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Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation:  
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I. Overview  -- The Department of Political Science and Public Affairs seeks to attract and retain colleagues who are productive, engaged, and scholarly. Our first priority is to be excellent teachers, and to be scholarly in our teaching. Research is our second priority and service, though important, is our third priority. The department needs to balance teaching, scholarship, and service, but individual faculty members don’t all need to achieve exactly the same balance. We will differ with regard to specialty area within our discipline, and also in terms of the types of scholarship we emphasize, as well as our investment in service and engagement. This complex and rather abstract blend of expectations, which may differ by individual, is hard to specify and harder to quantify. Nevertheless, it is important to provide faculty members with guidelines to help them develop productive and gratifying careers—guidelines specific enough to be practical, yet flexible enough to promote the individual differences that make our department a great place to live and work.

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the Department of Political Science and Public Affairs. 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 consult 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 4.04 & 4.05)

1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following three areas:
   a) Pedagogical Content Knowledge -- Effective teachers remain current in their fields, know how students learn, and recognize what prior information, including misconceptions, students bring to their courses. Most important, they know how to combine these three kinds of knowledge to create teaching acts that lead to student learning. Shulman (1987) has called this combination “pedagogical content knowledge” to distinguish it from content knowledge alone or pedagogy alone. Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars
restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and useable by their students.

b) **Professional Aspects of Teaching** -- Effective teaching relies upon the ability to perform well the required administrative and professional functions associated with instruction. While good teaching relies upon disciplinary expertise — and different disciplines often approach teaching differently — teaching is also a profession that requires common duties regardless of area. Such functions include, for example, providing appropriate and timely feedback to students, providing clear instructions, providing regular information regarding progress, responding appropriately and in a timely manner to students, making materials available, and making effective use of time allocated for the course. Highly effective teaching is more than class management; it is class management that relies upon an instructor’s ability to perform the duties associated with the job.

c) **Student Response to Instruction** -- 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.

2. **Methods of evaluation**

a) **Self-evaluation.** Each faculty member is responsible for providing a written statement in which s/he provides evidence of effective teaching. This statement should address the criteria that are specified for self-evaluations in the Faculty Handbook, especially pedagogical content knowledge. *(4.05B2C)*

b) **Peer review of teaching materials using the department protocol.** Peer review of teaching materials for all tenured and tenure-track faculty will coincide with the annual peer observation of instruction (described below). This review will be conducted by the departmental teaching review committee. These materials should include a copy of the course syllabus; a copy of one course assignment/activity to which substantial grade weight has been assigned, and a copy of the mid-term or final exam material. All of these materials should be for one designated course—preferably the course that is visited for the peer evaluation. When feasible, teaching committee should ensure that materials for different courses are evaluated from year to year. *(4.05B2B)*

c) **Direct peer observation of instruction using the department protocol.** All tenured and tenure-track faculty will be evaluated by a direct peer observation of teaching annually. The Department teaching committee will assign the peer reviewers at the second department meeting of the Fall. This committee will be made up of at least three full-time faculty members. At least one should be tenured and at least one should be untenured. When possible, the committee should include one faculty member who concentrates in public administration, one who concentrates in American politics, and one who concentrates in
comparative politics, or international relations. The committee will take care
to ensure that different courses are evaluated every year (preferably rotating
between fall and spring semesters). The class visitation will be arranged at
least one week ahead of time so that the instructor knows when the visit will
occur. (4.05.B2B)

d) **Student assessment of instruction.** All sections taught by all faculty will
include SAIs using a form of the Faculty Senate-approved 20-Item university-
wide SAI instrument. The candidate can decide whether to include a complete
set of responses to the open-ended questions in their dossier. (4.05B2A)

3. **General comments** —The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of
data, each with its own unique contribution. The department recognizes the
value and the potential misuse of teaching evaluations. Consequently, the
Collegial Review Committee (CRC) and the department head will not simply
compare mean scores for student evaluations, but will examine the data in more
detail to determine whether the students feel they are receiving an adequate
education. Professional development activities in the area of teaching are also
valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific
review event. Receiving a teaching award and/or being named a finalist for a
teaching award is recognized as a measure of teaching excellence. The
department also encourages engaged teaching and examples of engaged teaching
should be adequately noted. Faculty should be available and responsive to
student needs and maintain regular office hours. The department will not
consider letters from students or alumni when evaluating teaching.

