

The Citadel
Department of Mathematics & Data Analytics

**Standards and Procedures for Tenure, Post-tenure Review, Academic
Promotion, and Annual Evaluation**

Effective September 26, 2025

This document has been reviewed and approved by the faculty of the Department of Mathematics & Data Analytics, by the Dean of the Swain Family School of Science and Mathematics, and by the Faculty Senate.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction and Overview

II. Purpose of Standards and Procedures.

III. Probationary Reappointment

- A. Procedures
- B. Standards for Assistant Professor
- C. Standards for Associate and Full Professor

IV. Tenure

- A. Procedures
- B. Standards for Tenure as an Assistant Professor
- C. Standards for Tenure as an Associate Professor
- D. Standards for Tenure as a Full Professor
- E. Procedures for Tenure upon Appointment
- F. Early promotion and/or tenure.

V. Promotion

- A. Procedures
- B. Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor
- C. Standards for Promotion to Full Professor

VI. Post-Tenure Review

VI. Annual evaluation for tenured, tenure-track, and instructors

- A. Procedures
- B. Standards for Tenured Faculty
- C. Standards for Tenure-Track Faculty
- D. Standards for Instructors

Appendix

I. Introduction and Overview

The purpose of this document is to outline departmental standards and procedures for probationary reappointment, tenure, post-tenure review, annual evaluation, and promotion decisions. These decisions are based on a candidate's accomplishments in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. When preparing documentation of performance, candidates should provide evidence of the quality of their work in each area. A guiding principle is that faculty members should maintain a dossier of their activities and accomplishments throughout their careers, which may be used during reappointment, tenure application, and promotion. An appendix listing possible activities in these three areas is attached. The candidate and evaluation committee should use this standard as a rubric for assessing faculty performance.

A candidate for tenure in the department should have attained a Ph.D. or an equivalent terminal degree. The terminal degree requirement may be waived if the candidate offers evidence of outstanding scholarly productivity and/or professional work experience.

The procedures to include the roles of all parties, the development of recommendations, clarifications, and appeals will be conducted according to Annex C and Annex D of Memorandum 3-601.

II. Purpose of Standards and Procedures

The standards and evaluative criteria outlined below for probationary reappointment, tenure, post-tenure review, annual evaluation, and promotion decisions are not meant to be exhaustive or rigid. Nor are they intended to serve as a checklist. Recognizing that individual strengths vary; evaluations should consider the overall picture rather than assessing each area in isolation.

III. Probationary Reappointment

A. Procedures

The tenured members of the department will meet as specified in Annex C and Annex D of Memorandum 3-601 to evaluate tenure-track candidates and to make recommendations for probationary reappointments. The probationary reappointment decision in the third year will be a preliminary summative review. For the third-year review, the department head, with input from the candidate, will appoint a senior faculty member from outside the department to serve as a voting member of the review committee.

B. Standards for Assistant Professor

By the time of the third-year review, it is expected that the probationer can document solid progress toward meeting the goals of tenure. The cumulative annual departmental evaluations, faculty responses, and documentation of effective teaching within The Citadel environment will play a significant role in the evaluation for probationary

reappointment. The candidate is expected to maintain an active research agenda and will have obtained peer-reviewed feedback on their research toward legitimate publications in the discipline. Such feedback may be formal--e.g., referee reports of submitted manuscripts--or informal, such as evaluations of preliminary papers or scholarly presentations at professional conferences. Additionally, the candidate should provide evidence of some service, such as departmental, school, or college-wide committees on which he/she has served. For the third-year review, the committee should vote on the candidate's reappointment by assigning one of the ratings---"*Unsuccessful*," "*Successful*," or "*Exceptional*," as defined in the Appendix---in all three categories: teaching, scholarship, and service, based on each of the years reviewed. To meet the standard for reappointment, the candidate must receive at least 90% of votes rated as "*Successful*" or "*Exceptional*" in teaching, and at least 80% in each of the other two categories.

