I. **Overview** — The criteria, guidelines, and procedures outlined here are supplementary to Section II, 4.00 of the current WCU Faculty Handbook and WCU Tenure Policies and Regulations as approved by the Board of Governors, the provisions of which shall prevail over any matter not covered here or on any point where this departmental document is inconsistent with these provisions.

II. **Domains of Evaluation**

A. **Teaching** *(Faculty Handbook 4.04 & 4.05)*

1. Evaluation of teaching centers on three areas: pedagogical content knowledge; the professional administration of the class; and student response to instruction. “Pedagogical content knowledge” refers to the ways that scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and useable by their students. The “professional administration of the class” refers to the required administrative and professional functions associated with instruction. “Student response to instruction” refers to observed and reported ratings of teaching effectiveness from the student’s perspective.

B. **Methods of evaluation**

1. **Pedagogical Content Knowledge** — Faculty members should be able to evaluate the current state of their pedagogical content knowledge for a particular course by responding to the questions: “What am I doing to help my students understand the most important material in my field?”; and “How have I changed my teaching practices to help students understand the central concepts, skills and advancements for the courses I teach?”. Peer evaluators should be able to see evidence of pedagogical content knowledge in the portfolios of materials faculty members submit, including their syllabi, assignments, exams, classroom exercises, and self-evaluations. Two statements will be submitted: 1) a statement by the faculty member discussing how instruction has changed or developed in relation to her/his discipline; 2) a peer evaluation of the extent to which a faculty member’s pedagogy is appropriate to the discipline.

2. **Professional Aspects of Teaching** — Direct observation by peers of instruction and materials is the basis for evaluation of a faculty member’s organizational and administrative performance in their classes. Student feedback (on SAIIs, for example) may also provide evaluation of performance in this area.
3. **Student Response to Instruction** – Evaluation is based on feedback from direct peer-observation of teaching and by peer-evaluation of teaching materials. All sections of all courses taught by all faculty will also be evaluated by SAIs using a version of the Faculty Senate-approved university-wide SAI instrument. Independent studies and other course formats where student anonymity cannot be maintained are exempt from this requirement. Course-specific SAIs may be used to supplement but not replace the university-wide SAI instrument. *(4.05B2A)*

4. **General comments** – Teaching evaluation draws on input from varied sources each with positive and negative aspects. While student evaluation is valued and provides specific insights into instructional activities, peer review provides a less biased assessment. Teaching is not a static process. Demonstration of professional development as an instructor is an expectation of all faculty.

5. **Sources of Data for Evaluating Teaching** – When evaluating a faculty member's teaching for tenure, promotion, and reappointment, data must be included from at least the following three sources: Student assessment of instruction (SAI); Colleagues’ reviews of teaching and teaching materials; Instructor's self-report and evaluation.

   a) **Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI)** – Tenured faculty members are required to report SAIs during at least one semester each academic year. Those standing for promotion or reappointment may be required to provide more frequent evaluations as prescribed by the Provost. SAIs will be conducted using forms and procedures that have been departmentally approved and include one of the university-wide assessment forms approved by the Faculty Senate.

   b) **Colleagues’ Review of Teaching** –

   - **Teaching Materials.** A committee of at least two tenured faculty colleagues representing both Anthropology and Sociology programs will be designated by the department head, but which will not include the department head, to review and evaluate teaching materials prepared by the instructor being evaluated. Materials may include course syllabi, examinations, quizzes, reading lists, assignments, study guides, handouts, slides and media, computer programs, etc. The committee will follow departmental protocol in reviewing materials.

   - **Direct Observation of Classroom Teaching.** All tenure-track faculty members must be evaluated by direct observation of classroom teaching as required by the University of North Carolina General Administration (see UNC Policy Manual 400.3.1.1(G)). Classroom observation should never be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. Peer observation assignments will be made available to faculty members by the department head. Other faculty members may also include direct observations in support of their AFE.
c) Instructor's self-report and evaluation – Faculty members should provide a short written statement addressing the currency of their pedagogical content knowledge by responding to the questions: “What am I doing to help my students understand the most important material in my field?”, and “How have I changed my teaching practices to help students understand the central concepts, skills and advancements for the courses I teach?”.

B. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)

1. WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four types described by Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described below. The Department of Anthropology and Sociology recognizes that during each evaluation cycle faculty members may emphasize one of these forms of scholarship more than another. Each Boyer category is valued equally.

