

POLICY CONCERNING FACULTY
APPOINTMENT, EVALUATIONS, AND PROMOTION

DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES
REVISED MARCH, 2008

Approved by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, April 2008

Qualification for appointment at various ranks are consistent with policies of the University and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Similarly, the procedures outlined in this document are governed by and consistent with College and University policies, even if their details are not repeated here. All parties involved should be aware of College and University policies within which specific policies of the Department are placed.

A. SPECIFIC QUALIFICATIONS FOR EACH RANK

The criteria below are those of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, *with some additions in italic specific to the Department of Religious Studies*. These criteria are consistent with and more specific than the qualifications for rank specified in the University's *Operations Manual* (III-10.4, <http://www.uiowa.edu/~our/opmanual/iii/10.htm#104>), which should also be consulted.

1. **Assistant Professor.** Faculty members appointed to the rank of assistant professor are ordinarily expected:

- a. to hold the doctorate or other terminal degree in the discipline or to present equivalent training and experience as appropriate to the particular appointment;
- b. to show promise in teaching;
- c. to have begun a promising program of research or creative professional work consistent with eventual promotion to associate professor.

2. **Associate Professor.** Faculty members are expected to have served at the rank of assistant professor for a period of time sufficient to have established a record of teaching, scholarly or creative work, and service that meets the criteria below and shows unmistakable promise of promotion to full professor. Most faculty members in the College serve a probationary period of six years.

Faculty promoted or appointed to the rank of associate professor are ordinarily expected:

- a. to hold the doctorate or other terminal degree of the discipline or to have equivalent training and experience as appropriate to the particular appointment;
- b. to have an acknowledged record of success in undergraduate and graduate teaching, including successful direction of doctoral and/or master's candidates, as applicable.
- c. to have national recognition for a productive program of research, scholarship, or creative work, supported by substantial, significant publication (or the equivalent) of high quality

The Department of Religious Studies requires candidates to present a substantial and published work of scholarship, ordinarily a book based upon a dissertation. The candidate's scholarship must exhibit notable skills in research and independent thinking. In exceptional circumstances, the tenured faculty may agree to consider a set of published articles which embodies a coherent program of research and interpretation. The Department also requires evidence that the candidate's scholarly productivity is ongoing and that he/she is embarked upon a second major project. In every case, separate articles published in refereed journals are a valued auxiliary to the major work.

d. to have participated in the professional activities of the discipline, in ways other than teaching and research; and

e. to have established an appropriate record of departmental service.

3. **Professor.** Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to have established a record since promotion to associate professor that demonstrates a pattern of sustained development and substantial growth in achievement and productivity in the areas of teaching; of research, scholarship and creative work; and of service.

Faculty promoted or appointed to the rank of professor are ordinarily expected

a. to hold the doctorate or other terminal degree of the discipline or to have equivalent training and experience appropriate to the particular appointment;

b. to have an acknowledged record of continued success in undergraduate and graduate teaching, including continued successful direction of doctoral candidates to the completion of their degree programs;

c. to have sustained unmistakable national recognition and, where applicable, to have achieved international recognition for a productive program of research, scholarship, or creative work of high quality;

In the Department of Religious Studies, ordinarily the evidence will take the form of a second published book and additional articles. In every case, the work must exhibit a scholarly maturity and make a noteworthy contribution to the candidate's disciplinary area(s).

d. to have a substantial and sustained record of effective service to the department, the institution, and the profession.

B. RECRUITMENT AND APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

The following procedures are used by the Department of Religious Studies for recruitment and appointment at all ranks.

When the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences has authorized a new tenure-track faculty search, a search committee consisting of three faculty members and a non-voting graduate student representative appointed by the DEO. In the case of joint appointments, the composition of the search committee will be determined by agreement with the other unit involved and with the College.

The search committee must carefully review the information on tenure-track searches on the College's website (<http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/recruitment/index.shtml>) and in the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity *Recruitment Manual*, (<http://www.uiowa.edu/~eod/searches/index.html>). The College expects departments to provide recent data on the availability of qualified women and minorities.