C. Standards for Associate and Full Professor

During the annual probationary review, it is expected that the probationer will have demonstrated solid progress toward meeting the goals of tenure. This must include documentation of teaching effectiveness. It is expected that evidence of scholarly productivity during the probationary period will be demonstrated. The probationer needs to have made appropriate progress in research so that by the time the tenure decision is made they have papers of sufficient quantity and quality accepted in legitimate publications in the discipline to be granted tenure. For the third-year review, the committee should vote on the candidate's reappointment by assigning one of the ratings---"*Unsuccessful*," "*Successful*," or "*Exceptional*," as defined in the Appendix---in all three categories: teaching, scholarly activity, and service, based on each of the years reviewed. To meet the standard for reappointment, the candidate must receive at least 90% of votes rated as "*Successful*" or "*Exceptional*" in teaching, and at least 80% in each of the other two categories.

IV. Tenure

A. Procedures

Recommendations for tenure are the responsibility of all tenured faculty members in the department, along with a senior Citadel faculty member from another school or department, selected by the department head in consultation with the candidate. For tenure at the professor level, an external evaluation of the candidate's research or professional service is required (see Memorandum 3-601, Section 4.H.).

The candidate is responsible for preparing a dossier documenting activities during the probationary period. When compiling this documentation, the candidate must substantiate the quality of performance in each area. The length of the probationary period is determined by college policy, as outlined in Memorandum 3-601, Section 4.

Information considered by the tenured faculty in forming its recommendation will be shared with all relevant parties, including the candidate.

The procedure for tenure upon appointment follows college policy, as specified in Memorandum 3-601 (Annex D, Section B.9). The tenure decision must be made before the appointment.

B. Standards for Tenure as an Assistant Professor

The successful candidate for tenure as an Assistant Professor will meet these standards.

1. The candidate must demonstrate effective teaching skills to include careful classroom preparation and fair evaluation of student work. The candidate should demonstrate a willingness to teach a broad range of service courses as well as courses for departmental majors. The candidate must also show a commitment to sharing ideas and insights and to staying current with developments in teaching practices. The tenure committee should vote on the candidate by assigning a rating of “*Unsuccessful*,” “*Successful*,” or “*Exceptional*” in teaching, as defined in the Appendix. To meet the standard for tenure, the candidate must receive at least 90% of votes rated as “*Successful*” or “*Exceptional*” in teaching.
2. The candidate must have a record of scholarship and professional development beyond their terminal degree. The candidate must have established a scholarship plan and demonstrated, throughout the period of employment at the college, steady progress towards meeting the goals of this plan. The tenure committee should vote on the candidate by assigning a rating of “*Unsuccessful*,” “*Successful*,” or “*Exceptional*” in scholarship, as defined in the Appendix. To meet the standard for tenure, the candidate must receive at least 80% of votes rated as “*Successful*” or “*Exceptional*” in scholarship.
3. The candidate must demonstrate a willingness to collaborate with colleagues and work conscientiously toward departmental and institutional goals. The person should be knowledgeable about issues affecting the department, the school, and the college. The tenure committee should vote on the candidate by assigning a rating of “*Unsuccessful*,” “*Successful*,” or “*Exceptional*” in service, as defined in the Appendix. To meet the standard for tenure, the candidate must receive at least 80% of votes rated as “*Successful*” or “*Exceptional*” in service.

C. Standards for Tenure as an Associate Professor

The successful candidate for tenure as an Associate Professor will meet these standards.

1. The candidate must demonstrate effective teaching skills to include careful classroom preparation and fair evaluation of student work. The candidate should demonstrate a willingness to teach a broad range of service courses as well as courses for departmental majors. The candidate must also show a commitment to

sharing ideas and insights and to staying current with developments in teaching practices. The tenure committee should vote on the candidate by assigning a rating of “*Unsuccessful*,” “*Successful*,” or “*Exceptional*” in teaching, as defined in the Appendix. To meet the standard for tenure, the candidate must receive at least 90% of votes rated as “*Successful*” or “*Exceptional*” in teaching.

