

**Policy title: PROMOTION AND TENURE/CONTINUING STATUS AND PROMOTION**

**Effective: 2005-2006**

**Updated: 2018-2019**

**PRINCIPLES**

1. Every person hired into a tenure track or continuing eligible position by a department or unit in SBS is hired with the hope and intention that they will earn tenure or continuing status. Tenure and Continuing Status are functional equivalents, but they are given to jobs of different characteristics and workloads in teaching, research, and service/outreach. The College procedures for promotion and tenure (P & T) and continuing status (CS & P) are intended to ensure a fair and transparent process for all candidates.
2. It is essential that a faculty member's workload responsibilities are clearly defined at the time of hire and are reviewed prior to beginning of each academic year. An ideal time to do this is in conjunction with the annual performance review for the prior year.
3. Units in which the tenure or continuing status candidate holds an appointment and/or participates, the College, and the University all have important interests and investments in tenure or continuing status decisions.
4. Tenure or continuing status and promotion in SBS should be granted only to candidates who have demonstrated excellence in research, teaching, and service and outreach activities in accordance with their job expectations and unit level guidelines. Excellent research should have a demonstrable impact on the area of study in which it is meant to contribute and should provide evidence of attained scholarly and research distinction as well as a strong presumption of future distinction. Excellent teaching should be demonstrated by evidence of a strong motivation to engage University of Arizona students in the learning process, by the rigor and scope of the courses taught, and by student and peer evaluations of the course and instructor. Excellent service and outreach are evidenced by active engagement in disciplinary and community (both university and extramural) activities related to one's scholarship and creative activity. The only overriding criteria for granting or not granting tenure or continuing status are the quality, quantity, and impact of the candidate's research, teaching, and service/outreach and the promise of continued excellence. SBS principles follow the UA's "Inclusive View of Scholarship."
5. Granting tenure or continuing status is a decision that affects the long-term reputation and scholarship of a unit. For this reason, recommendations for or against tenure or continuing status should not be the decision of only a small number of the rank-eligible members of a unit. We expect that all rank-eligible faculty members will have the appropriate opportunity for input into the decision-making process and all reasonable efforts should be made to enable that input.

6. Candidates are entitled to a procedurally correct tenure or continuing status review. Both the department head/school director and the faculty member should have a clear understanding of the order and timing of events relating to promotion and the conferral of tenure or continuing status. A procedurally correct tenure or continuing status review is one in which:
  - a. The several steps in the tenure and continuing status processes as outlined by university, college, and unit documents and which have been conveyed to candidates have been followed.
  - b. Unit Tenure/Continuing Review peer committees and rank-eligible faculty have given a thorough, critical reading to the candidate's major work and have engaged seriously with it in their discussion.
  - c. The full scope of interdisciplinary work (whether done inter-unit or intra-unit) has been taken into account in making a recommendation for tenure or continuing status. In some units, this may mean augmenting the peer committee with intellectually aligned ad hoc faculty members.
  - d. Colleagues' discussion of the candidate's work has been conducted in professional and confidential terms.
  
7. Criteria for tenure and promotion or continuing status and promotion must be as transparent as possible.
  - a. Each department head/school director is responsible for providing new faculty upon their hire with department, college, and university guidelines and criteria. These criteria, deadlines, and a list of candidates' workload responsibilities must be made available in writing and in a timely manner to all new tenure-track or continuing-eligible appointees, and must be provided to all faculty members prior to additional promotions. Also, department heads/school directors or departmental standing advisory committees should meet with tenure-eligible or continuing-eligible faculty members at least once a year to review promotion and tenure/continuing status criteria and to answer questions. University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP) requires department heads/school directors to meet with junior faculty to discuss progress toward promotion and tenure.
  - b. These criteria must take account of the changing nature of scholarship, including interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary work and the possibilities of electronic publication, public engagement, and course development. They must enunciate clearly the importance of research, teaching and service/outreach.
  - c. Units must develop written criteria that are consistent with those of the College and address the definition of excellence with respect to disciplinary and (where appropriate) interdisciplinary standards. These criteria must be made available to all faculty.

