



PPC FILE GUIDE*

*a guide with reference to requirements

In this Guide

The first four items below (1-4) parallel the four general parts of a PPC file: it contains an access memo, a table of contents, an informational summary, and documentation.

1. Access memo (put inside jacket pocket)
2. Table of Contents (of the entire file's contents listing everything in the file except the Access Memo. For an example Table of Contents, see Appendix)
3. Informational Summary (of your application for tenure, promotion, or sabbatical). This would be the second document in file after the Table of Contents, but first item listed in the Table of Contents.
4. Documentation (is the bulk of the PPC file. The order of items are explained and then illustrated in the example Table of Contents).

This guide also reviews:

5. Expectations and PPC Evaluation
 6. How it happens: timelines and procedures
- Appendix:** Sample of table of contents.

1. Access memo (G 5, G 6)

- Is a short memo listing who has access to review your PPC file. *Should be placed in the jacket of PPC file, not inside the file itself.* Each year that people need to review your file as you are evaluated and apply for tenure, sabbatical, and/or promotion, you need to update your access memo and send copies to your Dean and to the VPAA's office for their records, and place another copy in the jacket of the first volume of the file.
- Create a memo and name the people who have access: Include the members of your Evaluation Team, Department, and Dean. For the first, second, and pre-tenure years, or for promotion or sabbatical, again include Department members, the Dean, and up to three (non-probationary) faculty (chosen by you) so they can access your file in order to complete *Individual Evaluation Reports* (I.E.R.s).
- In the case of candidates for Full Professor "who have not had an Evaluation Team in the preceding three (3) academic years," be sure that two people who write an I.E.R., and thus are given access to your file, have completed "classroom visitations to two or more different courses within the past two years" (2.4.4).

2. Table of Contents (G 4.9)

The Table of Contents is very important. Those evaluating a candidate will be frustrated if they cannot easily and quickly find the documentation supporting your claims in your the Informational Summary. *This guide suggests the use of TABS for ordering the contents (see the example Table of Contents, Appendix).* The Contract states:

G 4.9 A table of contents of all documents contained within the file. To the extent practicable, the contents should be arranged according to the three criteria of evaluation identified in H 1.2 [teaching, scholarship, service]. All documents should be numbered for reference in the table of contents. The first main item listed in the table of contents should be the Information Summary identified in G 4.10.

3. Informational Summary (F 2.4.4)

A. What the “Informational Summary” is:

It’s like an essay or narrative. The Contract refers to the Summary in three places:

(1) With reference to the duties of the PPC, it states: “The committee, through its chairperson, shall request that each candidate eligible for promotion and/or tenure provide an *Information Summary*...” (F 2.4.4)

(2) With reference to the contents of the PPC file: “Information of a positive nature, indicating special competence; achievements; scholarly research; academic, professional or other contributions.” (G 4.6)

Note: (2) above refers to the faculty member’s accomplishments-to-date in the three areas of by which you are evaluated by colleagues and administrators (teaching, scholarship, and service) and is the most important part of the Informational Summary.

(3) With reference to the contents: “I. *Summary of history* at SVSU (time of hire, dates of tenure, promotion and sabbaticals, current vita, etc.) II. *Statement of current goals and objectives* with respect to teaching activities, scholarly activities, and University service.” (G 4.10)

In short, the Informational Summary itself contains three parts:

(i) *summary of history* (time of hire, dates of tenure, promotion and sabbaticals, current vita, etc.) This often is only a paragraph in length.

(ii) *accomplishments-to-date* in the **three areas** – teaching, scholarly activities, service – by which candidates are evaluated. This often will be several pages, depending on length of employment.

When one writes the “accomplishments-to-date,” specifically explain each element in relation to the given criteria. At the same time, keep in mind the following Contract statement introducing these criteria and include that information if relevant:

...in many cases outstanding achievement in one or more areas set forth below may justify lesser achievement in other areas. Only the criterion of teaching performance must be satisfied in all cases...

i.e. Outstanding achievement in Service may justify lesser achievement in Scholarship, or vice-versa. But “lesser” does not mean insufficient, it means at least satisfactory!

(iii) *future goals and objectives* This is particularly important for sabbatical applications.