2. The candidate must have a record of scholarship and professional development beyond their terminal degree. The candidate must have established a plan for scholarship and demonstrated, throughout the period of employment at the college, steady progress towards meeting the goals of this plan. The tenure committee should vote on the candidate by assigning a rating of “*Unsuccessful*,” “*Successful*,” or “*Exceptional*” in Scholarly, as defined in the Appendix. To meet the standard for tenure, the candidate must receive at least 80% of votes rated as “*Successful*” or “*Exceptional*” in scholarship.
3. The candidate must demonstrate a willingness to collaborate with colleagues and work conscientiously toward departmental and institutional goals. The candidate should be knowledgeable about issues affecting the department, the school, and the college. The tenure committee should vote on the candidate by assigning a rating of “*Unsuccessful*,” “*Successful*,” or “*Exceptional*” in service, as defined in the Appendix. To meet the standard for tenure, the candidate must receive at least 80% of votes rated as “*Successful*” or “*Exceptional*” in service.

D. Standards for Tenure as a Full Professor

The candidate must continue to perform at a level meeting the standards of promotion to full professor. The candidate must have demonstrated that he/she has adapted to the teaching environment at The Citadel and must have demonstrated a willingness to cooperate with colleagues in the department, the school, and the college.

E. Procedures for Tenure upon Appointment

The procedure for tenure upon appointment will be determined by college policy as stated in Memorandum 3-601 (Annex D, Section B.9). It is understood that the tenure decision will be made before the appointment.

F. Early Tenure

The department will consider early tenure only when such provisions are explicitly stated in the original offer letter issued by the provost. Procedures governing early tenure follow the College policy outlined in Memorandum 3-601.

V. Promotion

A. Procedures

A faculty who intends to be considered for promotion during an academic year must notify the department head of their intentions early in the fall term. The department head is responsible for organizing the promotion process and will establish and chair the departmental promotion committee. In addition to the department head, the committee will consist of faculty members who hold academic rank equal to or higher than the academic rank sought by the candidate. At least one member must be a senior Citadel faculty member from another school or department, selected by the department head in consultation with the candidate. The candidate is responsible for preparing a dossier that documents the quality of activities during the review period. Information considered by the department promotion committee in reaching its recommendations will be shared with all parties, including the candidate.

B. Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor

The successful candidate will meet these standards.

1. The standard for teaching is the same as for tenure as an Associate Professor.
2. The candidate must have a record of scholarship beyond their terminal degree. The person must have established a research plan that extends beyond the time of tenure and promotion and must demonstrate steady progress toward meeting the goals of this plan throughout the probationary period. The promotion committee should vote on the candidate by assigning a rating of “*Unsuccessful*,” “*Successful*,” or “*Exceptional*” in scholarly, as defined in the Appendix. To meet the standard for promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must receive a rating of “*Successful*” or “*Exceptional*” in the categorical summaries for Scholarly Activities for three consecutive years prior to the promotion or tenure review (see Appendix). The candidate must provide evidence of the acceptance of at least two publications in legitimate peer-reviewed journals within the discipline, which are not part of the candidate’s dissertation and are based on work completed during the probationary period.
3. The standard for service is the same as for tenure as an Associate Professor.

C. Standards for Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor is intended to recognize status as a productive scholar and active professional, as an outstanding teacher, and as a significant contributor to the development of departmental, school wide, or college wide programs. The following items are regarded as standards for promotion to this rank.

1. The candidate must have established a record of excellence in teaching. This record should include successful engagement in activities such as creating a new course, making a major revision in an existing course, teaching special topics courses, teaching in special programs such as the Honors Program, and directing student reading or research courses. To meet the standard for promotion to Full Professor, the candidate must receive a rating of “*Successful*” or “*Exceptional*” in at least three areas within the categorical summaries of Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness for three consecutive years prior to the promotion or tenure review (see Appendix).
2. The candidate must have made significant contributions to their area of specialization while holding the rank of tenured associate professor at The Citadel. Usually, a successful candidate for full professor will have engaged in several of the scholarly activities outlined in the appendix and is expected to demonstrate at least three scholarly accomplishments while serving as associate professor. Examples of such accomplishments include publishing a peer-reviewed research paper in legitimate publications in the discipline, being awarded an external grant, and giving an invited address at a major conference.
3. A candidate must have a record of sustained, substantial service to the department, the school, the college, and the discipline. This record should reflect consistent engagement and leadership roles in the college, the school, and the department affairs. Discipline-related service may include refereeing journal papers and reviewing journal articles or books and making significant contributions to professional organizations—for example, serving as an officer, organizing a conference, or acting as a program chair. Additionally, it may include significant discipline-related service to the community.

