to observe the faculty member present her/his original scholarship or creative work. The presentation gives the Committee an opportunity to gain further insight into the research agenda or creative interests of the candidate.

Expected content/focus of the talk: Scholarship is broadly understood to include a wide variety of activities, including traditional academic research and creative work (performances, productions, exhibitions). The presentation allows faculty members to share their current *scholarly* interests with an audience of faculty peers.

Please note the following expectations:

- 1) The presentation should highlight the faculty member's ability to engage with an educated, intelligent audience about their scholarship or creative work.
- 2) Terms outside the ken of a general audience should be defined and explained as the audience will mostly be unfamiliar with the candidate's specialized area of interest.
- 3) The colloquium is not a class, nor should it duplicate a classroom presentation—the committee will ensure that someone visits your classroom to observe your teaching.
- 4) Typically a presentation is 40-50 minutes with 10-20 minutes of questioning and discussion afterwards.
- 5) A title and short summary of the talk is to be provided no later than two weeks in advance.
- 6) Presentations will be video-recorded with the candidate's permission. These recordings are available only to Personnel Committee members, and are especially helpful to committee members who must miss a talk. Prior to the talk faculty will be asked to sign a form granting permission for the recording, which they are free to decline. No preference will be given for recording or not recording.
- 7) Presentations must be completed by December 1.

Suggestion: The Personnel Committee recommends that faculty members who are under review attend several of their colleagues' talks in order to become familiar with the genre and communal expectations.

Evaluation of Faculty in Shared Positions

Each faculty member in a shared position will be reviewed separately for purposes of continuation, tenure, and promotion. Each faculty member is expected to maintain appropriate teaching excellence, professional development, and service to the institution, and is expected to do so as if s/he were teaching on a full time basis. In other words, for purposes of the Personnel Committee review process, each faculty member in a shared position is on the same “time line” as any full time faculty member. The Personnel Committee recognizes that this means there will be fewer course evaluations, etc. for consideration, but the Committee believes it is following the guidelines of the Shared Position Policy in moving faculty members along at this pace.

In terms of the overall shared position, each faculty member must be making sufficient progress to merit the recommendation for continuation of the position, and for tenure and promotion. Thus a recommendation for continuation (or tenure or promotion) means that ALL faculty involved in a shared position meet necessary requirements and levels of performance. (As an example, if faculty member “A” is making excellent progress while faculty member “B” is struggling, the Personnel Committee might recommend the shared position not be continued.)

Use of Student Evaluations

The Personnel Committee recognizes that student evaluations must be looked at in the context of other information and are subject to bias. Nevertheless, the Personnel Committee views student evaluations as a relevant source of information. Comparisons to other faculty (either College-wide and/or in relevant groups – for example, all instructors of a multiple section offering), can demonstrate areas of relative success or concern, and while absolute numbers may not be critical in and of themselves, significant deviations from the norm may signal areas of further investigation.

The Personnel Committee views student evaluations as “one source of information among many” that committee members will consider for their recommendations.

Personnel Committee Statement on the Use of Narratives Approved 9/24/03

The Personnel Committee asks that faculty members offer a narrative in response to student evaluations for each class. The Personnel Committee feels that this narrative information is of significant importance in terms of its deliberations. More specifically,

1. The goal of the narrative is to have the faculty member use the data to improve teaching. To this end, the Personnel Committee wants to see that the faculty member has developed strategies/ideas for improving classroom teaching (in other words, can the interpretation of the data lead to any changes?).
2. The narrative helps the faculty member (and the Personnel Committee) understand and interpret the data – Were there any reasons why the data might be significantly above or below the average? Was there something about this particular class of students? Did the faculty member significantly alter pedagogy? What might explain variance across sections?
3. The Personnel Committee recognizes that the raw numbers are of limited value in and of themselves. In some cases (for example, where standard deviations are large and/or sample size is small), the data can only be seen as an indicator.

In sum, the Personnel Committee will look carefully at the narratives offered by faculty, and will use these in conjunction with the student evaluation data.

Notes :

(added November 3, 2017)

Because the date for Tenure and Promotion materials is before final grades are submitted, and therefore before results of fall semester student evaluations are available, faculty in these two groups SHOULD NOT use the student evaluations for the fall semester of the year they are up for consideration.

Since the date for pre-tenure materials is after the grades have been submitted, faculty in this category SHOULD include student evaluations for the fall semester of the year they are up for consideration.

Evaluation Processes – Non Tenure-Track Faculty

I. Process for Full time, non-tenure track, continuing in multi-year contracts. Candidates are evaluated one year prior to the end of their current contract. For example, in a 3-year contract evaluation would occur in the 2nd year, a 5 year contract in the 4th year.

II. Process for Full time, non-tenure track (anyone teaching full time in a non tenure-track position, on a year-to-year basis, regardless of Title).