According to the Contract, when explaining one’s accomplishments or goals,

It is helpful to include explanations of the relationships between various activities and the major categories of activity as set forth below and by Article H 1.2, where such relationships overlap various categories or where the relationships are not clear.

When describing one’s accomplishments-to-date, for example, with reference to teaching performance, one should tell how these accomplishments specifically relate to that category (to teaching). Or if some other activity, such as working with students on a research project, then one should explain how this relates to service; or how a paper presented at a conference relates to one’s own research and scholarly activity. If a research paper or work with students also relates to a different activity, say teaching, then one should explain these overlaps. Overlap is not a problem, it’s a strength; but not clarifying the overlap is a problem for those reading your file.

B. About the “Informational Summary”

The most important facet of writing your Informational Summary is understanding how and by what criteria faculty are evaluated in each of the three areas whether for tenure, promotion, or sabbatical:

“The criteria are as follows:

H 1.2.1

Teaching Performance is to be evaluated by course evaluation forms, classroom visits, student evaluations, and peer evaluations. Materials related to teaching which are included in the PPC file may be evaluated for the information they provide concerning innovation, creativity, organizational skills and other aspects of instructional performance.

[G4.10 III. Teaching activities (courses taught, innovations in curriculum, new course development, summaries of course evaluations, other statements from students or colleagues related to teaching, etc.)]

H 1.2.2

Scholarly and creative activities such as, but not limited to, publishing, developing or conducting workshops, research, presentations of papers or of posters in poster sessions, exhibitions, performances, or participating in educational or teaching research or artistic activity relevant to the discipline; and discipline-related activities of a scholarly and/or community service nature which reflect specialized knowledge of the faculty member, require new learning or research, and which bring credit to the

University.

[G4.10 IV. Scholarly and creative achievements and activities (research, performances, exhibitions completed or in progress, publications, book reviews, paper or workshop presentations, community activities related to expertise in discipline which required new research or learning, continuing education in discipline or related areas, honors and awards received, grants obtained, etc.)]

NOTE: According to the Contract, publications *are not necessary* for tenure or promotion! But they are welcome and they strengthen your case. The reason is that Teaching at SVSU carries more weight and importance.

H 1.2.3

University service, leadership in student activities and community service are defined as service on standing or ad hoc committees, either elective or appointive; participation in departmental activities; Faculty Association leadership functions; sponsorship of student functions; activities relevant to the discipline in the community outside the campus which do not require new learning or research; significant community leadership roles; and other meaningful university-related or discipline-related activities.

[G4.10 V. Service to the university and the community (university, college, Faculty Association, departmental committees, evaluation teams, leadership related to student organizations, student advising, community activities related to established expertise in discipline, etc.)]"

Weighting memo (2.4.5, #3)

- This memo does NOT go into the PPC file. *A copy should be sent to the VPAA's office along with the Access memo* at the time you apply for tenure, promotion, or sabbatical.
- The memo states the "weight" that a faculty member chooses to assign to Scholarship and Service for the years in which they are being considered and may be changed with each promotion, sabbatical.
- Whether the application is for tenure or promotion, **teaching** is always weighted 50%. It is "at the option of the faculty member" to distribute the remaining 50% to the other two categories, per above.
- Faculty may assign a weight of ".2" to one category and thus ".3" to the other, or may assign ".25" to both. Teaching is always ".5" by default. Don't use other numbers.

4. Documentation

After the Table of Contents, the PPC file essentially contains all the documentation that matches the Table of Contents and supports the claims of the Informational Summary. One *may* present the documentation in the following order:

- I. The following documents:
 1. Curriculum Vita

2. G 4.1 Documents supporting the claim to professional and academic training. [e.g. degree certificates]
3. G 4.2 Letters or records establishing the claim to prior work experience.
4. G 4.3 All documents relating to the evaluation conducted for said faculty member. [i.e. Evaluation Team Reports]
5. G 4.4 All documents relating to final resignation or discharge. [i.e. as concerns prior employer, if any]
6. G 4.5 All records, academic assignments and transcripts supporting the faculty member's claim to continued professional development after initial appointment [if any].
7. G 4.6 [redundant, see *II. Documentation* below]
8. G 4.7 Any statements that the faculty member wishes to have entered in response to or in elaboration of any other item in the file [uncommon]

II. Documentation supporting Scholarly Activities claims in the Informational Summary (G 4.6) (G 4.10, IV) (H 1.2.2) “research, performances, exhibitions completed or in progress, publications, book reviews, paper or workshop presentations, community activities related to expertise in discipline which required new research or learning, continuing education in discipline or related areas, honors and awards received, grants obtained, etc.”