C. Standards for Promotion to Senior Instructor.

Procedures for promotion to senior instructor will follow Memorandum 3-601. To meet the standard for promotion, the candidate must receive at least 90% of votes rated as “*Successful*” or “*Exceptional*” in teaching, and at least 80% in service.

D. Early Promotion

In rare circumstances, early promotion may be granted to faculty members who previously held a senior rank at another institution but were appointed to a junior rank in this department. Eligibility in such cases requires an “*Exceptional*” rating in all three evaluation categories, along with a distinguished record of publications in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals. These recommendations must be unanimously supported by the Department Head, the senior member of the departmental committee, the dean, and the provost. Procedures governing early promotion follow the College policy outlined in Memorandum 3-601.

VI. Post-Tenure Review

The period of evaluation will be the interval since either their last personnel action (tenure and/or promotion) or their last Post-tenure Review, see Memorandum 3-602, policy 4. For continued appointment with tenure, the faculty member must demonstrate continued performance in teaching, scholarly activity, and service. The department will consider two ratings: “*Satisfactory*” and “*Unsatisfactory*.” A rating of “*Satisfactory*” indicates that the faculty member has been rated at least “*Successful*” in teaching and in one of the other two areas during the period of evaluation. Actions following an evaluation of *Unsatisfactory* are defined in Memorandum 3-602.

VII. Annual Evaluation for Tenured, Tenure Track, and Instructors

A. Procedures

All faculty members are required to undergo an annual evaluation. As part of this process, each faculty member must compile and submit a dossier that documents the quality and impact of their teaching, scholarship, and service activities over the past year, following the college’s established timeline. The department head will review each dossier and provide written feedback, which will include an overall rating of *Exceptional*, *Successful*, or *Unsuccessful* based on performance across all evaluated areas.

B. Standards for Tenured Faculty

Tenured faculty will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. To be in good standing, they must receive a rating of *Exceptional* or *Successful* in teaching and in at least one additional area (either scholarship or service). They must also meet the following criteria: maintain a professional demeanor, be punctual and dependable in fulfilling teaching assignments, and maximize instructional time. Additionally, they should show evidence of fair evaluation of student work (as outlined in the Appendix).

C. Standards for Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated in teaching, scholarship, and service. To be in good standing, they must receive a rating of *Exceptional* or *Successful* in all three areas. Additionally, they must maintain a professional demeanor, be punctual and dependable in fulfilling teaching assignments, and maximize instructional time. They must also achieve a satisfactory rating in the annual peer class evaluation and show evidence of fair evaluation of student work (as outlined in the Appendix).

D. Standards for Instructors

Instructors are evaluated in teaching and service and may optionally report on scholarship. They must receive a rating of *Exceptional* or *Successful* in teaching and in service to be in good standing. Additionally, they must demonstrate a professional demeanor by being punctual and dependable in fulfilling teaching assignments,

maximizing instructional time, and achieving a satisfactory rating in the annual peer class evaluation. Additionally, they should show evidence of fair evaluation of student work (as outlined in the Appendix).

Appendix

This list outlines activities and achievements that faculty may include in a portfolio for tenure, academic promotion, post-tenure review, or annual evaluation. While not exhaustive, it highlights the most commonly performed faculty activities.

Teaching

The criteria used to evaluate teaching are listed below. Under each element, examples of evidence of proficiency are provided, though other valid forms of evidence may also be considered.

