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Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation:
Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review

I. Overview — Since the University is committed to the transmission and advancement of knowledge, and sees academic freedom as essential to attaining these purposes, the Department of Philosophy and Religion exhorts its faculty and students to unrelenting freedom of inquiry in classroom teaching and learning, sustained scholarship, collegial discussion, periodical publications, and appropriate service conduits. Beyond advancement of knowledge, we also emphasize and aspire to model for others in all these ways the pursuit of the love of wisdom. Accordingly, the Department of Philosophy and Religion endeavors to attain and retain colleagues who are pedagogically inspiring, academically prolific, and deem scholarly activity as their vocation in all their varied academic and other pursuits. ‘We teach in order that we may learn’: this implies that being excellent teachers is our primary departmental goal, but that requires that faculty stay active in scholarship in their respective areas. It is to be expected that departmental members will exhibit expertise in different specialty areas within our discipline, and that each will vary in strengths displayed in the individual areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, but each will aspire to achieve some balance in terms of commitment to passionate teaching, to the pursuit of wisdom through scholarship, and to some form of service and engagement. In the words of Ernest Boyer, we see the aim of education as “not only to prepare students for productive careers, but also to enable them to live lives of dignity and purpose; not only to generate new knowledge, but to channel that knowledge to humane ends; not merely to study government, but to help shape a citizenry that can promote the public good” (Boyer, Scholarship Reconsidered, pp. 77-78).

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the Department of Philosophy and Religion. The document is guided at the highest level by The Code of the UNC system and by the Faculty Handbook of Western Carolina University. Included also are policies issued by General Administration, by the Office of the Provost, and in some cases by the college. While this document is intended to be comprehensive and precise with regard to department-level criteria and procedures, the faculty member should have familiarity with The Code and with the WCU Faculty Handbook (section 4.0). Further, in preparing a dossier for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the faculty member should also have available the Guidelines for the Preparation of the Dossier, a separate document disseminated annually by the Office of the Provost.

II. Domains of Evaluation
A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05) is evaluated according to the following three dimensions: Pedagogical content knowledge, Professional aspects of teaching, and Student perceptions of learning.
1. Pedagogical content knowledge
   a. An instructor’s pedagogical content knowledge is reflected in the teaching acts that represent a discipline’s central concepts, skills, and recent advances though a variety of means, including classroom explanations, assignments, and other course requirements. PAR understands this dimension to include the professor’s knowledge of the discipline (since effective teachers bring to their teaching deep knowledge of the discipline’s central concepts, theories, history, and current developments) and the professor’s design of the class (since effective teachers plan courses that use appropriate texts, assignments, and examinations to provide well-organized opportunities for students to learn.
   b. The data for evaluating the professor’s pedagogical content knowledge are assessed by the professor’s peers. Peer evaluators should be able to see evidence of pedagogical content knowledge in their observation of the faculty members’ teaching and in the portfolio of materials that the faculty members submit, which may include their syllabi, assignments, exams, and classroom exercises.

2. Professional aspects of teaching
   a. Effective teaching relies upon the ability to perform well the required administrative and professional functions associated with instruction. Such functions include, for example, providing appropriate and timely feedback, providing clear instructions, providing regular information regarding student progress, responding appropriately and in a timely manner to students, making materials available, holding class and making suitable use of class time. PAR also expects that effective teachers create engaging and challenging experiences in the classroom.
   b. The data for evaluating the professor’s teaching is assessed by the professor’s peers and includes critical input from the professor’s students. Peer evaluators should be able to see evidence of a professor’s performance from direct observation of teaching and from their review of teaching materials and the professor’s self-evaluation. Student input is gathered through SAI responses, direct observation of teaching, and exit interviews.

