



Policy title: PROMOTION AND TENURE/CONTINUING STATUS AND PROMOTION

Effective: AY 2005-06

Updated: 2018-2019; September 20, 2020; July 2025

PRINCIPLES

1. Promotion and Tenure/Continuing Status and Promotion in SBS

All faculty hired into a tenure-track or continuing status-eligible positions in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) are 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 and promotion (CS&P) are intended to ensure a fair and transparent process for all candidates.

2. Workload

It is essential that a faculty member's workload responsibilities are clearly defined at the time of hire and are reviewed prior to the beginning of each academic year. An ideal time to do this is in conjunction with the annual performance review for the prior year.

3. Eligibility

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.

Research excellence 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.

Teaching excellence 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, by student and peer evaluations of the course and instructor, and other methods of evaluating teaching.

Service and Outreach excellence 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 University of Arizona's (UA) view of [publicly engaged scholarship](#).

4. Shared Responsibility in the Promotion Decision

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.

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.

5. Procedural Integrity

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, which have been conveyed to candidates and have been followed.
- b. Unit Tenure/Continuing Review peer committees and rank-eligible faculty have been 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.

6. Transparency

Criteria for tenure and promotion or continuing status and promotion must be as transparent as possible.

- 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 unit-level 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.
- 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. These criteria must enunciate clearly the importance of research, teaching and service/outreach.
- 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.



- 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.
- SBS deadlines should be followed by all faculty members and made available to all faculty members by the department head/school director.

7. Evaluation

The candidate should be evaluated by 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.

8. Conflicts of Interest

Faculty members who have a conflict of interest (COI) with the candidate must not participate in the review process. Under the National Science Foundation (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 COI 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 COI 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 COI 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. Review Committees

Units without a standing personnel committee should constitute a committee the Spring prior to the tenure or continuing promotion decision. This committee should include scholars best suited to evaluate the candidate's work, and to the extent possible, represent relevant intellectual foundations. If the unit does not have sufficient and appropriate rank-eligible faculty members to form the committee, the unit head/director will seek the approval of the dean in order to constitute an appropriate interdisciplinary or ad hoc committee. Similarly, if a candidate's work is sufficiently broad or interdisciplinary, the unit head/director may seek approval to form a committee that includes faculty outside the home department to ensure comprehensive evaluation.



At the college level, the Promotion & Tenure (P&T) and Continuing Status& Promotion (CS&P) committees should also be representative of the wide array of intellectual and disciplinary backgrounds in the college's units. These committees are appointed by the dean for a term of no longer than three years. The college has two subcommittees: one handling assistant to associate professor promotions and tenure cases, and the other reviewing promotions from associate to full professor. Each subcommittee is composed of at least five rank-eligible faculty members and strives to represent the college's disciplinary breadth. In years with a large number of promotion cases, the dean may appoint a larger committee to facilitate thorough review. Each subcommittee is chaired by one or two co-chairs.

The CS&P committee, given the smaller number of continuing-eligible and continuing status faculty, includes at least three rank-eligible members. It oversees continuing status and promotion cases for faculty on appropriate tracks.

2. Selecting External Evaluators

Great care should be used when choosing external evaluators. 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 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), SBS recommends that the unit head/director or 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, unit heads/directors are encouraged to consult with SBS Faculty Affairs 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 and Mandatory Reviews

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 (see "Changes to the tenure clock", below)

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 the candidate 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 SBS Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Advancement with any procedural or other questions.

5. **Multiple Paths to Tenure, Continuing Status & 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 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 publicly engaged scholarship ([UHAP 3.3.02.B](#) 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. **Typical Review Timeline**

Spring (Academic Year Prior to Review)

- Unit head/director should meet with candidates to plan the individual process for completion of the dossier.
- Unit review committee should be constituted
- Letters should be requested from external reviewers no later than March. Given the travel schedules and commitments of many academics, it is critical to send dossiers out 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 must be submitted for review to SBS Faculty Affairs before being sent to external reviewers.

August of Review Year:

- External Reviewer letters due

September:

- Dossiers released to and reviewed by unit committee
- Rank-eligible faculty vote (if required per unit bylaws)

By October 15:

- Head/director letter completed and email notification of recommendation is sent to candidate.



- Complete dossiers are due at the Dean's Office each year by October 15. If October 15 falls on a weekend, the due date moves to the following Monday.
- The SBS Assistant Director of Administration and Faculty Affairs will review each dossier for compliance with UA guidelines, internal consistency, and clarity. Dossiers may be returned to the unit for correction and must be resubmitted promptly

Between October 15 and November 1:

- After unit review, the Dean's Office forwards dossiers to the college committee for review. The college review committee should provide their recommendations to the dean no later than December 15.

Mid-to-Late January:

- Complete dossiers are due at the Provost's Office. Any requests to append additional information must be made no later than February 1.
- Dean notifies candidate of recommendation via email.
- Cases are sent by the Dean's Office for University Committee Review.