Currency in the Field

- Stays informed about current developments in their area of expertise and integrates them into teaching.
- Attends conferences, seminars, or workshops related to mathematics education and pedagogy.
- Develops a new course or significantly revise an existing one.
- Teaches a special topics course, a senior seminar, or an Honors Program course.
- Designs special projects for a course.
- Introduces or enhances the use of technology in instruction.
- Supervises an independent study course on topics not consistently offered in the department.

Classroom Presentation

- Delivers clear, concise lectures that engage students and foster enthusiasm for mathematics/statistics.
- Cultivates a spirit of scholarly inquiry that drives innovations in course content, the development of new teaching methods, and the creation of new courses.
- Prepares and distributes well-organized syllabi, handouts, and other instructional materials.
- Communicate effectively with students of diverse learning styles and levels of preparation.
- Receives a major teaching honor or award (e.g., department, school, or institution-wide recognition).

Fair Evaluation of Student Work

- Assesses student performance objectively, without bias or arbitrariness.
- Grades and returns work within a reasonable time.
- Designs assessments that align with the level of instruction.
- Provides timely feedback to support student learning throughout the course.
- Respect and acknowledge student opinions.

- Employs a variety of methods to assess student performance.

Willingness to Help Students

- Readily available to students for consultation regarding course assignments.
- Provides helpful and timely feedback in response to student inquiries.
- Actively advises students on academic matters.
- Offers review sessions outside of regular class hours.

***Categorical Summaries for Currency in the Field, Classroom Presentation, Fair Evaluation of Student Work, and Willingness to Help Students.**

Unsuccessful: Meets fewer than 50% of the stated objectives in these categories, with little or no improvement over time.

Successful: Meets 50–75% of the stated objectives in these categories or demonstrates consistent improvement over time

Exceptional: Meets 75–100% of the stated objectives in these categories.

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness.

Student evaluation. Ratings of instruction obtained at the end of each semester will serve as one indicator of the quality of instruction faculty members receive their student evaluations in the semester after the one in which ratings were obtained. Faculty members who consistently are rated below the department mean are expected to use this information as formative feedback and to develop a plan for improvement in consultation with the Department Head. It is expected that the faculty member will show improvement in student ratings after addressing areas of concern.

Since student evaluations are obtained across the college and department, the Mathematics Sciences Department system considers the average ratings from these broader groups and uses these as points of comparison for the individual faculty member. This procedure should reduce the influence of course and student characteristics on students' evaluations by collapsing across all courses taught at The Citadel.

Student ratings are expected to be representative of the faculty at The Citadel for an instructor to receive a designation of “*Successful*.” Failure to achieve a “*Successful*” rating would be demonstrated by a pattern of student ratings that consistently, across courses, falls below the department mean and shows no evidence of improvement over time. To receive a designation of “*Exceptional*,” student ratings of most courses would fall at or above the

department mean for all faculty members. Each faculty member can use the following guidelines as formative feedback to guide his or her development. The guidelines can also be used by the Department Head for annual evaluation and by faculty review committees for tenure and/or promotion reviews.

At the time of evaluation for tenure and/or promotion, comments that consistently reflect students' perceptions that the faculty member is skilled, is effective, is accessible to students, has a proper mathematics background, has a good presentation of material, is punctual, and demonstrates professionalism may, at the discretion of the committee member (evaluator), serve as the basis for raising the rating for evaluation of instruction by one level. Conversely, comments that consistently reflect students' perceptions that the faculty member is ineffective, is unavailable, is late, or is unprofessional and that indicate little progress after the faculty member has received the feedback, may, at the discretion of the committee member (evaluator), serve as the basis for lowering the rating for evaluation of instruction by one level.

***Categorical Summaries for Student Evaluation**

Unsuccessful: Less than 50% of courses taught at or above department mean with little to no improvement over time.

Successful: 50-75% of courses taught at or above the department mean.

Exceptional: 75-100% of courses taught at or above the department mean.

Student Mentoring.

Research with students may be considered evidence of teaching effectiveness. Examples include mentoring students in publications (papers or problems) and presentations, advising a student who is giving a talk at a conference, leading an independent study or student research project, providing frequent help sessions in the evenings or at weekends, and preparing students for competitions.