A Recruitment Plan (Form A) is submitted to the office of the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences, where it will be reviewed before forwarding the Office of Provost and the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity. The College requires that the recruitment plan incorporate techniques to attract a candidate pool high in quality and diverse in gender and ethnicity. The recruitment ad must prominently include language such as the following:

The Department and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences are strongly committed to gender and ethnic diversity; the strategic plans of the University, College and Department reflect this commitment. Women and members of underrepresented minorities are especially encouraged to apply. The University of Iowa is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer.

The search committee advertises the position through professional meeting announcements, journals, and by letters to department heads where the desired specialty is taught. Care is taken to follow federal, state, and University Equal Opportunity and Diversity procedures. Approval of the Dean's Office, the University Equal Opportunity and Diversity office, and the Office of the Provost must be obtained before any job offer is made.

After careful screening of the applicants, the search committee submits a Pre-interview Audit recommending that one or more of the candidates (ordinarily three) be invited to The University of Iowa for an interview. After College approval for the Pre-interview Audit, candidates will be invited for an on-campus interview. The person being interviewed meets interested parties, including the faculty of the Department of Religious Studies, deans in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and when appropriate in the Graduate College. The candidate will be expected to show evidence of teaching ability and to make a scholarly presentation in a form determined by the search committee.

In the case of senior appointments, the search committee will take care to make explicit judgments about the teaching effectiveness and the accomplishments of the candidate in research and publication. Copies of the candidate's work and the candidate's c.v. must be made available to the faculty prior to the interview.

In addition, if the appointment is at a senior rank the search committee will recommend to the faculty whether or not the appointment should be made with tenure. If the recommendation is that the appointment be made without tenure, the committee will recommend a period of probationary appointment, which may not exceed three years.

The faculty of the Department of Religious Studies then determines by majority vote whether a recommendation should be made to the Dean of the College to offer a contract to the candidate. The DEO honors the decision of the faculty or explains the reasons for disagreement. The DEO presents the Department's recommendation to the Dean of the College, carefully presenting the faculty majority's view as well as his/her own, if their disagreement is not resolved.

All appointments to the faculty of the Department of Religious Studies are made by the Iowa State Board of Regents on the recommendation of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Provost, and the President of the University.

C. PERIODIC REVIEWS

1. Probationary Faculty Reviews

In accordance with University policy, probationary faculty are reviewed annually. These reviews follow the procedures laid out by the University and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, as described on the For Faculty page of the College's website at http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/review/annual_rvw.shtml. (Please also note the special procedures for third-year reappointment reviews, at http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/review/annual_rvw.shtml#thirdyear and see section D. 1.a, below.)

The review is done by the tenured faculty of the Department, and the results of the review form the basis for a meeting between the faculty member and the DEO in which the results of the review are given in writing to the faculty member under review. For the most part, reviews are carried out by the faculty Review Committee.

In the Department of Religious Studies, records examined in probationary reviews other than the third year review (in addition to an updated CV) are as follows:

a. Teaching. The DEO and members of the Review Committee (**i.e.**, all tenured faculty) inspect course outlines and syllabi, attend classes, and review student evaluations of teaching. The Review Committee will designate a minimum of one and a maximum of three of its members to observe the classroom presentation on at least one occasion. Peer evaluations of teaching will also be sought from faculty who have had the opportunity to collaborate with a probationary faculty member in classroom teaching. Here and elsewhere in the document where it is a question of faculty evaluation of teaching it is understood that a written evaluation will be placed in the review file.

b. The DEO will request from the probationary faculty member information on research currently underway and the prospects for substantial publication.

c. Service given by the probationary faculty member to the Department, the College, the University, and the profession will also be evaluated.

The third-year review results in an assessment of the candidate's progress toward an eventual successful tenure review. It also results in a decision on reappointment of faculty for a second, three-year probationary contract. The reviews follow the procedures laid out by the University and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, as described at http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/review/annual_rvw.shtml#thirdyear. These procedures parallel, with some exceptions, the UI/CLAS Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Decision-making (http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/promotion_tenure/index2.shtml).

2. Tenured Faculty Reviews

In addition to the annual review of faculty for purposes of preparing salary recommendations (conducted by the DEO), each tenured associate professor and each tenured professor will be reviewed every five years, the DEO excepted. These reviews will follow the College's Procedures for Tenured Faculty Review (http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/review/tenured_fac_rvw.shtml) and will apply the College's Standards for Tenured Faculty (<http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/review/TenFacStandards.pdf>) and the Department's

Standards for Tenured Faculty (see Appendix A: Department of Religious Studies Standards for Tenured Faculty Review).