3. Student perceptions of learning
   a. Students have a unique and important perspective on certain components of teaching effectiveness. They value intellectual engagement, enthusiasm, and passion for course content. Course organization and clarity, two aspects that relate to student success, are validly rated by students. Effective teachers are available to the students. The extent to which the student feels respected and shares a sense of rapport with the instructor correlates with teaching effectiveness.
   b. The data for evaluating students’ perceptions is gathered through SAI responses, direct observation of teaching, and exit interviews.
4. **General comments** — The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data, each with its own unique contribution, but we attach significant weight to the peer review of substantive teaching materials, as well as to direct observation of instruction when conducted by at least two experienced peers. Another factor that will be considered are quantitative and qualitative student assessments as recorded in SAs, as suitably summarized and interpreted by the departmental review committee.

   a. **Professional Development** - The Department offers a mentoring process in which tenured mentors are assigned to tenure-track faculty to help them develop in professional areas, especially in teaching. Classroom visitation with observation comments, syllabi (and other teaching material) recommendations, and any other helpful tools will be offered. Feedback will be forwarded to the Department Head. The Department also encourages faculty to further their development through the Coulter Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, as well as directs faculty to read professional journals like *Teaching Philosophy* for tips on how to be effective teachers of Philosophy.

B. **Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)**

   1. **Scholarly activity** — WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four types described by Ernest Boyer in his book, *Scholarship Reconsidered*. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described in this section. The Department of Philosophy and Religion recognizes that different faculty members might emphasize one of these forms of scholarship more than another, but we also expect that the scholarship of discovery or integration will receive the highest emphasis in our field. Given the Overview of our departmental mission, all in our field will stress the commitment to knowledge for its own sake, as well as a commitment to freedom of disciplined inquiry into philosophical or theological truth in the pursuit of wisdom. However, since our curriculum also stresses the importance of student learning across different disciplinary areas, we value the quest to place specialized disciplines in a larger context, thus showing the synthesis of diverse forms of knowledge and inquiry. However, colleagues working in applied areas of philosophy (e.g., Environmental Ethics) should be prepared to show the practical significance of their work. Should anyone choose to pursue the scholarship of teaching and learning, we also support these endeavors.

   a. **Scholarship of discovery** — Original research that advances knowledge. Typically, in our two fields, this will involve scholarship published in peer-reviewed journals or in books. It could also include commentaries on or translations of primary sources in the field (often originally written in classical Greek or Latin, as well as modern languages such as German or French).

   b. **Scholarship of integration** — Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.
c. **Scholarship of application** – Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.

d. **Scholarship of teaching and learning** – Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

While acknowledging these 4 different types of scholarship, we still need a set of criteria for determining what counts as scholarly activity. Toward that end, we propose that faculty meet the following criteria: 1) the activity undergoes some form of external peer review, so as to determine that high performance standards have been met or exceeded; 2) there is some evidence of scholarly rigor as derived from standards in the field; 3) the results of the activity are disseminated to some sort of scholarly community or generally-educated audience; and 4) the activity has results beyond merely the teaching activity itself. Peer review will include traditional forms (journal/book reviewers, editors) but can also include broader communities of scholars (retired professionals, invited addresses at conferences or other academic and professional institutions) as recognized by the department. When it meets the four criteria above, scholarship can include research and writing used in the context of teaching and intra- or inter-collegiate colloquia, and not merely work directed towards publication or conference presentations. This work should show that the instructor is staying professionally alive by remaining in touch with scholarly developments in the field.

**2. Methods of evaluation** – Scholarship in the Department of Philosophy and Religion, regardless of the Boyer category used, will be based on the concept of a ‘module’ of work, which generally will reflect the expectation for most faculty members for a normal period of scholarly work assessment. The departmental CRD Committee will judge whether or not a module has been attained on the basis of the following guidelines for assessing scholarly contributions:

a. Works accepted for publication even if they have not yet been published are counted for TPR decisions as equal to published works.

b. The department values collaboration, so we will encourage faculty to write both single- and co-authored articles, even though the former is the typical method of publication in our field.

c. Presentation at national or international conferences is valued more highly than presentation at regional or local conferences. However, we should count organization and leadership at a significant local conference as a valuable contribution to the field, if it can be documented from key scholars in the field that this conference has made a significant contribution to a neglected scholarly topic in the fields of philosophy or religion.

d. Invited addresses for conferences are counted more highly than panel discussions, paper commentaries, conference organizers, etc.

e. Organizing a symposium or panel discussion and participating in it is valued more highly than simply participating in the symposium or panel discussion.
f. Publishing the first edition of a book, since it requires more research and time, counts more highly than publishing subsequent editions of the book.

g. In general, scholarly treatises that display original, innovative work will count more highly than textbooks, with the following provisos. Given Boyer’s point about seeking more creative ways of analyzing faculty talent, we will follow his suggestion and count a broader range of writing than the scholarship of discovery. So following his lead in advancing the scholarship of integration, we will count writing a textbook as a significant intellectual contribution to the field. Also, we will count writing for non-specialists — disseminating complex philosophical or theological ideas to a more popular audience — as a valuable scholarly contribution.

