

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