In the Department of Religious Studies, the Review Committee consists of all the tenured faculty. Under the College's Procedures for Tenured Faculty Review, in a standard review the DEO may participate as a member of the review committee. In an extended review the DEO may not be a member of the review committee. The DEO will appoint one person to chair the review committee, prepare the necessary documentation, and present it to the whole committee. This same person will prepare a draft report for the committee to rework and approve. The committee will evaluate teaching effectiveness, research, and service. This will be done according to the guidelines established below for each of these activities.

The faculty being reviewed will submit the following to the review committee:

- a. A curriculum vitae
- b. A brief report on research, teaching, and service activities since the last review, as well as a plan for future work.
- c. Student perceptions of teaching and/or other forms of student evaluation of teaching; information about new courses introduced since the last review or scheduled to be introduced in the near future, and an account of how these courses meet curricular needs.
- d. A minimum of one and a maximum of three class sessions must be observed as a part of each peer evaluation of teaching.
- e. Other material deemed appropriate by the faculty member under review or requested by the DEO or review committee chair.

The purpose of this review is to strengthen the work of the faculty member and to inform recommendations of merit pay increases, outstanding teacher awards, teaching assignments, semester assignments, and leaves of absence.

The committee will submit its report to the DEO. He/she may append comments. The report, and the DEO's comments, will be made available to the faculty member under review. He/she is entitled to write a response. The report, along with whatever comment or response that it has generated, will be sent to the Dean of the College.

3. Timetable for Periodic Reviews:

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| October-November: | DEO gets notification of faculty to be reviewed. |
| November-December: | DEO appoints a tenured faculty member to chair the Review Committee. |
| December-January: | Faculty member provides materials needed for the review. |
| January-February: | Committee members observe classes and review materials. |
| February-March: | Committee meets to discuss review and formulate report; committee submits report to DEO. |
| March: | Report and DEO's comments given to faculty member; DEO meets with faculty member; materials sent to Dean of the College by a deadline established annually by the College. |

4. Faculty Rights and Appeal

A faculty member who has been reviewed shall have the right to respond in writing to the letter of the DEO or to the report of the review committee.

- Probationary faculty have the right to respond in writing to the DEO when the report of the annual review of the Probationary Faculty Review Committee is forwarded to the Dean.
- In a tenured faculty review, the faculty member has the right to respond in writing to the DEO when the report of the annual review of the Probationary Faculty Review Committee is forwarded to the Dean. In extended tenured faculty reviews, the faculty member also has the right to respond to the “DEO's Summary of Actions to Be Taken as a Result of the Tenured Faculty Review.” The DEO forwards a copy of the written faculty response to the Dean.

All the materials from the review process (including his/her written responses) will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. In accordance with University policy (See *Operations Manual*, 20:330), a faculty member shall have the right of access to his or her own personnel files, wherever they are maintained. The faculty member may have access to letters and other material written in an explanation of confidence after the means of identification have been removed. Requests for access to personnel files should be made to the DEO.

D. REVIEW FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

1. Description of the Process

a. Reappointment

The reappointment review (i.e., the third-year probationary review) results in an assessment of the candidate's progress toward an eventual successful tenure review. It also results in a decision on reappointment of faculty for a second, three-year probationary contract.

Reappointment reviews follow the procedures laid out by the University and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, as described at http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/review/annual_rvw.shtml#thirdyear. These procedures parallel, with some exceptions, the UI/CLAS Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Decision-making (http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/promotion_tenure/index2.shtml).

- 1) The review for reappointment of probationary faculty member takes place in the final year of the initial three-year contract, on the timeframe indicated in C.4, above, with the review record due to the Office of the Dean by a deadline in March established annually by the College

Reviews for reappointment are carried out by tenured members of the faculty superior in rank to the person being considered. In the case of a non-tenured faculty member appointed at the rank of professor, the tenured professors carry out the review.

b. Promotion and/or Tenure

The promotion and tenure (P&T) process follows the CLAS/UI Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Decision-making, available on the College's website at http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/promotion_tenure/index.shtml.