III. Documentation supporting Service in the Informational Summary (G 4.10, V) (H 1.2.3) “service on standing or ad hoc committees, either elective or appointive; participation in departmental activities; Faculty Association leadership functions; sponsorship of student functions; activities relevant to the discipline in the community outside the campus which do not require new learning or research; significant community ... Service to the university and the community (university, college, Faculty Association, departmental committees, evaluation teams, leadership related to student organizations, student advising, community activities related to established expertise in discipline, etc.”

IV. Student Evaluations

- Do not have faculty assistants (secretaries) type student comments.
- Order the evaluations by semester chronologically. Place the oldest first because you will need to add new student evaluations each year. Your efforts will be reduced if you add on to the end of the file and avoid having to re-tab the entire contents.

5. Expectations and PPC Evaluation

The PPC (Professional Practices Committee) -- which is composed of three (3) appointed administrators and six (6) elected faculty -- uses the following scale to evaluate applicants (F 2.4.5):

“1. Each candidate's performance first will be evaluated on **each criterion** [teaching, scholarly activity, service] by each committee member according to the following 10 point scale:

- 10 = Outstanding
- 9 = Superior
- 8 = Very Good
- 7 = Good
- 6 = Acceptable (Marginal)
- 5 = Unacceptable (Marginal)
- 1 - 4 = Unacceptable”

Regarding evaluations during one’s first semester, expectations for service and scholarship are not a great as for teaching. And in subsequent evaluation years prior to tenure, the Contract states, “The primary purpose of pre-tenure evaluation shall be to evaluate teaching performance for input to the tenure evaluation of PPC” (H 2.2).

Tenure applicants must score at least “6” on teaching from the PPC committee. Candidates for tenure or promotion who are scored 6.0 or less on the average/weighted scores of the three criteria *combined* may not gain a majority of positive votes by the Committee. Candidates for sabbatical are weighted more on the scholarly activity proposed, and in relation to that, one’s record of scholarly activities.

For promotion there are also minimum degree requirements, or progress toward degree completion. Applicants for promotion to Assistant, Associate, or Professor rank do not require greater performance in the area of scholarly activity than the other two areas (teaching and service) as is sometimes assumed. Nor are publications required for any promotion, including to full professor, though they do help. One may score higher in Service than Scholarly Activities and still be eligible for promotion to any of the ranks. As noted above, the Contract states:

“...in many cases outstanding achievement in one or more areas set forth below may justify lesser achievement in other areas. Only the criterion of teaching performance must be satisfied in all cases; and the failure to satisfy said criterion [teaching] shall, by itself, serve as a bar to tenure or promotion. Performance on any one of the other criteria shall not, by itself, constitute reason for any decision for or against tenure or promotion for any faculty member” (H 1.2).

The caveat is that performance on any of the other criteria shall not constitute reason for any decision against tenure as long as the average of the three scores by each member of the PPC is not less than “6.”

Further, while applicants for tenure or promotion rank do not require greater performance in

the area of scholarly activity than the other two areas, PPC members do have increased performance expectations for the successive ranks across *all three* criteria:

“Scoring is relative to which decision is being considered (that is, promotion to the different ranks, tenure, or sabbatical). Different decisions made regarding the same faculty member might result in different scores” (F2.4.5).

In other words, what it takes to get a score of six (6) or greater on any of the three criteria is successively greater for promotion to Assistant, Associate, and Professor. For example, a level of performance may be sufficient for tenure, but not for promotion. Or in the case of promotion, the PPC expects more in all three areas by Associate applying for promotion to Professor compared to an applicant seeking tenure or promotion to Assistant or to Associate.

6. How it happens

The first two years of employment is probationary for all tenure-track faculty. Probationary employment extends up to the without experience credit. *All* full-time tenure-track faculty are evaluated in each of their first two years of employment. Those without experience credit are evaluated again in the fourth year; those with one year experience credit may apply for promotion in their fourth year and those with two years’ experience may apply for promotion in their third year (additional details on this, and how experience credit applies to tenure applications, are below).

