

Religious Studies Department Criteria for Post Tenure Review

Submitted: 9/15/2023

Approved by the Dean's Office and Office of the Provost: 9/18/2023

In alignment with University and Board of Governors' regulations (10.003), as well as state law, all tenured faculty members in the Religious Studies Department are subjected to post-tenure review every five years. The post tenure review is an evaluation of the previous five years of employment. The review packet, which comprises the material to be reviewed, will include a narrative record of accomplishments over the previous five years prepared by the faculty member under review, the previous five years of annual performance reviews, the faculty member's CV, and the faculty member's disciplinary record (if there is any).

These guidelines for post-tenure review ensure that the faculty member will be reviewed in relation to nationally recognized standards consistent with the field as it exists at research universities. These guidelines are based on quantifiable department criteria for annual evaluation. Post-tenure review will be based on the annual assignments of the faculty member across the five-year period under review.

Rating categories for post-tenure review shall include the following:

1. Exceeds expectations: a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performances of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Performance is appreciably greater than the average college faculty member of the candidate's present rank and field at top-tier research institutions. Must have a sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
2. Meets expectations: expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Sustained record commensurate with the academic standards of a top-tier research institution; evidence of at least a satisfactory performance rating in each annual evaluation during the previous 5 years and satisfactory or greater assessment in each area of assignment; sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
3. Does not meet expectations: performance falls below the expected range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit but is capable of improvement. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during one of the previous five years without evidence of a trajectory of subsequent improvement or exhibited unsatisfactory performance in any single area of assignment over multiple years or pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies may be deemed to not meet expectations.
4. Unsatisfactory: failure to meet expectation that reflects disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance that involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in university regulations and policies. A

faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation two or more of the previous 5 years or unsatisfactory performance in two or more areas of assignment over three of the last five years of the review period may be deemed unsatisfactory. Demonstrates a consistent pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by the University or sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures.

The following criteria for post-tenure review in Religious Studies are drawn from university approved criteria for annual evaluations:

Teaching

Post-tenure review of teaching will be based on the previous five years of annual evaluations and assignments. The post-tenure review will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period. The criteria are as follows:

1. Exceeds expectations: evidence of syllabi that not only meet university guidelines but reflect courses that challenge students intellectually, stimulate their interest, and develop their skills through assessments designed to meet stated goals of the course; consistently receives teaching evaluations above departmental and college means; an absence of patterns of criticism or complaints in qualitative student evaluations of teaching.
2. Meets expectations: evidence of syllabi that not only meet university guidelines but reflect well-organized and well-conceived courses; consistently receives teaching evaluations near departmental and college means; an absence of patterns of criticism and complaints in qualitative student evaluations of teaching.
3. Does not meet expectations: evidence of syllabi with major lapses in both university guidelines and course design; some patterns of criticism or complaints in qualitative student evaluations of teaching.
4. Unsatisfactory: evidence of syllabi with major lapses in both university guidelines and course design; significant patterns of criticism or complaints in written commentary.

Research

Post-tenure review of research will be based on the previous five years of evaluations and assignments. The post-tenure review will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period.

Tenure-track faculty are expected to publish in leading presses (university or major academic or commercial) known for disseminating reputable scholarly work and in leading journals in specialties or the field as a whole. The quality of the venues in which faculty members publish, as assessed by professional disciplinary standards, is taken both as an indicator of the quality of the work and as evidence of the work's visibility within and impact on the field.

Given the variety of forms of research and publication, there are numerous ways to receive a given rating. The following criteria are extrapolated from the requirements for annual evaluation

and presuppose a research assignment of approximately 40%. Digital humanities projects as well as publications smaller than an article/chapter will be given weight in terms of an article/chapter (e.g., a large DH project might be valued at two articles while several substantial, well-placed book-reviews might count as one article). The criteria are as follows:

1. Exceeds expectations: A sole-authored book, a co-authored book, an edited book, or a co-edited, or five articles/book chapters.
2. Meets Expectations: Three articles/chapters or equivalent.
3. Does not meet expectations: One article/chapter or equivalent.
4. Unsatisfactory: No evidence of research or publications over the five-year period under review.

Service

Post-tenure review of service will be based on the previous five years of annual evaluations and assignments. The post-tenure review will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period. For reference, the following are deemed normal types of service in various categories; however, this list is not exhaustive.

Department

- Faculty Advisory Council
- Graduate Committee
- Undergraduate Committee
- Ad hoc committees

College/University

- SHUM Committees
- CAS Committees
- University Committees
- Faculty Senate
- Informal/ad hoc committees

Profession

- Journal Manuscript review
- Book Manuscript review
- External Review for tenure and promotion
- Letters of Recommendation
- Conference organization
- Conference panel organizer
- Conference panel chair
- Officer in professional organization
- Editing journal or book series

Community

- Work with public schools
- Public lecture
- Community engaged work

The criteria are as follows:

1. Exceeds expectations: At least five items of Department service plus ten other items from the above list.
2. Meets expectations: At least five items of Department service plus five other items from the above list.
3. Does not meet expectations: No departmental service plus some items from the above lists.
4. Unsatisfactory: No departmental service and no items from the above list.

The post-tenure review requires one, holistic evaluation score. This will be the weighted average according to annual assignments based on of the scores in teaching, research, and service.