- d. Each position to which an academic professional is appointed should have associated with it a clear description of the responsibilities and duties involved. Each academic professional should have a copy of the job description. Substantial changes in responsibilities or duties that may occur subsequent to employment should be reflected in a new position description and sent to the Dean. The job description should clearly show the distribution of effort between job duties and responsibilities, service/outreach, scholarly activities, and (if applicable) teaching and research to ensure that evaluation for continuing status or promotion will be fair and objective.
  - e. SBS Deadlines should be followed by all faculty members and made available to all faculty members by the department head/school director.
8. The candidate should be evaluated by an inclusive set of rank-eligible colleagues, who are best able to judge the substantive value of a candidate's work, and who are drawn from within the candidate's discipline. When necessary, colleagues outside the discipline may be utilized to evaluate interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary scholarship and its impact.
9. Faculty members who have a conflict of interest with the candidate must not participate in the review process. Under the NSF guidelines the UA follows to ensure impartiality, collaborators include all who have co-authored books, articles, projects, reports, abstracts, papers or grant proposals in the 60 months preceding the dossier review. Other conflicts of interest would occur in the event of significant mentoring, or in the case of an ongoing or past romantic relationship or family relationship. When the department head or school director has a conflict of interest with the candidate, that head or director should also refrain from participating in any element of the review process (e.g., generating a list of potential external reviewers, soliciting letters of evaluation from external reviewers, voting on the promotion). Rather, heads and directors in this situation are asked to notify the college of their conflict of interest as soon as possible, before the review process starts. A surrogate head or director will then be appointed by the college and this individual will perform the duties of the head or director pursuant to assembly, evaluation, and delivery of the case to the college.

## **LOGISTICS**

### **1. Putting together committees**

Units without a standing personnel committee should constitute a committee the spring prior to the tenure or continuing promotion decision. That committee should comprise scholars best suited to evaluate a candidate's work, and to the degree possible, should also be diverse with respect to gender, ethnicity, and intellectual foundations. In the event that the unit does not have sufficient and appropriate rank-eligible faculty members to constitute the committee, the unit head/school director will seek the approval of the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Inclusion in order to constitute an appropriate review committee, usually called an interdisciplinary or ad hoc committee. In some cases, the department head/school director may also seek approval to constitute an interdisciplinary committee if the work of the candidate is sufficiently broad as to warrant input from faculty members outside of the home department.

The college P&T and CS&P committees should also be diverse with respect to gender, ethnicity, and intellectual foundations. These committees are appointed by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Inclusion for a term of no longer than three years. The composition of the committee should be of five appropriate rank-eligible faculty members.

## 2. Choosing letter writers

Great care should be used when choosing letter writers. The University stipulates that both the candidate and the unit recommend external reviewers and that the candidate has the right to identify reviewers to whom the dossier should *not* be sent for review. In addition to the University of Arizona requirement that external reviewers be independent from the candidate (i.e., not have a conflict of interest as defined above, not have engaged in broad research collaboration, not have chaired or served on the candidate's dissertation committee), we recommend that the department head/school director and chair of the review committee select external reviewers who are recognized experts in the candidate's field and who are employed at peer institutions or those of higher standing in the relevant disciplines. We recommend that external reviewers be chosen on the basis of their qualifications to review the research and leadership of the candidate. Subtle questions about the boundary between knowledge of the candidate and conflict of interest may arise when selecting external reviewers. In such cases department heads/school directors are encouraged to consult with the associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Inclusion before invitations to external reviewers are extended. We recommend beginning this process early in the spring term; the later external reviewers are approached, the greater the likelihood they may be unavailable due to other commitments.

## 3. Early Review:

Tenure and continuing-eligible faculty members may be considered and recommended for tenure or continuing status during any year of service, but they must be considered no later than the sixth year of service unless a delay has been granted by the Office of the Provost.

Tenure-eligible or continuing-eligible faculty may be considered for early review for tenure/continuing status under extraordinary circumstances. If the outcome of this early review is a recommendation to deny tenure or continuing status, the faculty member or professional will not receive a terminal-year appointment immediately following the review and may reapply, without prejudice, for tenure or continuing status during the mandatory review year (usually sixth year) of tenure-eligible or continuing-eligible service. If such faculty members are still denied tenure or continuing status, they will be given a terminal year appointment.

If a candidate chooses to undergo an early review, the same criteria must apply to that candidate as if they had applied during the mandatory year. In other words, a review committee should assess a candidate's entire academic record irrespective of the year in which he or she seeks tenure or continuing status.