   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 Anthropology and Sociology, 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 AFE/TPR 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 in which an article appears will play a role in determining the value of the contribution.
c) The department values multi-disciplinary research but candidates should show competence in anthropology or sociology.

d) The department values collaboration and co-authorship, but sole author status is valued slightly higher than the other alternatives.

e) Presentation at national, international, or regional conferences is valued more highly than presentation at local conferences.


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 resulting from professional consulting for academic, governmental, or professional organizations will be evaluated differentially based on factors such as impact of scholarship (international, national, state, regional, etc) and type of scholarship (discovery, integration, application, etc.).

i) When acquiring grants, external grants are more highly valued than internal grants.

j) Applying for a grant, even if unsuccessful, is valued.

k) Scholarship should 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 AFE/TPR peer review 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 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**

- Authorship of a first edition book with a university press or equivalent

**Category B: two units**

- Authorship of an article in a refereed international or national journal
- Authorship of the first edition of a textbook
- Editorship of a book with a university press or equivalent
- A previously unpublished chapter in a scholarly edited book

**Category C: one unit**

- Authorship in a nationally-recognized regional journal (sponsored and refereed by a regional professional association)
- A successful external grant proposal, external awards, contracts, or other professional funding support
- A peer-reviewed technical report based on implementation of an original project or investigation that has the purpose of aiding society or the discipline in addressing problems

Category D: one-half unit
- Authorship in a refereed state-level journal or equivalent
- A book review prepared for professional journals or publishers
- A presentation at a professional conference
- A successful internal grant proposal (excludes travel grants)
- An article related to your scholarship in a magazine or other non-scholarly publication
- An encyclopedia entry in a scholarly publication
- Facilitation of undergraduate research that results in a presentation or publication
- An unsuccessful external grant proposal
- A grant or manuscript review
- A presentation in workshops related to one’s discipline
- A presentation in workshops related to the scholarship of teaching and learning

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 departmental AFE/TPR peer review committee will create a formal peer review process that will result in at least two positive written assessments of the work in question by qualified external peer-reviewers. These assessments will be filed in the departmental office and will be included in tenure and promotion dossiers. Forensic Anthropology case reports may be peer reviewed within the medicolegal system. Due to their confidential and sensitive nature this process involves the use and acceptance of the report by professionals in the medicolegal system. 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. As the candidate progresses through the probationary period, expectations increase with regard to production of scholarship and creative works.

C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)

1. Types of service
a) **Institutional service** – Institutional service may include, but is not limited to
- participation in faculty governance by serving on department, college, and university committees
- serving on the Faculty Senate
- participation in recruitment (both on and off campus)
- serving on departmental and college search committees
- mentoring fellow faculty
- administrative duties (other than Department Head)
- special assignments for benefit of department, college, or university

b) **Community engagement** – As social scientists, community engagement is a common element of faculty service and may include
- participation in the activities of community service agencies and boards
- participation in local and state organizations related to one’s discipline
- consultation provided *pro bono* to community groups and organizations
- presentations to non-professional organizations
- presentations to elementary, middle, and high school classes or groups
- non-compensated off-campus instruction

c) **Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership** - Some university and professional service may involve significant time or other commitments
- serving as an officer or board member in a professional organization
- membership on national committees or holding offices in professional organizations related to one’s discipline
- serving on professional accrediting boards
- serving on editorial review boards
- administrative duties such as department head
- any major role in faculty governance

d) **Advising** – All department faculty have the expectation of student advising. With this expectation comes the responsibility of maintaining accessibility to students and advisees, as well as currency in university curriculum and related policies. Special activities may include
- advisor to department student organizations
- advisor to or serving on on-campus student honorary societies
- support of student participation in research activities and presentations
- service or engaged learning activities

2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence** – Using these criteria the departmental AFE/TPR peer advisory committee will review and evaluate the service activities of each faculty member. It is recognized that not all faculty can serve in the same manner and that junior faculty will have fewer opportunities.

3. **General comments** – The Department of Anthropology and Sociology recognizes that each faculty member should be a good “academic citizen.” The expectation of more entailed service comes with rank and longevity. While service is generally regarded as secondary to teaching and scholarship it is an important element in each faculty member’s professional development.
III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Overview – All faculty are evaluated annually. Timelines for the completion of the review process are determined annually by the Dean and Provost.