Every evaluation (H 2.2) is conducted by an Evaluation Team composed

of three faculty members, at least two of whom shall be tenured and all three shall have at least two years service at SVSU. The first of the three shall be appointed by the appropriate dean or director after consultation with the departmental chairperson; the second shall be appointed by the Association; and, the third shall be selected and agreed upon by the first two appointees. (H 2.2.1).

It is important for new faculty to know that evaluation for tenure emphasizes successful teaching. The Contract states, “The criterion of primary importance for a probationary member shall be teaching performance ... The primary purpose of pre-tenure evaluation shall be to evaluate teaching performance for input to the tenure evaluation of PPC” (H 2.2). Further, a failure to satisfy the criterion for teaching will bar tenure or promotion, where as a failure to satisfy one of the other two areas – scholarship or service criterion – will not necessarily bar tenure or promotion (but could if the overall score by the PPC is below 6). Article H 1.2 states, that “Only the criterion of teaching performance must be satisfied in all cases; and the failure to satisfy said criterion shall, by itself, serve as a bar to tenure or promotion. Performance on any one of the other criteria shall not, by itself, constitute reason for any decision for or against tenure or promotion for any faculty member.”

Your Evaluation Team will meet with you to schedule classroom visits, which are elemental to your evaluation, as are their review of your student evaluations. Typically all classes are visited

by at least one evaluation team member. Sometimes each Team member can visit only one class. Toward the end of the semester, but before final exams, Evaluation Team members will distribute and collect student evaluations from each class. The Team's Chair writes an Evaluation Report:

The evaluation record shall then be forwarded to the evaluatee and dean for review. The dean may then add such written comments, any recommendation for action regarding the evaluatee, and/or pertinent material as he/she deems necessary. The record shall then be returned to the team and evaluatee. The evaluatee shall then be given the opportunity to review the record again, and respond in writing, if any negative material has been added and return the record to the team. The team may then add further comments or materials, if it so desires, and shall compile a brief outline of the record and its specific recommendations, an index of the complete record and a dated cover entitled "EVALUATION RECORD" and place the whole in the faculty member's PPC file. The evaluation team shall forward its recommendation to the evaluatee.

There is no application for tenure. You are considered automatically. However, faculty must submit an application for promotion and for sabbatical. If experience credit was not gained at the time of hire, it may be applied for. Visit the Academic Affairs webpage for the forms and for the submission deadlines. Don't forget to apply by the deadline! Note that F 2.4.2 states, "Failure to submit the form to the committee chair by the due date and time established by the committee may constitute sufficient grounds for denial of promotion and/or sabbatical leave." If one does miss the deadline, one can appeal, but will likely have to apply the following academic year.

Generally, faculty apply for promotion *the year before* they are considered for tenure. But there are a variety of exceptions. Those hired without a doctorate who complete the degree before tenure consideration are eligible for earlier promotion and an automatic pay increase (typically from Instructor rank to Assistant rank). In this case, the faculty "shall receive an automatic \$2000 increase, prorated from the time in the year that the faculty member obtains said doctorate [and] the experience requirement for years in rank as instructor will be reduced to one year for persons who hold a doctorate" (N 4).

It is important to observe that "tenure may be granted [only] at the rank of Assistant Professor or above." Faculty are hired at different ranks according to credentials and progress toward the doctorate as follows:

Instructor: "Normally, the formal degree qualification for the rank of instructor shall require possession of an appropriate master's degree or its equivalent."

Assistant Professor: "Normally, the formal degree qualification for promotion or appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor shall require possession of a master's degree plus fifteen (15) semester hours of appropriate course work beyond the master's degree or its equivalent. Appointment may be made upon specification that a terminal degree will be obtained within

four years following the effective date of employment for purposes of (1) continued employment or (2) promotion.”

Associate Professor: “Normally, the formal degree qualification for promotion or appointment to the rank of associate professor shall require possession of a master's degree plus thirty (30) semester hours of appropriate course work beyond the master's degree or its equivalent. Appointment may be made upon specification that a terminal degree will be obtained within three years following the effective date of employment for purposes of (1) continued employment or (2) promotion.”