4. Changes to the tenure clock:

UHAP 3.3.01 (for tenure-eligible faculty) and 4A.3.01 (for continuing-eligible faculty) stipulates the circumstances under which delays may be considered, including personal reasons (birth or adoption, a faculty member's individual medical condition, or other personal reasons) and professional reasons (adverse professional circumstances, prestigious external commitments). The process for requesting delays may differ based on the circumstances leading to the delay request, and faculty members are encouraged to connect with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Inclusion with any procedural or other questions.

5. Multiple paths to tenure and continuing status and promotion.

All tenure and continuing status and promotion reviews should look at the totality of the candidate's scholarly, teaching, and service/outreach record with emphasis on current trajectory. The review should recognize that candidates come to tenure or continuing status or promotion by following multiple paths, which may result in a longer term record of scholarship to be recognized during the review.

In addition, reviews should be attentive to the University's commitment to an inclusive view of scholarship (UHAP 3.3.02.b a. for tenure, UHAP 4A.3.02.1 for continuing status). Original research in peer-reviewed publications, along with integrative and applied forms of scholarship (translational research, commercial activities, patents, community collaborations, innovative and expansive teaching and outreach), should be recognized.

6. Timetable for departments and college to follow:

- a. The department head/school director should meet with all candidates in the spring of the academic year prior to the review in order to plan the individual timetable for completion of the dossier.
- b. The department review committee should be constituted no later than May 1 in the academic year prior to the review.
- c. Letters should be requested from external reviewers no later than June 15 of the year prior to the review. Given the travel schedules of many academics, it is critical to send the dossiers out for review as early as possible. SBS recommends identifying and beginning to contact external reviewers early in the spring term prior to the review year. P&T and CS&P CVs should be submitted for review to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Inclusion prior to being sent to external reviewers.
- d. Complete dossiers are due at the Dean's Office each year no later than October 15. If October 15 of any year falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the due date will be the following Monday.

- e. College faculty affairs personnel will review each dossier for compliance with UA guidelines, internal consistency, and overall clarity, and may send dossiers back to the unit as needed. In that case, dossiers should be corrected and returned to the SBS Dean's office as quickly as possible.
- f. After thorough review, Dean's Office forwards dossiers to the college committee, ideally no later than November 1.
- g. The college review committee should provide recommendations to the Dean no later than December 15.
- h. Complete dossiers are due at the Provost's Office each year no later than January 15. A request to append additional information to the dossier should be made no later than February 1.

7. Part time tenure and continuing status:

Tenure-eligible faculty who hold less than 1.0 FTE appointments will be reviewed for tenure using the following criteria:

- a. The mandatory tenure review will normally take place during the individual's sixth year of appointment (unless the individual applies for, and receives, a delay of tenure clock for any of the reasons specified in UHAP 3.3.01(A)).
- b. Individuals will normally be expected to have taught a number of courses proportionate to the number normally expected of full-time tenure candidates in their unit, and at the same level of teaching quality expected of full-time tenure candidates. For example, a .51 appointee will be expected to have taught half the number of courses normally taught by a 1.0 appointee. Similar expectations govern the evaluation of other instructional activities, such as independent study courses and service on graduate, thesis, and dissertation committees.
- c. Individuals will normally be expected to have contributed an amount of service and outreach activities proportionate to the amount usually expected of full-time tenure candidates and consistent with FTE, and at the same level of quality expected of full-time tenure candidates.
- d. Individuals with reduced research assignments are not expected to have conducted the same amount of research and publication as that expected of full-time tenure candidates with greater time commitments to advance their research. In all reviews, assessments should be based on candidates' assigned duties as documented in their entire dossier, including impact of scholarship and teaching, outreach and engagement activities, heavy administrative duties and/or service, and other types of contributions.

- e. If individuals' FTE appointments change during their pre-tenure period, then expectations regarding the total quantity of teaching, service, and outreach will be adjusted appropriately to reflect the entire pre-tenure period.
- f. The normal expectations described above may be adjusted for good reason in individual cases, with the written approval, in advance, of the unit administrator and the dean.