2. Composition of review committee - An AFE/TPR peer advisory committee comprised of up to six tenured faculty (excluding the Department Head) will be formed each academic year. The members of this committee will be elected by the faculty at large at the beginning of each academic year with the intention of fairly representing each discipline.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation

   a) All faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes:
      1) Teaching
         a. a self-evaluation addressing the three dimensions of teaching (especially pedagogical content knowledge), a statement of teaching philosophy, a description of goals, methods, and strategies used; and selected teaching materials for courses taught during the period of review
         b. copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials
         c. copies of peer teaching observation report
         d. student assessment of instruction (SAI)
      2) Scholarship and Creative Activity – List scholarly activity that took place during the current academic year (the 12 months since the last AFE review cycle). Documentation (reprints etc.) of scholarly activities may be requested in order to give the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee the opportunity to see the individual faculty member’s scholarly work.
      3) Service – List service activities by category (institutional, community, special, advising) that took place during the current academic year (the 12 months since the last AFE review cycle). In the case of advising list the number of advisees assigned to the faculty member and present the results of student assessment of advising.

   b) Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document
      1) At least two weeks prior to the start of the evaluation process the Department Head will solicit from each full-time faculty member materials to comprise the AFE document. The assembled AFE document will be provided to the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee.
      2) In preparing AFE materials the faculty member will include the following:
         a. A copy of the written feedback from the departmental peer review of classroom instruction. These peer ratings should be for the current academic year.
         b. A summary of SAI results for each course section taught. Because spring semester data are not available at the time of the AFE review
include SAI data for the prior spring semester. Include summer session courses. If supplementary narrative SAIs are used summarize the student responses. It is not necessary to include student narrative answers.

c. Representative samples of teaching materials from the current academic year. Include syllabi, examinations or other assessment forms, projects and assignments
d. Results of departmental peer-review of teaching materials.

e. Any other documentation the faculty member wishes to include such as reprints, letters of acceptance, abstracts, technical reports, and documentation of service activities.

c) The Department Head shall prepare a written AFE summary statement based on the AFE document assembled by the faculty member together with the evaluations provided by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee. This statement will address the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, with regard to departmental expectations (does not meet, meets, exceeds). The faculty member meets with the Department Head to read and sign the AFE Statement. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, he/she may submit a response which indicates areas of disagreement. The faculty member will have one week in which to provide a written response to the Department Head evaluation. This response will be appended to the Department Head’s evaluation. The Department Head may reconsider the evaluation and change, amend or forward it as previously written.

d) The evaluation of the Department Head, with responses attached as appropriate, will be provided to the Dean of Arts and Sciences according to the timetable provided by that administrator.

e) Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track instructors (4.05F) – It is assumed that part-time faculty members are responsible solely for teaching. Although the AFE will be conducted during the time of annual faculty evaluation, peer review of classroom instruction will take place during each semester of teaching.

1) All part-time instructors will be evaluated by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee with regard to teaching effectiveness based on the three dimensions (as outlined in Section II.A.1. above).

2) Materials to be evaluated include
   a. a self-evaluation addressing the three dimensions of teaching—especially pedagogical content knowledge—(as outlined in Section II.A above), a statement of teaching philosophy, a description of goals, methods, and strategies used.
   b. copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials
   c. copies of peer teaching observation report
   d. Student Assessment of Instruction
3) The Department Head shall prepare a written AFE summary statement based on the AFE document assembled by the faculty member together with the evaluations provided by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee. This statement will address the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, with regard to departmental expectations (does not meet, meets, exceeds). The faculty member meets with the Department Head to read and sign the AFE Statement. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, he/she may submit a response which indicates areas of disagreement. The faculty member will have two weeks in which to provide a written response to the Department Head evaluation. This response will be appended to the Department Head’s evaluation. The Department Head may reconsider the evaluation and change, amend or forward it as previously written.

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

1. Overview – Probationary faculty will be evaluated annually. Evaluation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will normally take place at the beginning of the sixth year of service. Faculty to be considered for tenure should meet with the Department Head during the Spring Semester of the fifth year to begin organizing materials for the TPR dossier.

2. Composition of review committee (4.07D1) – An AFE/TPR peer advisory committee comprised of up to six tenured faculty (excluding the Department Head) will be formed each academic year. The members of this committee will be elected by the full-time faculty at large at the beginning of each academic year. The Department Head will Chair (non-voting) the committee.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation – The candidate list for each college is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to the deans for review. The list is finalized by the Office of the Provost in conjunction with the Dean’s office. Detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually from the Office of the Provost including the TPR schedule for when documents are due and decisions are made at the various review levels.

C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Overview – A post-tenure review is required of all tenured full-time faculty. This review will be consistent with the policies and procedures developed by the University and by the College of Arts and Sciences. This review is conducted every five years and provides an evaluation of activities of tenured faculty in order to promote and support continuing faculty development, to promote faculty vitality, and to encourage excellence in the performance of duties.