Using these guidelines, the department’s CRD Committee will determine the ‘module’ totals for each faculty member being reviewed. We will use the following categorical scheme to help both the candidate and the committee to ascertain how to compare and assess work.

**Category A** — 3 modules:
- Sole authorship of 1st edition of a textbook or scholarly treatise

**Category B** — 1 module:
- Authorship of an article in a peer-reviewed journal, or equivalent scholarly publication

**Category C** — ¼ up to ½ module:
- Paper presentation at a recognized professional conference, book reviews, or op-ed publications.

Normally, the candidate will be awarded one module for each single-authored work; and the candidate will need to attain a total of four modules in order to be awarded tenure and promotion, at least three of which need to be in category A or B. However, we want to recognize that some published articles might be lengthier than a standard article of, say, 15-20 pages; and so the committee might want to count a longer, substantial article as counting for, say 1 and ½ modules. Or the quality and/or originality of scholarly contribution might count for more, should the committee so choose to assess it. We do not expect that all candidates will attain a full module in the same length of time. However, within the department, we will provide guidance that encourages faculty to make progress towards tenure. Given the lengthy amount of time required to master the philosophical literature in various parts of the field (often from our ancient roots to the present controversies), we will encourage faculty to attain a module within the first few years of commencing their careers at our university. Signs of progress will include things like reading papers at conferences, disseminating
revised versions of those papers to colleagues in their respective subfields with documentation of their constructive remarks, and giving departmental colloquies that assure some critical peer review of these works in progress.

3. **General comments** – These guidelines and examples are not exhaustive, nor do they include ‘borderline’ cases. The activities listed are typical of what now are regarded as scholarship in the field. Clearly, other activities will be counted, but decided on a case-by-case basis. Were a candidate to explore scholarly activities that would fit in some of the other Boyer categories, the department would count them, insofar as the candidate could defend and document those activities as genuine scholarship. Should it be needed, the CRD Committee will consult outside reviewers for advice. In cases where the candidate seeks prior review of a proposed project, the CRD Committee should consult with experts at peer institutions to perform the peer review function, but would need to supply candidate with written feedback, so as to be included in dossier or other evaluation materials, and a copy would be submitted to Department Head for candidate’s file. Professional development activities pertinent to scholarship count positively for candidate’s evaluation, and should also be described and documented appropriately. One example would be giving an invited lecture on an area of one’s expertise at another academic institution or its equivalent, say, for a popular lecture series (such as the Highlands Lectures); the points for these activities will be counted on analogy to the three categories listed above in terms of effort and impact.

C. **Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)**

1. **Types of service:****
   
   a. **Institutional service** – committee service, recruiting, faculty governance, search committees, mentoring, as these apply at all levels, including department, college, and university.
   
   b. **Community engagement** – providing disciplinary expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, or national/international level.
   
   c. **Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership** -- service in professional organizations, contributions to accreditation documents, administrative duties such as Department Head, a major role in faculty governance, etc.
   
   d. **Advising** – faculty need to stay current in the departmental curricular changes, Liberal Studies, and Humanities program curriculum, but may also work as organizational advisors, Honors College work, and any other ways that enhance students in moving toward graduation and future professional or post-graduate goals.

2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence** – The faculty member’s listing of service/engagement activities will be examined and evaluated with regard to time and energy requirements, level of expertise involved, available quantitative/qualitative data (e.g., number of advisees, advisor evaluations by students, etc.), and other indicators of quality of service, including documentation or artifacts included in the appropriate dossier appendix.
3. **General comments** — Faculty members are expected to participate in a variety of service activities at several institutional levels (discipline/department, college, university), and to be competent and proficient advisors to students. For a tenure-track or tenured faculty member, service/engagement will typically take up 10-15% of one’s workload, though tenured members may find this percentage increase. Professional development activities in the domain of service/engagement are highly valued by the department; they should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event.