Candidates for promotion and tenure and members of the Departmental Consulting Group must thoroughly familiarize themselves with these procedures. The Procedures include a timeline and summary of the process, at http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/promotion_tenure/timeline.shtml

The review committee in reviews for tenure in the Department of Religious Studies includes all tenured faculty except the DEO, acting as a committee of the whole. The review committee in reviews for promotion to the rank of associate professor includes all tenured faculty holding the rank of associate professor or full professor except the DEO. The review committee in reviews for promotion to the rank of professor includes all faculty holding the rank of professor except the DEO. The chair of the Review Committee is appointed by the DEO and presides over the committee meetings. The DEO is in attendance.

2. Professional Activities to be Evaluated

a. Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness

The prime requisites for effective teaching are intellectual competence, integrity, and independence; a willingness to consider suggestions and to cooperate in teaching activities; a spirit of scholarly inquiry which leads the professor to develop and strengthen the content of courses in the light of developments in the field and to improve methods of presenting material; a vital interest in teaching and working with students and, above all, the ability to stimulate their intellectual interest and enthusiasm. The quality of teaching is admittedly difficult to evaluate.

The following evidences of teaching effectiveness will be considered, though not all will be pertinent or of equal weight in every case:

- 1) Faculty evaluation of the objectives, methods and materials of courses that have been designed by the individual.
 - a) Course content indicates he/she is informed of new developments in the specialty and related fields.
 - b) Relevant and fair procedures are used to evaluate student performance.
- 2) Student and peer evaluation of the in-class performance of the individual.
 - a) Standardized evaluation instruments developed by the University, college and/or department provide evidence of improvement or ongoing effectiveness of teaching as perceived by students.
 - b) Evaluations of teaching effectiveness from former students and present advisees are not solicited. If submitted, such unsolicited evaluations may not be considered part of the evaluation process.
 - c) In reviews which require the faculty member to submit a personal statement on teaching, it must show evidence of a teaching philosophy.
 - d) Individual develops new courses.
 - e) Individual indicates the relationship of the subject matter of the course to other areas within the program.
- 3) Evaluation of teaching effectiveness by faculty who have taught with the individual or have observed classes taught by the individual. The Review Committee will designate a minimum of two and a maximum of three of its

members to observe one classroom presentation. Members of the Review Committee are expected to notify the faculty member at least one day in advance of that class. Video observation is not a part of teaching evaluation.

- a) Rapport with students is good to excellent.
 - b) Relevant methods of teaching subject matter are employed and evidence of improving them discernible over time.
- 4) Evaluation concerning the performance of students taught by the individual whenever possible and appropriate.
- a) Departmental courses taught by the individual which are prerequisite for other departmental courses provide proper and adequate preparation of students.
 - b) Departmental courses for non-majors provide proper introduction to the subject matter.
- 5) Evaluation of design of courses and programs and innovations in teaching that influence teaching outside the classroom.
- a) Publications of prepared notes, elementary level textbooks and other educational materials that are recognized by colleagues and peers as a worthwhile contribution to the discipline.
 - b) Invited presentations or workshops which are the result of reputation as an effective teacher.
- 6) Faculty evaluation of effective advising of undergraduate students based on student input or other relevant evidence.
- a) Knowledge of departmental and University requirements is evident.
 - b) Availability and accessibility to students is good to excellent.
- 7) Evaluation by faculty of effectiveness in directing or serving on graduate student research committees and in directing undergraduates in honors courses, tutorials, or essays.
- a) Candidate provides critical evaluation of thesis projects.
 - b) Candidate demonstrates a willingness to encourage and support creative or scholarly thesis projects.

b. Aspects of Evaluating Research

In the Department of Religious Studies, publication in media of quality is expected as evidence of scholarly interest pursued independently of supervision or direction. Quality of publication is considered more important than mere quantity. Significant evidence of scholarly merit may be either in a single work of book length or in a series of studies constituting a program of significant research. The candidate is expected to be pursuing a defined program of continuing research.

Excellence in research and publication will be required for a recommendation of promotion or tenure. Refereed, juried and invited work will carry more weight than non-refereed work. For each entry under this section, the faculty member should indicate whether work is refereed or juried (local, regional, or national), invited, or non-refereed. Materials should be organized into the following categories with full citations given for each:

- 1) Books
- 2) Chapters in books
- 3) Monographs
- 4) Journal articles

- 5) Published book reviews and reviews of others' creative work
- 6) Published reviews of candidate's work
- 7) Published abstracts or proceedings
- 8) Awards or commissions resulting from competitive peer reviews
- 9) Presentations at state, regional, national, or international meetings
- 10) Invited lectures, seminars or scholar-in-residence
- 11) Grants obtained in open competition

Judgments about material prepared to aid classroom teaching, such as introductory textbooks, should be included under evaluation of teaching. Work intended as a new synthesis of knowledge or of methodologies in a field and which may serve as advanced textbooks, should be evaluated with scholarly activities.