**B. Scholarship (4.05C)**

1. WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four types described
by Ernest Boyer (1990). Specific departmental perspectives on these categories,
relative valuation of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific
examples are described in this section. The Department of Political Science and
Public Affairs recognizes that different faculty members might emphasize one of
these forms of scholarship more than another.

a) **Scholarship of discovery** — Original research that advances knowledge.

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.

An activity that qualifies as scholarship, regardless of type, must meet the
following general criteria: (1) the activity is subjected to external peer review; (2)
there is clear evidence of methodological rigor; (3) the activity results in
substantive outcomes or implications beyond the scope of the activity itself; and
(4) the outcomes are disseminated to a professional, governmental, or scholarly
audience. These four criteria help to differentiate the scholarship of teaching and
learning from teaching, and the scholarship of application from
service/engagement. Peer review can include traditional forms (e.g., journal reviewers, editors, committees awarding grants), but it can also include a broader community of scholars.

2. Methods of evaluation -- Scholarship in the Department of Political Science and Public Affairs, regardless of the Boyer category involved, will be based on the concept of a “unit” of work, which generally reflects the expectation for most faculty members for a normal year. The department’s CRC Committee will judge whether a unit has been achieved on a case-by-case basis, but the following provides general guidelines:

a) Published pieces are valued more highly than unpublished pieces.
b) The quality of the journal (as measured by journal citation counts and reputational rankings) in which an article appears will play a role in determining the value of the contribution.
c) Research that garners citations and influences future research in the field is valued more than ones that do not.
d) The department values multi-disciplinary research but candidates should show competence in political science and/or public affairs.
e) The department values collaboration and co-authorship, but sole author status is valued slightly higher than the other alternatives.
g) With published books, scholarly treatises that involve some degree of original research are valued more highly than the production of textbooks.
h) Technical reports such as outcome evaluation projects or “white papers” will be evaluated differentially based on factors such as scope, societal impact, size and sophistication of intended audience, and so forth.
i) When acquiring grants, external grants are more highly valued than internal grants.
j) Applying for a grant, and being unsuccessful, is valued more highly than not applying for any grants.
k) Scholarship must identify Western Carolina University as the author’s institution unless a previous arrangement is made to count prior service.
l) The department expects faculty to have a well formulated research agenda indicating future projects and activities.

Using these general guidelines, the department’s CRC Committee will determine “unit” totals for each faculty member being reviewed. Although what constitutes a unit cannot be defined absolutely, the following should be useful to the candidate and to the TPR committee. Some items are of such high value that they will be awarded two or four units, most items will earn one unit, and some items will earn a half unit. It is important to recognize what follows are examples and do not exhaust the possible ways in which units can be earned.

Category A - four units:
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- Authorship of a first edition book with a university press, recognized and respected academic publisher or equivalent

Category B - two units:
- Authorship of an article in a refereed journal that is widely recognized as having the highest status within the discipline (APSR, AJPS, JOP, PAR, JPART, or IOI)
- Authorship of the first edition of a textbook
- Editorship of an edited book with a university press or equivalent

Category C - one unit:
- Authorship in a refereed journal other than those named in category B
- A chapter in a scholarly edited book
- An article in a law review

Category D - one-half unit:
- Authorship in a refereed state-level journal or equivalent (e.g., Journal of Political Science)
- A scholarly book review
- A presentation at a professional conference
- A successful internal or external grant proposal (excludes travel grants)
- An encyclopedia entry in a scholarly publication
- A technical report for a program evaluation project or government agency if subject to external peer review process (e.g., Citizen Satisfaction Survey)