***Categorical Summaries for Student Mentoring**

Unsuccessful: No meaningful engagement with students in research or scholarly activities.

Successful: Actively mentors students on novel research or applied projects. Efforts include guiding students in problem-solving, preparing them for poster or oral presentations, or submitting work to appropriate

venues.

Exceptional: Demonstrates sustained and impactful student mentoring, either by (a) mentoring multiple students or leading group research efforts, or (b) guiding student work that results in high-quality outputs such as peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations, or competitive awards.

Peer Observation and Evaluation.

Peer evaluations by faculty members provide valuable formative feedback. The Department of Mathematical Sciences requires regular observation of teaching by another faculty member for pre-tenure faculty. These evaluations are intended to offer constructive feedback on the faculty member's performance, promoting growth and development as an educator. Peer evaluations must be included in the faculty member's portfolio. Tenured faculty that desires a peer observation are responsible for initiating the peer evaluation process by requesting one or more peers to observe their teaching each year.

Faculty members should use the following general guidelines for evaluating a peer's instruction:

*** Categorical Summaries for Peer Observation and Evaluation**

Unsuccessful: Classroom presentations are disorganized, and there is poor rapport between the faculty member and students. Students appear inattentive, and the faculty member makes no attempts to engage them. Additionally, the faculty member may fail to employ Fair Evaluation of Student Work as defined herein.

Successful: Classroom presentations are well-organized and effectively delivered, with the faculty member actively engaging students in the learning process. Additionally, the faculty member demonstrates evidence of using Fair Evaluation of Student Work as defined herein.

Exceptional: Classroom presentations are highly organized and effectively delivered. The faculty member actively engages students in the learning process, employs varied instructional methods as appropriate, and demonstrates innovative teaching approaches when suitable. The faculty member has received awards for teaching excellence. Additionally, the faculty member provides evidence of using Fair Evaluation of Student Work as defined herein.

Categorical Summaries for Teaching

Candidates may choose three out of the following four categories: 1) Currency in the field, classroom presentation, fair evaluation of student work, and willingness to help students, 2) Evidence of teaching effectiveness, 3) Student mentoring, 4) Peer observation and evaluation. A rating of *Exceptional* requires that the candidate achieve *Exceptional* in at least two selected categories and no *Unsuccessful* ratings. A rating of *Successful* requires at least two *Successful* rating and no *Unsuccessful* ratings. A rating of *Unsuccessful* will be assigned if any of the three selected categories is evaluated as *Unsuccessful*.

Scholarship

The criteria for scholarly activity are outlined below. Under each element, examples of evidence of proficiency are provided, though other valid forms of evidence may also be considered. All scholarly activities must fall within the discipline, as defined by the department.

Scholarly Productivity

- Authors or co-authors a scholarly book or manual.
- Has publications in legitimate refereed journal, legitimate (see below) refereed conference proceeding, or refereed journal book.
- Develop grant proposals for internal and external funding.
- Authors or co-authors a scholarly book or instructional manual.
- Publishes in reputable, peer-reviewed journal, conference proceedings, or edited volumes.
- Presents research at local, regional, national, or international venues, including invited addresses, symposium or contributed papers, colloquium talks, and workshops.
- Serves as a reviewer for grant applications, journal articles, conference proceedings, or book chapters.
- Supervises student research that culminates in presentations at local, regional, national, or international level.
- Receives a significant honor or award for scholarship (e.g., sabbatical leave, Faculty Excellence, and Innovation in Scholarship Award).

External Grants:

- A major foundation (e.g., NSF, DOE, DOD, MAA, AMS, or a similar agency) grant
- External funding from lesser foundation

Internal Grants:

- The Citadel Foundation grant and Provost grant.

Work in Progress. Examples of scholarly work in progress may include, but are not limited to:

- A paper accepted for publication
- A paper submitted for publication
- A book-length manuscript in preparation
- A paper in preparation
- Attending a workshop/conference in one's research field

Legitimate publications: A publication is considered *legitimate* if it appears in MathSciNet, in Scopus, or in the departmental preapproved list (to be curated by the department chair). To add a publication to the departmental preapproved list, the candidate should provide the committee with three letters which affirm the legitimacy of the publication. These letters should come from practicing researchers in the field represented by the publication. Moreover, the researchers should not be among the candidate's prior or current coauthors.