## DEFINITIONS

1. Excellence: Excellence concerns quality and impact, not just quantity. Listing the activities of the candidate and counting publications or grants are not enough. The degree of originality, size of contribution, and impact in advancing thought in a field are all important. Departments may base reviews and recommendations on a selected group of the candidate's most significant contributions rather than on quantitative indicators. Candidates and departments must still provide quantitative indicators for promotion and tenure or promotion and continuing status reviews.
2. Teaching: The instructional function of the University requires faculty members who can effectively communicate the content of the current body of knowledge and the latest research results in the classroom, in other learning environments, with individual student contact and through professional modes of publication (in its widest sense, including community outreach and public pedagogy). Excellence in teaching may include, but is not limited to:
  - a. organizing and conducting courses appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
  - b. bringing to the classroom, and other learning environments, the latest discoveries, techniques and pedagogical approaches;
  - c. engaging the students, according to their capacities, in the current discourse and debates within a field;
  - d. enabling students to articulate issues and solve problems on their own;
  - e. being available outside the classroom for further instruction and advice;
  - f. when appropriate, successfully directing graduate, professional, and post-doctoral students;
  - g. when appropriate, advising and mentoring students at all levels;
  - h. when appropriate, supervising undergraduate research, honors work, independent studies.
3. Research/Creative Activity: The research function of the University requires faculty members to be actively engaged in the expansion of intellectual and creative frontiers, in the application and distribution of new knowledge, and/or in the integration of knowledge from various disciplines. Excellence in research may include, but is not limited to:

- a. a sustained program of scholarly research and publication or creative contributions;
  - b. the receipt and sustained renewal of grants, contracts, awards, and fellowships, where appropriate;
  - c. high quality as judged by independent peers both inside and outside the University; and
  - d. the responsibility and recognition achieved by being named to important professional positions.
4. Service/Outreach: Service includes service on departmental (or unit), college, and University committees; service to professional associations and on public committees where faculty disciplinary knowledge is required. Service becomes an increasingly important part of faculty members' activities as they advance through the professorial ranks. Outreach is a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching and research/creative activity. It involves delivering, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with University and unit missions. The application of one's expertise to issues in the community is encouraged and often generates research ideas and contributions. Service/outreach activities may include, but are not limited to:
- a. serving on campus committees and teams;
  - b. actively participating in faculty governance at unit, college, or university levels;
  - c. participating in activities of professional societies or organizations in one's discipline;
  - d. applying one's expertise to address local, regional, national, or global issues;
  - e. providing non-credit courses, extension programs, or short courses to governmental agencies, professional organizations, and community members;
  - f. providing clinical patient care and related work;
  - g. bringing pedagogical innovations and knowledge outside the classroom, to communities and partners through engaged public scholarship.
  - h. participating in peer review activities; and
  - i. working with local schools, agencies, commissions, and other public venues.

#### **JOINT APPOINTMENTS AND INTERDISCIPLINARY ACTIVITY**

1. Responsibility: The unit in which an individual holds a 50% FTE or greater appointment is responsible for initiating review processes unless alternate arrangements are made and approved by the dean(s) in writing. However, all units involved in a joint appointment must have the opportunity to provide input in the recruiting and evaluation process. For a faculty member with an appointment of more than 50% FTE in any one unit, the unit heads/school directors should arrange procedures appropriate to the individual case, with the concurrence of the related deans and the faculty member unless specified in the shared appointment agreement. These arrangements should be established early in candidates' appointments using the [Checklist for Shared Appointments](#) in Appendix A of the Promotion Dossier.



2. Interdisciplinary activity: If a candidate has a shared appointment, a member from the secondary unit will be included on the unit review committee. For candidates with shared appointments, department heads/school directors in all units in which the appointment is shared are expected to participate in the evaluation. Department heads/school directors may either collaborate on a single recommendation letter or submit separate recommendations. Review of the candidate should be consistent with the workload distribution in each unit. For example, a candidate whose research and service are primarily in one unit and whose teaching is in the secondary unit should have only the teaching contributions reviewed by the secondary unit.

## **CRITERIA**

In all cases candidates should be evaluated in a manner consistent with the workload assignment specified in the candidate's job description.

## **PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE OR CONTINUING STATUS**

### Research

Candidates must present evidence of having established a coherent and productive program of research or creative activity appropriate to the discipline, the standards of the College and department, and the candidate's conditions of appointment and/or service. The criterion of coherence is not meant to discourage contributions to multiple areas, but rather to encourage interrelated lines of research that establish a distinctive and recognized profile for the candidate. The research needs to have made an important contribution in the candidate's field. Published works should be of sufficient quality, impact, and quantity to establish an emerging national and possible international reputation and show clear promise of sustained contribution into the future. Candidates should involve undergraduate and graduate students, where appropriate, in collaborative research activities.