First Year:

Candidate has all classes evaluated using the standard MC form;

Candidate submits a vita;

Department Chair visits a class;

Department Chair writes a letter of evaluation;

Candidate completes the Professional Activities List;

Candidate includes response to student evaluations;

Personnel Committee will review the candidate's file, and will send a letter of recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and to the candidate's Chair.

Second Year:

Same as First Year:

Note: Assuming a positive letter of recommendation after the second year, the Personnel Committee would next review the candidate in her/his fourth year, with review then each three years after. If there was serious concern about the candidate in a given review year, the Personnel Committee would plan to conduct another review the next year.

III. Process for Part Time, non-tenure track.

Year One:

Candidate has all courses evaluated using standard MC form;

Department Chair visits a class;

Department Chair meets with candidate to review teaching and evaluations, submits a letter of recommendation for continuation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs offers to contact each candidate after their review. He or she confers with Personnel Committee if there are problems or concerns.

Assuming initial first year review is positive, the candidate is evaluated in the 2nd and 4th years, and thereafter every 3 years.

Faculty Self-Evaluation

The candidate should refer to the Statement of Expectations from Personnel Committee that is submitted with the letter from the Dean notifying them of their upcoming review.

Preamble

1. Faculty evaluation is one way that the Monmouth College faculty demonstrates and ensures its commitment to academic excellence.
2. The candidate bears the responsibility of presenting a fully-documented file which demonstrates that the candidate understands and meets Monmouth's standards and which contextualizes the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service for colleagues on the Personnel Committee who are not necessarily familiar with the candidate's discipline.
3. The Personnel Committee bears the responsibility of evaluating the evidence fairly, in accordance with the standards for faculty evaluation and following the practices established by the faculty.
4. The Self-Evaluation is the required centerpiece of a candidate's file. In it, the candidate addresses a series of questions about teaching, scholarship, and service. The Self-Evaluation, like a good piece of research, provides a coherent and documented argument demonstrating that the candidate understands and meets Monmouth's standards. In the Self-Evaluation, the candidate explains and interprets the other documents selected for the file. For example, if a candidate states that critical thinking is a goal that is emphasized in each course taught, then the Self-Evaluation would refer to syllabi and assignments.
5. The Personnel Committee recommends that the Self-Evaluation not exceed 7500 words (approximately 20-22 pages double spaced or 10-11 single spaced). A concise, well-written and evaluative report with carefully selected specimens of the candidate's work is preferred over one that is excessive.
6. The Self-Evaluation can take a variety of forms. Individual candidates are invited to frame it in a way consistent with their ideas and voice. The Self-Evaluation provides the means for the candidate to place his or her work in the wider context of a personal career, previous and upcoming reviews, his or her department(s), and Monmouth College. In the end, the Personnel Committee will want to assess each of the following areas after reading the Self-Evaluation, regardless of the form the candidate chooses to use. **The candidate should feel free to determine how to best address the prompts below in order to adequately self-evaluate.**

Teaching

1. Describe your **goals as a teacher**. How does your teaching reflect or embody the goals of the liberal arts? How does it relate to Monmouth's Statement of Purposes and other educational goals you deem relevant?
2. Describe the **methods you use** to achieve these goals.
3. **What do you want your students to learn?** How does this connect with the learning goals of your major and the general education courses you teach?
4. Describe the **changes in your teaching** since your last review (if applicable).
5. **Evaluate your teaching**. In other words, how well are you accomplishing your goals? What evidence supports your answer? (Candidates should include commentary on student course evaluations that addresses all negative comments, colleague evaluations, self-observations, and other evidence in answering this question.) What are your strengths and weaknesses as a teacher?

6. What is your philosophy of grading? How do you view the role of grades in supporting and encouraging academic excellence? Compare your grade distributions with those of your department (or relevant academic program) and address any anomalies.
7. Describe your **plans to develop** your teaching.

Scholarship/Research/Creative Work and Professional Development

1. Describe your **goals as a scholar/creative artist**. For example, what questions are you exploring, what skills and/or knowledge are you developing, what projects are you undertaking, and who is the intended audience?
2. Describe the **work now underway, plans for the future**, and **evaluate your progress** toward your goals. Describe the resources you are using to support your work. What results do you anticipate? How will your work be informed and evaluated by, and in due time contribute to, the wider conversation of scholars/creative artists in your discipline?
3. Describe how you, as a scholar, will **contribute to the dialogue** across and among Monmouth College faculty (within your department and beyond).
4. Explain how your scholarship/creative work strengthens and **enhances your teaching**, giving concrete examples if possible.

Service

1. Describe and evaluate your work as an **academic adviser**, including formal advising responsibilities, informal advising you do, and advising of a specialized nature.
2. Describe and evaluate your **engagement with students through informal interactions**, by contributing to campus programs, and by supporting student activities.
3. Describe and evaluate your **contributions to your academic department** and other programs that you participate in.
4. Describe and evaluate your **contributions to faculty governance** and the collective work of the faculty.
5. Describe and evaluate **other contributions** to the academic community of students and faculty that you consider relevant.