Listed below are additional criteria used in determining "quality" which will be considered in evaluating scholarship:

- 1) Originality of the study
- 2) Actual or likely impact of the work as indicated by reviews, citations, or other evidences
- 3) Difficulty or complexity of the subject matter
- 4) Thoroughness of analysis
- 5) Scope and depth of the subjects covered
- 6) Clarity of expression

c. Aspects of Evaluating Service

From time to time a faculty member is called upon to render major services to the University, the profession, or to society in general. Each person considered for tenure or promotion is expected to have participated in the staff meetings and the committee work of the Department of Religious Studies and to have taken responsible professional roles in the University and the general community. There is no standard pattern. Each person must find the role that he or she can do best in working collegially to promote the betterment of the Department and its programs, a responsibility that belongs to the entire staff.

Administrators and colleagues in a field must be able to make and support a judgment about the educational or scholarly value of the services rendered by a colleague. The weight to be accorded a particular professional contribution is a function of such factors as the following:

- 1) Its value to the Department, College, University, profession, and society.
- 2) The quality of the work.
- 3) The extent to which the experience contributes to a candidate's development as a teacher and/or scholar.

Evidence of service could be organized into the following categories:

- 1) Department, Collegiate, and University service:
 - committees (indicate if chair)
 - administrative
 - other
- 2) Professional service:
 - journal editing, reviewing journal articles, reviewing grant proposals,
 - serving on accrediting agencies or boards, public or governmental service,
 - receipt of honors and awards from serving on a committee of a professional organization,

- adviser to student organizations
 - contributing to professional growth development of junior colleagues
 - serving on professional/technical committees serving as an expert witness
 - other
- 3) Community Service
- guest lectures
 - preparation of material for paraprofessionals
 - other

Timetable:

The UI/CLAS Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Decision-making include a timeline and summary of the process, at

http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/promotion_tenure/timeline.shtml

3. Faculty Rights And Appeal

Faculty members reviewed for reappointment, promotion, or tenure have the right to file a response at specified stages of their reviews.

- CLAS/UI Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Decision-making, available on the College's website at http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/promotion_tenure/index.shtml, allow for the candidate to respond in writing at several stages in the process (see the timeline at http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/promotion_tenure/timeline.shtml).
- In third year probationary reviews (contract renewal reviews) the candidate has the right to respond within five days of receiving the review report and within five days of receiving a negative recommendation from the DEO (see the procedures at http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/review/annual_rvw.shtml.)

APPENDIX A
Department of Religious Studies
Standards for Tenured Faculty Review
Approved by CLAS, March 10, 2004

The following document establishes standards for assessment of tenured faculty (both associate and full professors) in the three central areas of teaching, service, and research. These standards are effective both for annual review for the purpose of recommending merit increases for salary and for five-year peer reviews of faculty performance. Standards will be applied to each faculty member according to the PTEA percentages. Standards apply both to Associate Professors and Full Professors, unless explicit distinctions are drawn.

In each of the following areas—teaching, service, and research—the DEO and at least one other senior faculty member (in the case of yearly assessments for salary increment) or peer review committee (in the case of five-year reviews) will make assessments of the performance of faculty members. The assessments will minimally include rating the performance as either “excellent,” “acceptable,” or “deficient” in the areas specified under each heading. As part of the review, the DEO will write a letter to the faculty member explaining any “deficient” ratings and outlining suggestions to improve them. The faculty member may reply in writing to the DEO. Collegiate policies and procedures for appeals apply.

I. Assessment of Teaching

The department expects both associate professors and full professors to show evidence that they are effective teachers whose courses play a significant role in the department, are well organized and delivered, are appropriate in size and level of instruction, and receive positive evaluations by the students. In addition, the department expects both associate and full professors to work conscientiously with advisees at various levels of learning as well as to serve effectively on student’s committees. Assessments of teaching will point out perceived strengths and needs for improvement with reference to the following areas.