An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. The candidate's scholarly stature and achievement may be measured in the quality, impact, and quantity of publications or (in the case of creative artists) presentations/performances consistent with the candidate's field of inquiry and job expectations. Other measures may include grants, awards and fellowships, citations, presentations of research or other scholarly work, and the degree to which advanced students are attracted to work with the candidate. In all cases, candidates should participate in national and/or international meetings as a primary outlet of research presentation.

- a. Candidates' record of research must establish their independence as a scholar or creative artist and provide evidence of one or several areas of sustained coherence in research. Thus, although many junior scholars continue to do some collaborative work with a former Ph.D. or postdoctoral advisor, it is important to establish a record of growing independence from former advisors.

- b. A key determinant for quality is the significance of impact of the body of work, that is, what has this person's scholarship or creative activity done to contribute to or change the field? Has there been a social or policy impact?
- c. Candidates must present evidence of research expanded and rethought significantly beyond the dissertation. The candidate needs to have commenced and made significant progress on new projects of research, whether related or unrelated to the dissertation.

## Teaching

- a. Candidates must present evidence of successful teaching appropriate to the unit's mission, including lower division, upper division, and graduate courses (where appropriate) for units involved at these levels.
- b. Candidates should be engaged in educating individual students at the highest level of their discipline and should be directing master's and doctoral work (where appropriate and to the degree deemed appropriate by the individual unit).
- c. The teaching performance of all faculty members, regardless of their academic rank or tenure or continuing status, must be subject to evaluation. The required evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion or continuing status and promotion decisions must have two major components, peer review and student surveys.

Peer Review: Academic units must make provisions for peer review for faculty being considered for tenure and promotion or continuing status and promotion, including at least one class observation. This is to be supplemented by information from student evaluations of all their courses. Faculty peers must evaluate course objectives and syllabi, handouts, assignments and tests, which may include theses and dissertations. Peers must also assess the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter, contributions to unit teaching efforts (consistent with workload), and any other teaching contributions, such as development of new courses or innovative instructional materials, authorship of texts or laboratory manuals, or publications and presentations on discipline-specific teaching techniques. Peer review could also include assessment of student performance on certification exams (if appropriate to the discipline), survey of the extent of mentoring and participation in other activities related to instruction, or assessment of an instructor's classroom performance via personal visit or videotaping of the class. If classroom visitations are part of the assessment, we recommend that there be multiple visits to courses of different types. It is to faculty members' benefit to prepare and regularly update a teaching portfolio that contains materials that will be considered during their evaluation.

Student Surveys: We strongly recommend that prior to achieving tenure or continuing status, candidates use the university TCE forms for the student surveys. In all cases, individuals teaching general education courses will use the university approved student survey form. If both the department and candidate wish to alter that protocol after achieving promotion with tenure or continuing status, then we recommend that the department head/school director and faculty member meet with the appropriate individuals to develop such a survey. The University recognizes that student evaluations may be impacted by factors such as faculty members' ethnicity, gender, or sexual identity as well as by the type of course and other distinctive aspects of an individual course offering. Student evaluations can provide useful supplementary information on teaching effectiveness, but assessments of teaching effectiveness should primarily be based on classroom observations, reviews of teaching portfolios, and available evidence of students' learning and success.

- d. In meeting the standard of excellence in teaching, consideration should be given to a possible trajectory in teaching quality. That is, most faculty show marked improvement during their first years as they gain experience and support.

#### Service/Outreach

In addition to the public service activities usual to university faculty, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences is distinguished by a number of units with constitutive, programmatic strengths in outreach/service. Individual faculty members are expected to make contributions consistent with their job description and expectations of the individual unit. Outreach/service activities become an increasingly important aspect of the overall job description and expectations as candidates advance through the professional ranks. Candidates should have begun to develop a habit of service, that their judgments are professionally respected and valued, and that they have demonstrated the ability and an interest in finding linkages between their discipline and public interests, needs, challenges, and opportunities.

- a. Candidates must contribute to academic planning at the unit level and, perhaps, at the college and university levels, by effectively carrying out committee assignments.
- b. Candidates should participate where appropriate in local, regional, national, and international meetings, be active in professional societies, and participate in peer review activities (including but not limited to manuscript and grant review, discussion of research at professional meetings).
- c. Candidates should share their professional expertise with the public through outreach avenues such as local schools, agencies, commissions, consulting assignments, community partnerships, or panels.