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. **Annual Faculty Evaluation**

1. **Overview** — All instructional faculty, regardless of status or participation in other review processes, are evaluated annually. This performance evaluation serves as an active, ongoing process of monitoring faculty effectiveness. Deadlines for completion of the review process are determined by the Deans and Provost.

2. **Composition of review committee** — In the Department of Philosophy and Religion, AFE files are reviewed and evaluated by the Department Head. The Department head will consult with the AFE Committee, which will be comprised of three faculty at least two of whom are tenured, with the Department Head serving as a non-voting chair. This committee will also be responsible for reviewing and evaluating the AFE file of the Department Head. At least 2 members of the AFE Committee will participate in peer observation of teaching; this will be done on an annual basis by the end of the spring semester.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation**

a. All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE file that includes (1) their AFE document and (2) a set of appendices with supporting documentation and artifacts. This should be submitted in a 1-inch, 3-ring binder, and the AFE document also should be submitted electronically to the Department Head. Include your name on the outside of the binder and on cover sheet, with the AFE and the academic year listed. In general, this file follows the structure of the TPR dossier but is limited to a single year rather than a cumulative record. The AFE document prepared by the faculty member should begin with a Self-evaluative statement.—1-2 pages maximum. Use this opportunity to describe the highlights of your year, focusing on teaching, scholarship, and service. Additional items should include the following:

   i. **Teaching.** List courses taught for the current academic year, including the preceding summer, with enrollments. Briefly address the 7 dimensions of effective teaching, citing examples from the current year.

   ii. **Scholarship.** List scholarly activity completed during the academic year (previous 12 months from time of submission of file). Clearly distinguish between outcomes and work in
progress. Take care not to duplicate entries from previous years. If an item appeared previously with a different status (e.g., 'article submitted'), clearly indicate that it was listed previously, and say how it was listed. Include in Appendix G any reprints, conference submissions, compressed formats of posters, etc. that document your scholarly activity.

iii. Service. List service to the department, college, university, and external community during the immediately previous 12 months. Address advising activities, including number of undergraduate advisees, work with Philosophy Club, The Gadfly, etc. Document as appropriate in Appendix H.

iv. Professional Development Activities. List workshops, training institutes, as well as related activities, and describe/document appropriately. Artifacts may be included optionally in Appendix I. This area would include any activities not already covered under teaching, scholarship, and service.

v. Other pertinent information. Describe additional information that does not fit into the categories above, or simply indicate N/A.

b. Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document -- Use the same appendix structure stipulated for the TPR dossier, but to a more limited degree, as follows:

i. Appendix A. (not used)

ii. Appendix B. Current curriculum vita.

iii. Appendix C. (not used)

iv. Appendix D. Peer review of teaching: include the written feedback from the departmental review of teaching materials. After direct observation of teaching is conducted, you may (though optional) include the ratings and comments of observers. These peer ratings should be for the current academic year.

v. Appendix E. SAI data. Because spring data will not be available in time for the AFE file, include SAI data for the calendar year, including any summer courses taught. Prepare a concise tabular summary of the average scores on the 5 factors for each course taught. Follow this with a 1-page presentation of quantitative data for each course. DO NOT include narrative responses to open-ended questions in this section. If you choose to include such qualitative data to support self-evaluative statements, include it in Appendix I, taking care to avoid excessive bulk.

vi. Appendix F. Samples of teaching materials from the current year, including syllabi, tests, exams, projects, assignments, etc. Avoid excessive bulk.
vii. Appendix G. Samples of scholarly products, including reprints, letters of acceptance, brief manuscripts or abstracts, or technical reports. Take care not to include the same products in multiple years.

viii. Appendix H. Documentation of service for the most recent 12 months. Include representative materials to document service/engagement activities.

ix. Appendix I. Optional. Any other documentation you wish to provide. Note: The Department Head shall prepare a written AFE Statement, addressing the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, placed in the context of departmental expectations. The faculty member will meet with the Department Head to read and sign the AFE Statement, and the member may prepare a rebuttal statement if they wish.

c. Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track instructors - These procedures and guidelines are based upon the assumption that the part-time faculty member is responsible only for teaching. Those with contractual agreements specifying other expectations will be evaluated using appropriate aspects and weightings of section IV.A below.

i. All part-time instructors will be evaluated with regard to teaching effectiveness based on the three dimensions of teaching, using data from the following sources: A self-evaluative narrative statement, peer review of teaching materials, and Student Assessment of Instruction, using the university instrument for each course taught. ii. Part-time faculty should have peer review of materials (by the departmental peer review of teaching materials committee) during the first semester of the academic year in which they teach; and similarly, they should complete the self-evaluation near the end of that semester.

iii. The Department Head shall write an evaluation summary of teaching effectiveness during the preparation of other AFEs in the spring.

iv. The Department Head shall place in the part-time faculty member’s file the evaluation summary, the peer review of teaching materials, and all available SAI reports.

B. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (4.06 & 4.07)

1. Overview - The Provost’s Office will generate an annual list of faculty eligible for tenure and reappointment.

2. Composition of review committee

a. The departmental TPR Committee shall be chaired by the Department Head (non-voting), and shall be composed of at least three and not more than six tenured faculty members, not including the Department Head. This TPR Committee will be elected annually by the
department's full-time faculty. In the event that there are fewer than three tenured faculty in the department, the committee shall be composed of the department head and tenured faculty, and the Department Head, in consultation with the department and Dean, will select tenured faculty from similar departments, so as to constitute a committee of at least three members.

b. The College TPR Advisory Committee shall be chaired by the Dean (non-voting) and shall be composed of faculty members of the college as specified in the Faculty Handbook.

c. The University TPR Advisory Committee shall consist of the Provost, as Chair (non-voting); the Dean of the Graduate School; and faculty members of the University, as specified in the Faculty Handbook.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation – as noted above, detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually by the Office of the Provost. The candidate will need (1) the departmental CRD, (2) the Guidelines for Preparation of the Dossier, and (3) the timetable for the review process.

C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Overview - These guidelines are based upon section 4.08 of the Faculty Handbook. Post-Tenure Review (PTR) is required of all tenured faculty with 50% or more responsibilities that involve teaching, scholarship, and/or service. This review is required of all tenured faculty no later than the 5th academic year following the most recent review event.

2. Composition of review committee - The departmental post-tenure review committee shall consist of all tenured members of the department, as well as the Department Head, but excluding any members scheduled for post-tenure review. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty in the department, the Department Head, in consultation with the department and Dean, will select tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation

a. The Office of the Provost includes the timetable for PTR along with the annual TPR schedule, distributed at the beginning of the academic year.

b. The documentation prepared by the faculty member should generally follow the structure and format of both the TPR dossier and the departmental AFE File described above in section III.A.3. Use a 1-inch, 3-ring binder, with name and PTR on the cover.
   i. Prepare a brief (2-3 pages) self-evaluative statement which highlights teaching, research, and service achievements over the past five years, since the most recent promotion or Post-Tenure Review.
   ii. Include the AFE documents you prepared for each of the past four years (as required by the Faculty Handbook.)
   iii. Finally, prepare a single set of appendices, which follows the labeling and structure described above (Section III.A.3.c) for the AFE file. In this case, include in Appendix C the 4 most
recent AFE Statements written by the Department Head, plus any rebuttals. SAIs should be provided for the past 3 years, as should ratings of the Peer Review of Teaching Materials Committee. In instances where the instructions above focus on a 12-month period, expand this to the full period of the Post-Tenure Review, but no further.

c. The committee shall present its written evaluation to the Department Head. The Department Head shall provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The Department Head shall add his/her own review, and any written response from the faculty member, and shall forward these materials to the Dean.

d. See the Faculty Handbook (Section 4.08) for further details concerning procedures, outcomes, appeals, and due process.

Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in the Department of Philosophy and Religion –

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Teaching – In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should display a high degree of competency or proficiency in their overall ratings on teaching materials, according to the consensus of the review committee. Their self-assessment on each of the 7 Dimensions of Teaching should reflect this competency or proficiency. They should receive a high overall rating due to direct observation of teaching from at least one of the observers. Another factor that will be considered are quantitative student assessments, along with qualitative narrative accounts derived from the SAIs, as suitably interpreted by the departmental review committee. Candidates for early tenure would need to demonstrate exemplary performance.

2. Scholarship – There is no specific annual measure expected here, but the candidate must attain at least four modules by the sixth year, when they submit their files for tenure and promotion. However, along the way, as the department mentors junior faculty, we do expect to see some signs of progress – typically, at least one annual conference paper presentation (or its scholarly equivalent) and at least two peer-reviewed publications (or their equivalent) by the fourth year.

3. Service – The tenure-track or tenured faculty member is expected to participate in institutional service at some level or other (department, college, university, peer institutions, external community). The time and energy commitment should approximate 10-15% of the workload. Part-time and fixed-term faculty should meet expectations as indicated in the terms of their contract.

4. General comments – Notice that we rely on a trifold distinction between Competency, Proficiency, and Mastery (this language modifies that of ‘competencies, conversancies, and mastersies’ as used by Rudolph Weingartner in his Undergraduate Education [1993]). In our usage, academic ‘proficiency’, like that of a craft, requires more skill, adeptness, or expertise than mere competency.
We use this language to describe the intellectual refinement of skills developed by faculty as they move from Assistant to Associate to Full Professor stages. For full-time tenure-stream faculty, the following is a general guide: teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 35-40%, and service 10-15%. According to the Boyer model, individual faculty should be allowed to match up the scholarship and service areas to their own strengths; however, at an institution that is primarily a teaching university, the teaching area (or, teaching/scholarship, where there is overlap) can never drop below 50%. Note also that given that some faculty recognize and sponsor undergraduate research flowing out of their teaching, one cannot expect that the distinction between teaching and scholarship can be rigidly observed. Part-time and fixed-term faculty are usually evaluated entirely on their teaching, but if contracts stipulate other activities, they will be evaluated accordingly.
B. Reappointment (4.06)

1. Teaching – In order to meet teaching expectations, the faculty member should, for 3 years prior to the review, receive high overall ratings (‘competent’ or ‘proficient’) on teaching materials according to the consensus of the review committee. Each candidate’s self-assessment on each of the three dimensions should display an acceptable level of competency or proficiency. Each should receive an overall rating of ‘competent’ or ‘proficient’ on direct observation of teaching from at least one of the observers. Another factor that will be considered are quantitative as well as qualitative student assessments (SAIs), as suitably summarized and interpreted by the departmental review committee.

2. Scholarship – at least one conference paper presentation, or its equivalent in terms of other forms of scholarship, with indications of moving it toward becoming a published paper or peer-reviewed project. Special note: For the initial reappointment decision, there will be no expectation for the completion of scholarly activity, only the indication that plans are under way to initiate a pattern of scholarly activity. As the candidate progresses through the probationary period, expectations increase with regard to activities from categories II.B.2A or B. See criteria for tenure below.

3. Service - The faculty member is expected to participate in service at some level or other (department, college, university, external). Obviously in early years, members will not be on many committees, and the pattern can change over the span of the probationary period. During the initial couple of years, there should be primarily departmental service and the gradual buildup of an advisee load. In these years, advisee training and attending Liberal Studies advising is expected, since our department offers a wide variety of Liberal Studies courses. By the 3rd or 4th year, there should be some service activity at the internal level, or where possible, service to external groups, with an emerging pattern of focus on at least one area of service/engagement.

4. General comments - The model that should guide junior faculty is for teaching to count approximately for 50%, scholarship 35%, and service 15%. In reality, in the early years of one’s career, teaching is likely to absorb 60% or better of one’s time, and scholarship to tempt one to exhausting the rest of one’s energies. Despite this absorptive trend, faculty should engage in some form of service, and teaching should be at an acceptable level of performance (and time constraints) by the end of the 2nd year.