Category E - one-quarter unit
- An opinion-editorial piece for a newspaper
- An article in a magazine or other publication

3. General comments – These guidelines and examples are not exhaustive, nor do they focus on "borderline" cases. The activities listed are intended to be typical examples of scholarship in this department. In the case of scholarship where a traditional external review is not possible, the Department Head in consultation with the Department Collegial Review Committee will create a formal peer review process which will result in at least two positive written assessments of the work in question by qualified external reviewers. These assessments will be filed in the departmental office and will be included in tenure and promotion dossiers. Although not specified in the unit system, professional development activities in the area of scholarship are also positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event.

C. Service (4.04.C.3 and 4.05.D)
1. Types of service:
   a) Institutional service – committee service, recruiting, faculty governance, search committees, at all levels, including department, college, and university.
b) **Advising** – being informed about curriculum and related processes, availability to advisees, mentoring, assistance with academic and career planning (includes thesis/dissertation committee service). Also includes mentoring student research. Consideration will also be given to service as faculty advisor to extracurricular student groups, including time commitments and special programs and projects.

c) **Community engagement** – providing disciplinary expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, or national level. This could involve serving on nonprofit boards, conducting interviews with media outlets, hosting public media or radio programs, or voluntary work in the community.

d) **Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership** – includes service in professional organizations, contributions to accreditation documents, administrative duties such as department head, a major role in faculty governance, etc.

e) **Disciplinary service** – includes reviewing articles for journals, reviewing book manuscripts and textbooks, serving as discussant and chair of panels at academic conferences, as well as other leadership positions for disciplinary organizations.

2. **Methods of evaluation** – 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 threshold level of service activity at each institutional level (department, college/school, university) and to be active and competent advisors to students. Advising will be assessed by the department. In addition, the faculty member is expected to exhibit exceptional contributions in at least one of the areas of service/engagement, which may be institutional or service to external constituencies. For a tenure-track or tenured faculty member, service/engagement should typically represent 15% of the workload.

### 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 monitoring of faculty effectiveness. Deadlines for completion of the review process are determined by the Deans and Provost.

2. **Composition of review committees** – In the Department of Political Science and Public Affairs, APE files are reviewed and evaluated by the Department Head, rather than by a faculty committee. The Department Head’s APE file is reviewed and evaluated by the tenured members of the department. All tenured and tenure-
3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation**
   a) All full-time faculty members 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. Include faculty name on the outside of the binder and on a cover sheet, with AFE and year. 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—one page maximum. Use this opportunity to describe highlights for the year, focusing on teaching, scholarship, and service. Additional items should be included as follows:
      i. **Teaching.** List sections taught for the current academic year, including the preceding summer, with enrollment. Also specify the level of the section, whether it was a new preparation, liberal studies, or official service learning course. Briefly address the three criteria for teaching as specified in the Faculty Handbook and include a narrative on pedagogical content knowledge, 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 how. Include in Appendix G any reprints, conference submissions, compressed formats of posters, etc., to 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 and graduate advisees, work with student clubs, and so forth. Document as appropriate in Appendix H.
      iv. **Professional Development Activities.** List workshops, training institutes, and related activities, and describe/document as appropriate. Artifacts may optionally be included in Appendix I.
      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 vita.
      iii. **Appendix C.** (not used)
      iv. **Appendix D.** Peer review of teaching. Include the written feedback from the departmental peer review of teaching materials. If direct observation of teaching was conducted, you may optionally include the ratings and
comments of observers. These peer ratings should be for the current academic year.

v. **Appendix E.** SAI data. Include all SAI data since the last review. Prepare a concise tabular summary of the average scores on the five factors for each section taught. Follow this with a one-page presentation of quantitative data for each section. 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, make sure to include all evaluations and include them in Appendix I.