A. Evidence of Effective Teaching

- All faculty members will distribute and submit **syllabi** for their courses. Every semester, the DEO will call for current syllabi to keep on file. Syllabi may also be available on the departmental webpage. The department expects that syllabi meet all collegiate standards in clarity and delivering essential information about the course. The department will assess course syllabi to determine whether faculty members are meeting the departmental expectation to update and improve their courses on a regular basis.

All faculty members will administer and submit **teaching evaluations** for their courses. Faculty members are expected to administer the departmental evaluations at the end of the semester. The faculty member will describe the evaluation process and then leave the classroom. A designated student should

collect evaluations in a single envelope with the name and number of course and the name of the instructor. The student should bring the completed evaluations to the departmental office, where the secretary will gather them for all the courses. If ACE forms are used, the secretary will send the evaluations to the Evaluation and Examination Service for scoring. Once scored, the evaluations will be returned to the department to be made available to the DEO. The DEO will copy the printout pages or summary notes to retain on file. If personal forms are used, the secretary will file the forms for the DEO. As soon as possible, the DEO will return the evaluations to the faculty members.

The department expects that teaching evaluations will reflect a generally positive experience by students in the course, and that faculty members will take seriously the constructive criticisms of students where they have merit.

- Where appropriate (e.g., the five-year review), peer faculty will **observe teaching** in the classroom. Arrangements will be made in advance so as to disturb the class as little as possible. The department expects that faculty members exhibit clear communication of important information in an organized way. The department also expects that the faculty member creates a classroom atmosphere that is conducive to learning and the free exchange of ideas relevant to the course content.
- All faculty members will serve as **advisers** to undergraduate and (where appropriate) graduate students. The department will keep lists of advisees, which it will make available at the time of review. The department expects that faculty advisers will be accessible to students according to clearly disseminated office hours (at least three per week), and that advisers give accurate and helpful information to students.

B. Standards to Apply for Assessing Collected Evidence

- **Contribution to Departmental Curriculum.** Courses will be evaluated with regard to their role in the departmental curriculum: Is the faculty member teaching courses that fit appropriately into the structure of the undergraduate major or graduate programs of the department?
- **Enrollments.** Enrollments should be appropriate to the role of the course in the curriculum. Individual faculty enrollments will be considered in relation to collegiate target numbers (90 students per year minimum): Is the faculty member teaching an appropriate number of students, given the role of her or his courses within the curriculum?
- **Quality of Course Content.** The syllabi will be examined for quality in presenting course content through thematic coherence, methods of examinations, writing assignments, speaking assignments, and reading assignments. Does the syllabus reflect an acceptable level of organization of material? Does the syllabus show knowledge of the material?

- **Quality of Evaluations.** Student evaluations give one measure of teaching. Do the evaluations reflect a positive assessment of communication skills, organization and mastery of content, and methods of examining students?
- **Updating of Courses:** Faculty members are expected to update existing courses where appropriate. Are courses, which purport to deliver current scholarship on issues, updated regularly and appropriately?
- **Developing New Courses.** Given needed changes in the curriculum, does the faculty member develop new courses to fit curricular needs or to expand the curriculum in desirable directions?
- **Advising Undergraduates.** All faculty members are expected to advise undergraduate students. Is the faculty member advising a fair number of students? Is the quality of advising acceptable?
- **Directing Honors Theses.** Faculty members are expected to work with honors students when possible and desirable. Does the faculty member attract honors students and advise them on their theses in proper proportion?
- **Advising Graduate Students.** Most faculty members serve as advisers for graduate students working under them in their areas of scholarly emphasis. Does the faculty member have an appropriate number of advisees, given the specific field of study? Are advisees well served by the advising they receive?
- **Serving on graduate thesis and dissertation committees.** Faculty members are expected to work with graduate students who request their participation on thesis and dissertation committees. Does the faculty member participate on committees as invited? Does the faculty member do an appropriate amount of work on thesis and dissertation committees? Is the student well served by the faculty member's participation?
- **Directing doctoral dissertations or master's theses.** Faculty members are expected to direct graduate students who fall under the faculty member's area of expertise and who are assigned to the faculty member as primary adviser. Does the faculty member accept responsibility for such supervision? Does the faculty member successfully and effectively supervise student work at the level of writing doctoral dissertations or master's theses?