C. Tenure (4.07)

1. Teaching - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for 3 years prior to the review, receive high marks (highly competent) in overall ratings on teaching materials, according to the consensus of the departmental review committee. The member’s self-assessment on each of the three dimensions should display a high level of competency. One should receive a high overall rating based on direct observation of teaching from at least one of the observers for each of the 3 years. Another factor that will be considered are quantitative and qualitative student assessments recorded in SAIs, as suitably summarized and interpreted by the departmental review committee.
2. **Scholarship** - A total of four modules is expected for tenure and promotion. While each can aspire to attain publications in Category A, one can also do all one's work in Category B. In any event, at least three of these four modules must be in category A or B.

3. **Service** - By the time of application for tenure, the faculty member should have an established record of service at some level within the institution, and where possible, some external engagement as well. One should be carrying a full share of advisees and demonstrate one's competence or proficiency as an advisor. Competency or proficiency as an advisor is a bit hard to demonstrate but can be documented by Banner printouts of student degree audits, copies of checklists for majors, records of time set aside during Advising weeks, and records of graduation applications.

4. **General comments** - For tenure, teaching counts approximately for 50%, scholarship 35%, and service 15%.

### D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)

1. **Teaching** - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for 3 years prior to the review, receive proficiency (beyond mere competency) in overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the departmental review committee. One's self-assessment on each of the three dimensions of teaching should show some improvement and diversity (expertise, course design, instructional versatility, sponsorship of student research) in the time since the initial hire. Another factor that will be considered are quantitative and qualitative student assessments as recorded in SAIs, as suitably summarized and interpreted by departmental review committee.

2. **Scholarship** - A total of four modules is required in order to earn tenure and promotion. We do not wish to tenure any candidate that we would not consider proficient enough to promote to Associate Professor.

3. **Service** - The faculty member should have a record of service at both the departmental and other appropriate forms of extra-departmental service. One should be carrying a reasonable share of departmental advisees, be a faculty advisor to a club or student group, and have demonstrated proficiency as an advisor.

4. **General comments** - For promotion, teaching counts approximately for 50%, scholarship 35%, and service 15%.

### E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)

1. **Teaching** - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for 3 years prior to the review, have a sustained record of excellent teaching, according to the consensus of the departmental review committee. One's self-assessment on each of the three dimensions of teaching should display mastery of teaching in Philosophy and/or Religion. Another factor that will be considered are quantitative and qualitative student assessments as recorded in SAIs, as suitably summarized and interpreted by departmental review committee.

2. **Scholarship** - Promotion to full professor requires four modules after promotion to Associate Professor, at least three of which must be in category A or B. These might be earned in terms of peer-reviewed, published articles, a book
published by a respected press, or through other forms of scholarship in any of the four types described in the Boyer model. That is, the philosophy and religion department recognizes and welcomes scholarship of discovery, of integration, of application, and of teaching and learning that are disseminated and receive external peer review.

3. Service — The faculty member should have an established record of service at a variety of institutional levels, including both at least one contribution at the university level and external engagement outside the university. External engagement involves using one’s professional expertise in service to the larger public (for example, speaking to or advising nonacademic audiences) or to the discipline (for example, serving on editorial boards or professional societies). One should be carrying a full share of advisees, and have demonstrated full mastery of the intricacies of advising, serving as a mentor to junior faculty. One should have served at least one term as Faculty Senator or on a university-level committee.

4. General comments - Overall, a candidate must have a superior record of teaching, scholarship, and service to be promoted to full professor.

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Teaching - The faculty member should, for 3 years prior to the review, receive an overall rating of ‘Excellent’ on teaching materials according to the consensus of the departmental review committee. Another factor that will be considered are quantitative and qualitative student assessments recorded in SAI’s, as suitably summarized and interpreted by departmental review committee.

2. Scholarship — A total of 2 modules or more since tenure, or the last post-tenure review.

3. Service — The faculty member should have a record of service at a variety of institutional levels, and perhaps some external engagement as well. One should carry a large number of advisees, and have demonstrated one’s high degree of proficiency and mastery as an advisor, in both departmental and Liberal Studies service.

4. General comments - Teaching counts approximately for 50%, scholarship 35%, and service 15%, though individuals can balance out the scholarship and service so as to match their strengths and meet departmental needs.
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