## **PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR OR FULL CONTINUING STATUS**

For promotion to full level, performance of high quality should be evident in the scholarly activities specified by job description and unit mission such as teaching, research, or scholarly/creative activity, and service/outreach with excellence. The effectiveness of carrying out assigned responsibilities is to be measured by the candidate's detailed job description, including characteristics and workload. The focus of faculty members' efforts must support the responsibilities and objectives of their unit, be reflected in the job description, and must be agreed upon with the department head/school director at each annual review.

Department heads/school directors should encourage individuals to prepare for promotion to full status. It is further recommended that faculty members interested in standing for promotion to full consult with the department head/school director and/or members of the unit level promotion and tenure committee prior to beginning the promotion process.

### **Research**

Candidates must present evidence of a continuing coherent and productive program of research or creative activity appropriate to the area of knowledge production or creative activity consistent with the conditions of appointment and /or service. Published works should be of sufficient quality, impact, and quantity to have established a national and international reputation and/or a reputation with the leadership in the field of inquiry and show clear promise of sustained and significant contributions into the future. Candidates should involve undergraduate and graduate students, where appropriate, in collaborative research activities.

An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. The candidate's scientific stature and achievement may be measured in the quality and quantity of publication of research or other scholarly work or (in the case of creative artists) presentations/performances. Other measures may include receipt and sustained renewal of grants, contracts, awards and fellowships (where appropriate), citations, and the degree to which advanced students are attracted to work with the candidate. Evidence should be presented that the candidate's work or findings have had significant influence on the development of scholarly ideas, understanding or practice. Other evidence may include reprinting and/or translation of a candidate's work abroad; invitation to serve on distinguished panels and boards, etcetera. All accomplishments since promotion to tenure or continuing status should be considered irrespective of the elapsed time.

### **Teaching**

- a. The teaching performance of all faculty members, regardless of their academic rank or tenure or continuing status, must be subject to evaluation. The required evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion or continuing status and promotion decisions must have two major components, peer review and student surveys. Academic units must make provisions for peer review for faculty being considered for tenure and promotion or continuing status and promotion. This is to be supplemented by information from

student evaluations of all their courses. Faculty peers must evaluate course objectives and syllabi, handouts, assignments and tests, and theses and dissertations. Peers must also assess the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter, contributions to unit teaching efforts, and any other teaching contributions, such as development of new courses or innovative instructional materials, authorship of texts or laboratory manuals, or publications on discipline-specific teaching techniques. Peer review could also include assessment of student performance on certification exams (if appropriate to the discipline), survey of the extent of mentoring and participation in other activities related to instruction, or assessment of an instructor's classroom performance via personal visit or videotaping of the class. It is to faculty members' benefit to prepare and regularly update a teaching portfolio that contains materials that will be considered during their evaluation.

- b. Candidates must present evidence of continued high quality teaching and mentoring, in the classroom, in other learning environments, and through individual student contact, as appropriate to the unit's mission. This should include lower division, upper division, and graduate courses for units involved at these levels.
- c. Candidates should continue to be engaged in educating individual students at the highest level of their discipline and should be directing master's and doctoral work (where appropriate).
- d. Candidates should have attained a leadership role in developing unit curricula, providing evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of other faculty, and contributing to more effective unit teaching approaches.
- e. Peer Review of teaching, including at least one class observation, is expected.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness should continue to come from student evaluations, peer evaluations, advising, achievements by students, teaching grants and awards, successful innovation, selection to teach in prestigious programs here and elsewhere, and participation in faculty development activities. Faculty members are expected to continually improve their teaching by staying current with the latest developments in the discipline and with pedagogical techniques. This continued learning should be evident in candidates' leadership of curricular reforms and collaborations on teaching.

### Service/Outreach

Candidates for full professor or full continuing status must have accepted much more service responsibility than that required for lower ranks. Evidence should be provided that candidates have a habit of service and that their judgments are professionally respected and valued. An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Evidence of service/outreach may include, but is not limited to the following:

- a. Leadership in faculty governance, in mentoring of junior faculty, and in establishing academic unit and college goals, objectives and performance standards.
- b. Leadership in professional associations, on professional review panels, and in the review of journal articles, manuscripts, grants and proposals.
- c. Work with governmental and non-profit agencies that involve one's area of expertise.
- d. Presentation of community lectures or performances.