Full Professor: “Normally, the formal degree qualification for promotion or appointment to the rank of professor shall be possession of an appropriate doctoral degree such as Ph.D, Ed.D, D.A., D.Ed, D.B.A., D.N.S., Sc.D., M.F.A., or a combination of both a J.D. and an M.B.A., or their equivalent.” (H 1.1.1 – H 1.1.5)

Tenure and promotion entail the completion of separate *Individual* Evaluation Reports. IERs are distinct from the Evaluation Report that is completed by the pre-tenure Evaluation team. However, the Evaluation Team will also complete a “collective IER” as part of its Evaluation Report. In addition,

each candidate eligible for promotion and/or tenure...shall request the completion of Individual Evaluation Reports (IERs) from the respective dean, from the department (reflecting a vote of the department, and signed by the department members acknowledging that the contents of the IER represent the position of the department), and up to three non-probationary faculty (chosen by the evaluatee). The parties agree to use the designated IER forms (F 2.4.4).

Generally, it is a good idea to request the IER from the Dean and the Department. Deans usually schedule a meeting with candidates before they complete their IER. The candidate is ultimately responsible for making sure the IERs are completed on time; *don't hesitate to send friendly reminders*. Also, evaluatees receive copies of the IERs and may respond in writing to any. F 2.4.4 states,

“...a copy of each [Individual Evaluation] report shall be sent by the evaluator(s) to the individual faculty member for review and comment (if any) to be added to the PPC file. It is the applicant's responsibility to meet the deadlines for these submissions with an appeal possible to the next higher level if the responsible party does not meet the deadline. The candidate shall have a week after the deadline for IERs to be submitted to respond to any IER before any action is taken by the PPC. A request for an IER shall include a written consent for the evaluator to review the candidate's PPC file.”

Again, observe that, “Separate IERs are required for each separate application for promotion and/or tenure.” The evaluators who complete IERs for tenure may also complete IERs for promotion.

The schedule for each evaluation year is generally as follows:

Sept and early Oct: Evaluation teams are composed by the FA and Deans, and charged by the Dean. The team meets to determine Teach Chair with evaluatee to arrange classroom visits.

Oct. and early Nov.: Evaluation teams visit classrooms.

Mid-late Nov. - prior to Finals Week: Evaluation teams conduct student evaluations for each class.

December-January: Evaluation Team Chair compiles report with review of report by team members. Team Chair receives Department Statement. (The Dept. members will not usually have access to student evaluations for the evaluation year and first Evaluation Report, but they may have access to the PPC file.) Team Chair places the student evaluations in the PPC file.

(Continuing per H 2.2.3:)

Full Year Mid-Year

Jan. 30	June 1	Evaluation team forwards preliminary record to evaluatee and dean, including, if necessary, a recommendation that the evaluatee formulate a correction plan
Feb. 10	June 12	The dean forwards preliminary record, with additions, to evaluatee and evaluation team
Feb. 18	June 18	Evaluatee forwards response, if any, to evaluation team [A faculty member may wish to respond to the comments of the Team or Dean; if so, it is advised to avoid appearing defensive]
Mar. 10	July 8	Evaluatee, if desires, submits correction plan to the evaluation team, the respective department chairperson, and respective dean
Mar. 17	July 15	Evaluation team places complete record in the PPC file and forwards its recommendation to the evaluatee
Mar. 20	July 20	Evaluatee, if desires, appeals to PPC

The above is repeated for each year of the three years in which a tenure-track faculty is evaluated. All faculty, with or without experience credit, are evaluated in three different years and then considered for tenure.

At the start of one's third evaluation, just prior to the year one is considered for tenure, a faculty is no longer on probationary status, but has achieved "pre-tenure status." This is important insofar as "pre-tenure status" means that, under normal circumstances, a faculty member is no longer issued yearly probationary contracts and has two opportunities (two successive years) to be considered for tenure and continue.

A chronology for a typical faculty member without experience credit:

Years One and Two: Evaluations conducted by an Evaluation Team with an Evaluation Report issued per above

Year Three: no Evaluation Team or Evaluation Report. A letter of pre-tenure status for the coming year is sent by March 31 in normal circumstances

IMPORTANT NOTE: student evaluations should always be given to students and placed in the PPC file for this year and during every year of employment regardless of tenure or promotion considerations. You may store them in your office across several years and then place them in the file as needed prior to promotion or sabbatical applications. *Always* leave the room when distributing paper evaluations and preferably have a student collect them and place them into a folder that is sealed and delivered by hand to the appropriate office where they are processed. Faculty should not view or handle student evaluations until they have been processed after the semester is completed.