April/May:

- Final decision from Provost is released

7. Considerations for Part-time tenure and continuing status promotion

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 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.

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.

COLLEGE DEFINITIONS AND CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

DEFINITIONS

1. **Excellence:**
Excellence concerns the quality and impact of a faculty member's work, not just its quantity. Listing the activities of the candidate and counting publications or grants is not sufficient. The degree of originality, size of contribution, and influence on advancing thought in a field are all important. Units 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:
 - organizing and conducting courses appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
 - bringing to the classroom, and other learning environments, the latest discoveries, techniques and pedagogical approaches;



- engaging the students, according to their capacities, in the current discourse and debates within a field;
 - enabling students to articulate issues and solve problems on their own;
 - being available outside the classroom for further instruction and advice;
 - when appropriate, successfully directing graduate, professional, and post-doctoral students;
 - when appropriate, advising and mentoring students at all levels;
 - 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 sustained program of scholarly research and publication or creative contributions;
 - the receipt and sustained renewal of grants, contracts, awards, and fellowships, where appropriate;
 - high quality as judged by independent peers both inside and outside the University; and
 - 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, college 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:
- serving on campus committees and teams;
 - actively participating in faculty governance at unit, college, or university levels;
 - participating in activities of professional societies or organizations in one's discipline;
 - applying one's expertise to address local, regional, national, or global issues;
 - providing non-credit courses, extension programs, or short courses to governmental agencies, professional organizations, and community members;
 - providing clinical patient care and related work;
 - bringing pedagogical innovations and knowledge outside the classroom, to communities and partners through engaged public scholarship.
 - participating in peer review activities; and
 - working with local schools, agencies, commissions, and other public venues.



CRITERIA

In all cases candidates should be evaluated in a manner consistent with the workload assignment specified in their 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 academic unit, 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 must demonstrate an important contribution in the candidate's field.

Published works should be of sufficient quality, impact, and quantity to establish an emerging national, and possibly 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 research 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, for creative artists, presentations/performances consistent with the candidate's field of inquiry and position expectations. Additional indicators may include grants, awards and fellowships, citations, presentations of research or other scholarly work, and the extent to which advanced students are attracted to work with the candidate. Participation in national or international meetings/conferences as a primary outlet of research presentation is expected.

Demonstrating Scholarly Independence:

- 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. While some early-career scholars continue collaborative work with former Ph.D. or postdoctoral advisors, it is important that the candidate demonstrates growing independence from former mentors.
- A key determinant of quality is the significance of impact of the body of work. Candidates must provide evidence of how their scholarship or creative activity have contributed to or changed the field, including, where applicable, demonstrated social or policy impact.
- Candidates must present evidence of research expanded and evolved significantly beyond the dissertation. The candidate should have initiated and advanced progress on new research projects, whether related or unrelated to the dissertation.

Teaching

Candidates must present evidence of successful teaching appropriate to the unit's mission, including lower-division, upper-division, and graduate instruction (for units involved at these levels).



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).

The teaching performance of all faculty members must be evaluated, regardless of their academic rank or tenure or continuing status. 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 visits 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 forms for student surveys. In all cases, individuals teaching general education courses will use the university approved student survey form. If both the unit and candidate wish to alter that protocol after achieving promotion with tenure or continuing status, then we recommend that the head/director and faculty member meet with the appropriate individuals to develop such a survey. The university recognizes that student evaluations may be impacted by numerous factors, including 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.

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 SBS 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.



- Candidates must contribute to academic planning at the unit level and, perhaps, at the college and university levels, by effectively carrying out committee assignments.
- 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).
- 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 unit head/director at each annual review.

Heads/directors should encourage and support faculty in preparing for promotion to full status. It is further recommended that faculty members interested in candidacy for full promotion consult with their head/director and/or members of the unit-level promotion and tenure committee prior to initiating the review 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 expectations. 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. The work should show clear promise of sustained and significant contributions into the future.

Candidates should involve undergraduate and graduate students, where appropriate, in collaborative research or creative activities.

As with promotion to the associate level, evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers is a key measure of quality. 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, etc. *Per university policy, only the most recent 10 years in rank may be included as reported service on the CV.*



Teaching

Teaching performance is subject to evaluation at all ranks, regardless of academic rank or tenure or continuing status. 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.

- 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.
- 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).
- 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.
- 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 and must remain current in both disciplinary knowledge and pedagogical practice. 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 demonstrate a sustained and substantially increased level of service than required for lower ranks. Evidence should show that the candidate has 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:

- Leadership in faculty governance, mentoring of junior faculty, and helping to establish unit and college goals, objectives and performance standards.



- Leadership in professional associations, on professional review panels, and in the review of journal articles, manuscripts, grants and proposals.
- Work with governmental and non-profit agencies that involve one's area of expertise.
- Presentation of community lectures or performance.