vi. **Appendix F.** Samples of teaching materials from the current year. This should include the materials used in the faculty member's peer assessment of teaching as well as syllabi from all other courses the faculty member taught since the last review. Avoid excessive bulk.

vii. **Appendix G.** Samples of scholarly products, including reprints, letters of acceptance, brief manuscripts or abstracts, or technical reports. Do not 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 APE Statement, addressing the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, in the context of departmental expectations. The faculty member meets with the Department Head to read and sign the APE Statement, and they may prepare a rebuttal statement if they wish.

c) Evaluation of non tenure-track faculty- 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 criteria for teaching effectiveness, using data from the following sources:
   - Annual peer review of teaching materials.
   - Student Assessment of Instruction, using the university instrument, for each course section.
   - Instructors must also provide a statement on pedagogical content knowledge.

ii. Part-time faculty should have peer review of materials 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. Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment
1. Overview - The Office of the Provost will generate an annual list of faculty eligible for tenure and reappointment.
2. Composition of review committees
   a) The departmental CRC Committee shall be chaired by the department head (non-voting) and be composed of up to six tenured faculty members elected by the department's full-time tenure-line faculty. When there are six or fewer faculty, the committee shall be composed of the department head and tenured faculty, provided the resultant committee has at least three tenured faculty, exclusive of the head. In the event that there are fewer than three tenured faculty, the Department Head, in consultation with the College of Arts and Sciences Dean, selects tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three.
   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 and the College Governance Document.
   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
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 involving teaching, scholarship, and/or service. This review is required of all tenured faculty no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent review event.
2. Composition of review committee - The departmental post tenure review committee shall comprise all tenured members of the department, excluding the department head and any members scheduled for PTR. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty in the department, the Dean, in consultation with the department, selects 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. consists of the following:

i. the four most recent annual faculty evaluations

ii. Include the AFE document you prepared for each of the last four years. (This is required by the Faculty Handbook).

iii. Finally, prepare a single set of appendices following the labeling and structure described above (III.A.3.c) for the AFE file. In this case, include the four most recent AFE Statements written by the department head, plus any rebuttals, in Appendix C. SAI's should be provided for the past four years, as should ratings of the peer review of the departmental teaching committee.

c) The PTR 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 or her own review, and any written response from the faculty member, and forwards this material to the Dean. If the department head is getting reviewed, the PTR Committee will appoint someone to act as department head.

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. **Expectations and Criteria** – The criteria specific to each form of review and each type of promotion are described in detail below.

A. **Annual Faculty Evaluation:** *(4.05)*

1. **Teaching** – In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the departmental teaching committee. Their self-assessment on each of the three dimensions should be satisfactory. They should receive a satisfactory overall rating on direct observation of teaching and on the SAIs.

2. **Scholarship** – Generally one unit, as described above. The committee should consider progress toward a book and/or other projects.

3. **Service** – The tenure-track or tenured faculty member is expected to participate in institutional service at all levels (department, college/school, university, discipline, and external community). They should exhibit exceptional performance in at least one category, which may be internal service or engagement with external constituencies. The time and energy commitment should approximate 15% of the total workload. In general, non-tenured faculty may dedicate less than 15% of their time to service. Part-time and fixed-term faculty should meet expectations as indicated in the terms of their contract.

4. **General comments** – Teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 35%, and service 15%. Instructors will be evaluated based on both teaching and service. Part-time faculty and lecturers are in most cases evaluated entirely on teaching. It is possible in some cases that individual part-time or fixed-term faculty members have contracts stipulating expectations other than teaching, and they should be evaluated accordingly. Copies of their contractual agreement should be included in their evaluation file.

B. **Reappointment:** *(4.06)*

1. **Teaching** - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for three years prior to the review, receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the review committee. Their self-assessment on each of the three dimensions should be satisfactory. They should receive a satisfactory overall rating on the SAIs and direct observation of teaching from at least one of the observers.