Year Four: pre-tenure year with pre-tenure status achieved. Following the deadlines provided by the Vice President for Academic Affairs' office, one may *apply* for promotion this year or earlier if warranted; see "accelerated promotion" below.

Year Five: pre-tenure status continues; automatically considered for tenure by PPC (and for promotion if one applied the prior year).

Year Six: If granted tenure, employment with tenure begins (July 1). If denied tenure, pre-tenure status is extended this year and one is automatically considered again for tenure. If denied a second time, pre-tenure status ends.

Year Seven: If tenure gained in year six, then employment with tenure begins.

Per the Contract, tenure-track faculty are given "yearly probationary contracts ...continued until the individual involved either proceeds to pre-tenure status or his or her employment relationship with the University is severed. Such yearly contracts will be issued by March 31 of the fiscal year" (H2.1.1). Typically faculty will have a pre-tenure evaluation during their fourth year of employment, which is their first "pre-tenure" year. The exception is for those who have experience credit (below). During the fifth year of employment (the second pre-tenure year), faculty will be automatically considered for tenure. If tenure is not gained, they will automatically be considered for tenure again in the sixth year (third pre-tenure year) of employment.

Faculty are not permitted a fourth pre-tenure year per the Contract: "Pre-tenure faculty shall receive yearly appointments for a maximum of three years. A pre-tenure faculty member shall be given written notice, in the letter of appointment for the third pre-tenure year, of tenure granted or the extension of pre-tenure status through the third year. If the faculty member is not granted tenure[,] or pre-tenure status is not extended through the third year, written notice shall be given by November 1 of the second pre-tenure year." (H2.1.2).

The earliest a tenure-track faculty may be considered for tenure is in the third year, but only if two years of experience credit (the maximum) was granted at initial appointment (see H 1.2.4: "less experience credit at initial appointment," and H 2.1.2, which refers to, "an appointment which includes experience credit sufficient to allow the achievement of pre-tenure status prior to the above fourth [consecutive yearly] appointment"), or if one applied for experience credit after hire and was granted by the PPC (See H 2.5). *One cannot gain experience credit for teaching in the same current appointment at SVSU.*

One may rescind one or two years of experience credit for additional time for improvement if

one's first or second evaluation team report was insufficiently strong. If so, send a memo to the Vice-President of Academic Affairs stating that one or two years of experience credit will be rescinded. With two years of experience credit, a faculty member achieves pre-tenure status during the second year of employment and is automatically considered for tenure in the third year, and if tenure is granted, becomes employed with tenure starting the fourth year (July 1). In such cases, Evaluation Teams evaluate the first and second year only as the candidate is considered for tenure by PPC during the third year. One may also apply for early promotion in the third year if two years of experience credit (the maximum) was granted at hire or granted by PPC decision. Experience credit does not count toward sabbatical eligibility; all tenure-track faculty become eligible to apply for sabbatical during their sixth year of employment and conduct sabbatical during the seventh year (see M 9.1).

In special cases, faculty may apply for accelerated promotion (H 1.2.4). The Vice-President's office maintains an earlier deadline for accelerated promotion than conventional promotion. It consists of a candidate's online application (see the Academic Affairs web page), and a written "nomination and recommendation" by the Department and by the Dean. Typically a candidate will approach her/his Department and Dean and request support and the Department will hold a confidential discussion and a confidential vote. If either the Department or the Dean do not support, then the application does not proceed. If both support, then the written nomination and recommendation are separately submitted directly to the Vice-President's office by the Department Chair and Dean respectively. Usually candidates will demonstrate an unwarranted or unfair "set back" or an extraordinary achievement in the three areas of consideration: teaching, research, and service.