In the discipline: Work completed within mathematical sciences (pure mathematics, applied mathematics, statistics, mathematics education, etc.). This includes interdisciplinary work which contains a mathematical component.

Categorical Summaries for Scholarly Activities

Unsuccessful: Exhibits low levels of scholarly activity. Provides no evidence of progress toward publishing papers in legitimate peer-reviewed journals.

Successful: Engages in consistent scholarly activity. Provides evidence of meaningful progress toward publication in legitimate peer-reviewed journals.

Exceptional: Demonstrates a high level of scholarly activity. Provides evidence of papers accepted or published in prestigious, high-impact peer-reviewed journals. By the third-year evaluation, has multiple publications in such journals. Has received awards for research excellence and may have served as a keynote speaker at prominent conferences.

Service

Student

- Student Group Advisor
- Company Academic Advisor
- Family Host for Cadets

Department

- Serve on a standing departmental committee
- Serve on an ad hoc or periodic (e.g., hiring) departmental committee
- Attend functions such as Math Club and awards/presentation dinner
- Serve as advisor of Math Club
- Serve as organizer of competitive teams e.g., Math Jeopardy.

- Organize colloquia
- Administer the Math Placement Exam
- Administer the Gateway Exam(s)
- Serve as a course coordinator

School and College

- Serve on a standing committee or Faculty Senate
- Serve on an ad hoc or periodic (e.g., SACS reaccreditation) committee
- Serve as chair of a committee, officer of Faculty Senate
- Serve as organizer of (Student Research program) the Citadel Student Excellent Day or advisor to Gold Star Review
- Serve as officer of a campus chapter of an honor society or a professional organization
- Serve as an external committee member on a departmental Tenure and/or Promotion or Post-tenure Review Committee.
- Receives a major service award (e.g., department, school, or institution-wide recognition).

Public

- Serve as judge at a science fair or at a conference
- Host or co-host a workshop, conference, or competition. For example, for middle or high school students
- Give a discipline-related talk at a K-12 school or program
- Give a discipline-related talk to a community group
- Write a scholarly or educational article for a newspaper or similar general audience publication
- Serve as advisor to a K-12 competitive team (such as South Carolina All-State Mathematics Team)
- Organize an event for high-school students (such as a mathematics competition)
- Serve on a high school student thesis committee
- Mentor a high school student in his/her theses or research project

Discipline

- Review papers, books, products for a journal
- Referee papers for journals
- Serve on the editorial board of a journal
- Serve as officer of a professional organization
- Chair a session at a conference
- Organize a session at a conference
- Organize a conference
- External adviser for a master or Ph.D. thesis
- External member of committee for a master or Ph.D. thesis
- External member of committee for ABD for examination.

- Serve as an organizer of regional, national, or international discipline related meetings
- Serve as a judge for student posters or oral presentations at a conference.

Please note that similar activities may vary significantly in their level of scholarly significance. For example, delivering a talk in an open session at a regional AMS or MAA meeting is not equivalent to giving an invited address at a major national conference.

Some discretion is required when determining whether an activity should be categorized as teaching, service, or scholarship. For instance, reviewing a short research paper for a journal typically qualifies as service, whereas substantial editorial work on conference proceedings is more appropriately considered scholarship. In some cases, an activity may be classified under more than one category.

Categorical Summaries for Service Activities

Unsuccessful: Exhibits minimal engagement in service activities and provides no evidence of a willingness to serve on essential departmental, school, or institutional committees.

Successful: Engages actively in service activities. Provides evidence of consistent participation on departmental or school/college committees, including service as a leader on at least one committee.

Exceptional: Engages in a high level of service activity. Provides evidence of sustained participation across multiple categories of service, including school- and college-wide committees, with leadership roles on several. May have received formal recognition or awards for excellence in service.

Memorandum 3-601 and Memorandum 3-602 supersede these guidelines.