2. **Scholarship** – One unit, as described above. Progress toward a book and/or larger project should also be considered. **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 ILB.2 A, B or C. See criteria for tenure below.
3. **Service** - The faculty member is expected to participate in service at all levels (department, college/school, university, external), though this pattern may emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period. During the initial year, there should be some departmental service and gradual building of an advisee load. Advising training is recommended. By the third year there should be at least some service activity at each institutional level, with an emerging pattern of focus on at least one area of service/engagement.

4. **General comments** — Teaching should be at an acceptable level of performance by the end of the 2nd year. Note gradually increased expectations for scholarship and service described above (and below, regarding tenure).

**C. Tenure (4.07)**

1. **Teaching** — In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, exhibit high levels of teaching. To meet this standard, a candidate should demonstrate a command of the three criteria for teaching effectiveness based upon a consensus of the review committee for the three years prior to the review. This review is based on an evaluation of the candidate’s teaching materials and the candidate’s self-assessment. The self-assessment should be thoughtful and demonstrate a path to further development. The candidate should also receive a satisfactory overall rating on the SAIs.

2. **Scholarship** — To meet the scholarship expectation, faculty should accumulate six total units. At least three units must be the scholarship of discovery from categories II.B.2. A, B, or C. At least three units must be completed during the latter portion of the probationary period. Candidates should also have a developed research agenda that demonstrates future promise.

3. **Service** — By the time of tenure application, the faculty member should have a high level of service at each institutional level and some external engagement as well. They should be carrying a full share of advisees and have demonstrated competence as an advisor.

4. **General comments** — None.

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

1. **Teaching** — In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, exhibit high levels of teaching. To meet this standard, a candidate should demonstrate a command of the three dimensions of teaching based upon a consensus of the review committee for the three years prior to the review. This review is based on an evaluation of the candidate’s teaching materials and the candidate’s self-assessment. The self-assessment should be thoughtful and demonstrate a path to further development. The candidate should also receive a satisfactory overall rating on the SAIs.

2. **Scholarship** — To meet the scholarship expectation, faculty should accumulate six total units. At least three units must be the scholarship of discovery from categories II.B.2. A, B, or C. At least three units must be completed during the four years preceding the requested promotion. Candidates should also have a developed research agenda.
3. Service – The faculty member should have a high level of service at each institutional level and some external engagement as well. They should be carrying a full share of advisees and have demonstrated competence as an advisor.

4. General comments – None.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)

1. Teaching -- In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should demonstrate superior teaching. To meet this standard, a candidate should demonstrate a superior command of the three criteria for teaching effectiveness based upon a consensus of the review committee for the three years prior to the review. This review is based on an evaluation of the candidate’s teaching materials and the candidate’s self-assessment. The self-assessment should be thoughtful and demonstrate a path to further development. The candidate should also receive a satisfactory overall rating on the SAIs.

2. Scholarship – To meet the scholarship expectation, faculty should accumulate six total units subsequent to promotion to Associate Professor. At least 4 of these units must be from categories II.B.2 A, B, or C and 3 of these 4 must be scholarship of discovery. Candidates should also have a developed research agenda with clear impact on the discipline.

3. Service – The faculty member should have a superior record of service at each institutional level and some external engagement as well. They should be carrying a full share of advisees and have demonstrated competence as an advisor. They should also assume leadership positions both on and off campus.

4. General comments – None.

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Teaching -- The faculty member should, for the period since the last review, receive generally satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the review committee.

2. Scholarship – All faculty should maintain an ongoing, established research program that has been productive since the last review.

3. Service – The faculty member should have a record of service at each institutional level and some external engagement as well. They should be carrying a full share of advisees and have demonstrated competence as an advisor.

4. General Comments – Teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 35%, and service 15%, but we understand and appreciate that faculty may focus on slightly different areas as their career progresses. Significant changes in load responsibilities must be approved by the Department Head.
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