Appendix

I. Sample Table of Contents (style is flexible):

Your Name

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOL I	TABS
Informational Summary	1
Curriculum Vita	2
Position Advertisement	3
Letter of Appointment	4
Evaluation Team Reports	
AY 2003/2004	5
AY 2002/2003 (2 nd Year)	6
AY 2001/2002 (1st Year)	7
Department, Dean, & Individual IER Reports	
For Tenure Application AY 2004/2005	8
For Promotion Application AY 2004/2005	9

DOCUMENTATION

Scholarly Activities

Publications (see CV for complete list)

Peer reviewed Journals/Book

“The Crisis of US hegemony” (Routledge, forthcoming)	10
“Hard Numbers and Cold Facts” in <i>Dialectical Methodology</i> , Volume 30, Numbers 1-2/March, 2006, pp. 27-70	11

VOL II

Manuscripts in Progress (see Documentation for drafts)

“The Decline of Manufacturing Unions, and the Rise of Academic Unions” (31 single spaced pages)	1
“The Neglected Role of Administrators in Contract MOUs” (37 single spaced pages)	3

Other Publications

“Helping Iraq Kill with Chemical Weapons,” <i>CounterPunch</i> , 2002	4
---	---

Papers

“Japanese Anthropology,” <i>American Cultural Association</i> , 2009	5
“Peasant Rebellion, Women Reelers, and Patriarchal US Unions... in the Japan-US Silk Commodity Chain, 1884-1886,” <i>International Studies Association</i> , 2001	6

VOL III

Presentations

American Biological Association

“The Small Creatures inside Each of Us” Biological Mini-Conference, University of San Francisco, August 7, 2009 1

Michigan Academy of Science Arts and Letters

"Biological Science in Modern Society," *Michigan Academy of Science, Arts & Letters*, March 2007 2

International Studies Association

“Peasant Rebellions in Japan, 1884-1886,” *Global Inequalities and World Systems Research III*, Feb. 21, 2001 3

Review Articles, Reviewer

Article/Book reviews; three (3) 4

Academic Advisory Board, *Taking Sides: Clashing Views in Global Issues*, 2008 5

Social Problems editorial assistant, 2001 6

Academic Conferences

Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters

Chair, Biology Section, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 7

American Biological Association

Atlanta, 2010 (scheduled to present)
Montreal, 2006
San Francisco, 2004 (section organizer, presenter) 8
Atlanta, 2003
Washington D.C., 2000 (presented)

Grants

Supplemental Professional Improvement Grants for attending conferences , 2007, 2008, 2009 9

Unit Grant proposal, 2006 10

Public Appearances

Currently Listening (“it’s His Show on Current Events”)
Thirteen (2,113) appearances, 2007-2010 11

Service

Department Service

- Search Committee Chair, Feasibility Department (2004-2005)
 - Faculty search committees (2001-present)
 - Biology Club Sponsor/organizer, 2001-2003
 - Assessment Report, 2006-2007
 - Presentation, “Careers in Socio-Biology,” 2001
-

Faculty Association

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Executive Board</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attended more than sixty (60) FA Executive Board meetings ▪ <i>Contract Review And Planning Task Force</i> ▪ <i>Floor Representative</i> ▪ <i>Presided Workshops</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Faculty Search Committee Procedures ○ PPC (2009) 	16
University	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Board of Fellows Annual Legislative Breakfast (2008, 2009) ▪ Online Teaching & Learning Symposium ▪ Grade Grievance Committees ▪ SVSU Task Force on Diversity 	17
Community	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amnesty International Sponsored Panels on the Middle East ▪ Church of Sacred Heart, Caro, MI (U.S. Foreign Policy presentation) ▪ St. John Lutheran Church/Bridge Center for Racial Harmony (U.S./Middle East relations) ▪ Amnesty International Sponsored Panels on the Middle East 	18
Teaching	
Awards, Recognition	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Landee Teaching Excellence Award, nominee 2003, 2005/06, 2007/08 ▪ Apple Award, SVSU Ablers Club, 2004 ▪ Teaching with Technology Award, Nominee, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 	19
Student Evaluations	
VOL IV	
Winter 2004	
112, The Rhetoric of Rhetoric	1
301, Banking and White Collar Crime	2
111, Intro to Obfuscation	3
390, World Bio-metaphors	4
Spring 2004	
262, Zero-Sum Math Models	5
211, Advanced Obfuscation	6
Fall 2004	
231, McDonalds and World Hunger	7
600, Wankel Rotary Engines and Anthropology	8
450, Mass Media Dysthymia	9
333, Nursing Intransience	10