2. Composition of review committee - At least three tenured department faculty (excluding the Department Head) shall comprise the Post-Tenure review committee. The members of this committee will be appointed by the Department Head.
3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation** –
   a) The faculty member will provide the following for evaluation of performance:
      1) the four most recent Annual Faculty Evaluations (Department Head will submit annual Dean’s evaluation) along with supporting materials, including a summary of SAIs and peer reviews of teachings
      2) a current *curriculum vitae*
      3) any other relevant documents the faculty member wishes to include
   b) Faculty shall be evaluated on the basis of professional competence; conscientious discharge of duties in relation to workload; and efforts to improve performance in teaching, scholarly development, and service.
   c) Members of the evaluation committee will present written evaluations to the Department Head.
   d) The Department Head shall prepare a written summary statement based on the document assembled by the faculty member together with the evaluations provided by the post-tenure review committee. This statement will address the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, with regard to departmental expectations (does not meet, meets, exceeds). The faculty member meets with the Department Head to review the Post-Tenure Review Statement. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, he/she may submit a response which indicates areas of disagreement. This response will be appended to the Department Head’s evaluation. If appropriate, suggestions for improving or enhancing performance may be provided. In the case of review of a department head, the dean shall perform the roles assigned to the department head.
   e) 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 Anthropology and Sociology

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

1. **Teaching** – Every faculty member should meet or exceed departmental expectations in the three areas of teaching effectiveness for the year with regard to the following criteria
   a) rating of teaching materials and self-assessment of teaching by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee
   b) rating of scores on the standard SAI by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee
   c) overall rating on the peer review of instruction

2. **Scholarship** – Every faculty member should meet or exceed departmental expectations for effective scholarship for the year
   a) an assessment of scholarship will be made by the AFE/TPR peer review committee
b) to meet expectations of scholarship each faculty member should produce one unit as described in Section II.B.2. of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology Collegial Review Document
c) though not required to do so each single year, faculty must successfully demonstrate ability to produce different forms of scholarship and show progress toward fulfilling tenure and promotion expectations

3. Service – All tenured or tenure track faculty are expected to participate in service
   a) satisfactory assessment (meets or exceeds expectations) of service by the AFE/TPR peer review committee
   b) to meet expectations of service each faculty member must demonstrate performance in at least one category each year
   c) though not required to do so in a single year, faculty will be expected to serve both internal and external constituencies

4. General comments – As this is an undergraduate department, teaching stands as the most important element in each faculty member’s annual activities. Scholarly activity follows with service usually as the least significant. In any given year each faculty member will have a different mix of proportions of the three areas of assessment. Regardless, teaching should never take a secondary role to either scholarly activity or service.

B. Reappointment (4.06)

1. Teaching - Every faculty member should meet or exceed departmental expectations in the three areas of teaching effectiveness for the year with regard to the following criteria
   a) rating of teaching materials and self-assessment of teaching by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee
   b) rating of scores on the standard SAI by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee
   c) overall rating on the peer review of instruction

2. Scholarship – For the initial reappointment decision, there will be no expectation for scholarly activity beyond a plan to initiate scholarly activity. As the faculty member progresses through the probationary period, expectations will increase with regard to the breadth of scholarly activity. A satisfactory assessment (meets or exceeds expectations) of scholarship by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee is expected each year of the probationary period
   a) to meet expectations of scholarship the faculty member must show evidence of at least one form of scholarship identified in Section II.B.2. of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology Collegial Review Document
   b) this evidence must demonstrate clear progress toward the completion of a research agenda (for example the presentation of research at a professional meeting that leads toward the submission of a peer-reviewed publication)
   c) during the probationary period the faculty member must demonstrate the ability to successfully produce externally peer-reviewed scholarly work

3. Service - For the initial reappointment decision, there will be no expectation for faculty service. As the faculty member progresses through the probationary period the expectation of service will increase. The faculty member should demonstrate
performance in at least one category including some community service activities. There should be a clear pattern of service beyond the department as the faculty member approaches tenure. Following the first probationary year the faculty member should carry an appropriate share of advisees.

4. **General comments** - As this is an undergraduate department, teaching stands as the most important element in the tenure-track faculty member’s annual activities. Scholarly activity follows with service as the least significant. Scholarly activity should increase in frequency and depth as the faculty member approaches tenure. Regardless, teaching should never take a secondary role to either scholarly activity or service.