II. Assessment of Scholarship

The department expects that associate professors exhibit continued scholarly growth beyond the level of expectation for tenure and promotion from assistant professor. Associate professors are expected to make progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor through scholarly achievements as measured by a record of publications and public presentations. Full professors are expected to maintain high

quality scholarship, as evident in publication, public presentations, and special honors or achievements.

A. Collected Evidence of Scholarship

- **Publications**
All tenured faculty members with a research component to their PTEA dossier are expected to pursue an active research program leading to publications. Faculty members are expected both to maintain a current curriculum vita with full information concerning published work and to provide the DEO with copies of published work during the assessment period. Publications will be assessed according to type—e.g., primary authorship of book or monograph, co-authorship of book or monograph, edited book or monograph with or without introduction or commentaries, contributed chapters to edited books, articles in journals, etc.
- **Scholarly Conferences**
All tenured faculty members with a research component to their PTEA dossier are expected to participate in scholarly conferences within their professional fields. Faculty members are expected both to update their curriculum vitae with information about participation at scholarly conferences and to provide the DEO with a program or other notice concerning the conference. Participation at scholarly conferences will be assessed according to quality and scope of the conference, as well as according to the role of the faculty member within the conference (e.g., plenary address, lecture with respondents, membership on panel, respondent, role in organization of conference, etc.).

B. Standards for Assessing Collected Evidence

- **Quality of Publication within its Type**
The DEO and at least one other appointed full professor or peer review committee will review and assess the published work of all faculty members, according to departmental policies and procedures. In the spring, the DEO will call for updates to faculty cv's and for offprints or copies of published materials. Judgments will be made about the quality of the research as well as the quality of the venue for its publication, and the basis of these judgments will be made known to the faculty members. Ordinarily, the DEO will have a point system by which to recognize the kind of publications, the number of publications, and their quality. The DEO is expected to discuss the system with the faculty at an open meeting. Reviews of work accepted for publication by presses, and reviews of published work by peers in journals, are valuable and helpful in assessing research and should be made available to the DEO. Both associate professors and full professors are expected to seek out the highest quality venues for their published work—i.e., venues of international or national reputation and recognition, which invite, referee, and commission work by notable scholars in the fields.
- **Quality of Scholarly Conference and the Role within It**
The DEO and appointed faculty colleague or review committee will assess the quality of participation at scholarly conferences as well. Both associate

professors and full professors are expected to maintain a record of active conference participation as presenters, organizers, and administrators of scholarly groups.

- **Acquisition of Resources to Support Scholarly Work**
Grants, fellowships, and scholarships to support scholarly work, are themselves evidence of quality in scholarship. Faculty members are expected to apply for such resources whenever it is feasible and desirable. In assessing faculty performance, applications as well as received awards will be taken into consideration.
- **Honors and Awards**
Peer recognition of scholarship in the form of internal or external honors and awards are important measures of accomplishment.

III. Assessment of Service

All tenured faculty members are expected to contribute to the service of the department, college, university, and profession. Associate professors are expected to assume higher levels of service than they were assigned as assistant professors. Full professors are expected to provide leadership in service areas.

A. Evidence of Service

- **Departmental Service**
All tenured faculty members are expected to perform duties in committee assignments, as specified by the DEO. All tenured faculty members are expected to attend departmental colloquia and departmental-sponsored events, whenever possible. All tenured faculty members are expected to attend faculty meetings as scheduled whenever possible.
- **Collegiate and University Service**
All tenured faculty members are expected to accept committee assignments or special appointments from the college or university.
- **Professional Service**
Associate professors are expected to establish a record of professional service. Professional service includes such assignments as editorial boards for publishers or journals, officers in scholarly organizations, conference organizers, referees for tenure decisions at other universities, referees for departmental reviews, referees for manuscripts under consideration for publication, and the like. Full professors are expected to be highly active and visible in the profession.
- **Service to the Community**
Service to the community by tenured faculty members is always appreciated.

B. Standards for Assessing Service

- Departmental, Collegiate, and University Service
All tenured faculty members are expected to meet the standard of willing, consistent, helpful service to the department, the college, and the university.
- Professional Service
All tenured faculty members are expected to meet the standard of willing, consistent, helpful service to the profession.