**C. Tenure (4.07)**

1. **Teaching** – The faculty member should meet departmental expectations in the three areas of teaching effectiveness for the prior four years with regard to the following:
   a) rating of teaching materials and self-assessment of teaching by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee
   b) rating of scores on the standard SAI by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee
   c) overall rating on the peer review of instruction

2. **Scholarship** - Meets or exceeds expectations of highly effective scholarship by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee for the prior four years of the probationary period. The faculty member should demonstrate a clear and consistent program of scholarly activity. To meet the scholarship expectation, faculty should accumulate six total units. At least three units must be from categories II.B.2. A, B, or C and at least one point must come from activity other than authorship of technical reports and successful grant proposals. This activity should demonstrate recognition of the faculty member’s efforts beyond the region.

3. **Service** – The faculty member should have a record of highly effective service at the department, college, and university levels as well as off-campus service or engagement activities. The faculty member should carry an appropriate share of advisees, have demonstrated competence as an advisor, and received satisfactory assessment by their advisees.

4. **General comments** – As this is an undergraduate department, teaching stands as the most important element in the tenure-track faculty member’s job expectations and evidence of highly effective teaching should carry the greatest weight in the tenure decision. Scholarly activity follows with service usually as the least significant.

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

1. **Teaching** - The faculty member should meet departmental expectations for highly effective teaching in the three areas of teaching effectiveness for the prior four years with regard to the following criteria:
   a) rating of teaching materials and self-assessment of teaching by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee
b) rating of scores on the standard SAI by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee
c) overall rating on the peer review of instruction

2. Scholarship – The faculty member should demonstrate a clear and consistent program of scholarly activity. To meet the scholarship expectation, faculty should accumulate six total units. At least three units must be from categories II.B.2. A, B, or C and some points must come from activity other than authorship of technical reports and successful grant proposals. This activity should demonstrate recognition of the faculty member’s efforts beyond the region.

3. Service – The faculty member should have a record of highly effective service at the department, college, and university levels as well as off-campus service or engagement activities. The faculty member should carry an appropriate share of advisees, have demonstrated competence as an advisor, and received satisfactory assessment by their advisees.

4. General comments – As this is an undergraduate department, teaching stands as the most important element in the tenure-track faculty member’s job expectations and evidence of highly effective teaching should carry the greatest weight in the promotion decision. Scholarly activity follows with service usually as the least significant. The faculty member should demonstrate a good balance in teaching, scholarly activity, and service.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)

1. Teaching - The faculty member should meet departmental expectations for superior teaching in the three areas of teaching effectiveness for the prior four years with regard to the following criteria
   a) rating of teaching materials and self-assessment of teaching by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee
   b) rating of scores on the standard SAI by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee
   c) overall rating on the peer review of instruction
   d) facilitating other faculty teaching through mentoring and/or pedagogical presentations and publications

2. Scholarship – The faculty member should demonstrate a superior record with a clear and consistent program of scholarly activity. To meet the scholarship expectation, faculty should accumulate six total units since promotion to Associate Professor. At least four units must be from categories II.B.2. A or B. This activity should demonstrate recognition of the faculty member’s scholarship at the national and/or international levels.

3. Service – The faculty member should have a superior record of service at the department, college, and university levels as well as off-campus service or engagement activities. The faculty member should carry an appropriate share of advisees, have demonstrated competence as an advisor, and received satisfactory assessment by their advisees.

General comments – As this is an undergraduate department, teaching stands as the most important element in the tenured faculty member’s job expectations and evidence of superior teaching should carry the greatest weight in the promotion decision. Scholarly activity follows with service usually as the least significant.
The faculty member should demonstrate a good balance in teaching, scholarly activity, and service. Activities should be commensurate with senior rank.

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Teaching - The faculty member should meet or exceed departmental expectations with regard to instruction for the prior four years with regard to the following criteria:
   a) rating of teaching materials and self-assessment of teaching by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee
   b) rating of scores on the standard SAI by the AFE/TPR peer advisory committee
   c) overall rating on the peer review of instruction

2. Scholarship – The faculty member should demonstrate a clear and consistent program of scholarly activity. An average of one unit for each year since tenure or the last post-tenure review is the general expectation.

3. Service – The faculty member should have a consistent record of service at the department, college, and university levels as well as off-campus service or engagement activities. The faculty member should carry a full share of advisees, have demonstrated competence as an advisor, and received satisfactory assessment by their advisees.

4. General comments – Expectations for scholarly activity will depend on rank.
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