



UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA WILMINGTON

Philosophy & Religion

Policies Manual

Revision History

Original Document: March 23, 1993
Revised October 31, 1997 [Faculty Workload]
Revised November 1997 [Faculty Workload]
Formulated October 23, 1998 [Post Tenure Review]
Revised September 17, 1999 [Travel Funds Allocation]
Revised November 2000 [Mission Statement of the Department of Philosophy and Religion]
Revised December 2000
Revised September 2001
Revised January 18, 2002 [Outcome of Post Tenure Review, Due Process in Post Tenure Review & Chair Recruitment]
Revised April 2004 [Travel Funds Policy]
Revised March 2006 [Process for Faculty RTP Applications, Process for Chairperson's RTP Process & Mentoring Policy]
Revised January 2007 [External Review Policy & Mentoring Policy]
Revised March 2007 [Tenure and Promotion Expectations]
Revised October 2007 [Tenure and Promotion Expectations – Teaching]

Table of Contents

Mission Statement of the Department of Philosophy and Religion.....	4
Guidelines for Faculty Professional Development in the Department	4
Introduction.....	4
Tenure and Promotion Expectations.....	5
Teaching.....	5
Research Accomplishments	6
Service	7
Scholarship and Professional Development	9
Process for faculty RTP applications.....	9
Process for chairperson’s RTP process.....	10
External Review Policy	11
Mentoring Policy	11
Peer Evaluation	12
Guidelines and Procedures.....	12
Composition of the Evaluation Committee.....	12
The Basis for Evaluation.....	13
Criteria for Evaluations.....	13
Method for Evaluations	14
Philosophy and Religion Chairperson	14
Job Description and Responsibilities.....	14
Term of Office	14
Organization.....	14
Communication.....	14
Personnel.....	15
Chair Recruitment.....	15-16
Assistant Chair	17
Hiring Procedures for Tenure Track Positions	17
Senior Members	18
Travel Funds Policy	18
Faculty Workload.....	18
Definition	19
Workload Parameters.....	19
Teaching Activities	19
Research Accomplishment.....	19
Service	19
Scholarship.....	20
Faculty Reassignment Procedures	20
Post Tenure Review Policy.....	20
Procedure for Post Tenure Review	20
Criteria for Post Tenure Review	21
Outcomes of Post Tenure Review.....	22
Due Process in Post Tenure Review	23
Format for the Post Tenure Review Document	23
<i>Appendix A</i> Format for a Faculty Member’s Annual Report to the Chair	24-25

Appendix B Format for Classroom Evaluation of Teaching 26
Appendix C Format for Post Tenure Review Document 27

Mission Statement of the Department of Philosophy and Religion

[Revised, November 2000]

The Department of Philosophy and Religion shares the university's commitment to excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. A constituent of the College of Arts and Sciences, the department supports the university's mission to ground all of its students in the humanities by providing a quality undergraduate education taught by a student-centered faculty who consider their scholarship, research, and service to be essential to effective teaching. It seeks to foster philosophy and the study of religions and to encourage a critical appreciation of the deepest issues of human experience of the past and present, in our own culture and globally. It plays a vital role in the University's effort to stimulate intellectual curiosity, imagination, rational thinking, and thoughtful expression in its students and in the community.

The Department of Philosophy and Religion strives to maintain a diverse faculty who excel in traditional modes of teaching, research, and service but who are also engaged in innovative approaches to teaching and scholarship. The department has been committed since its inception to internationalization of the curriculum, to community and regional service, and to university-wide and interdisciplinary programs, and it supports the university's resolution to make technology an integral part of all of its activities.

In all it undertakes, UNCW's Department of Philosophy and Religion reaffirms the values espoused by the University and the College: diversity, an international perspective, community citizenship, and the pursuit and communication of knowledge as integral to being human.

Guidelines for Faculty Professional Development in the Department of Philosophy and Religion

1. Introduction

Faculty professional development is viewed partly in terms of such quantifiable factors as degrees earned, years of service to UNCW, student evaluations of teaching, research productivity, professional service, and reports of scholarly activity. It is also observed in intangible qualitative factors which are difficult to measure quantitatively, such as intellectual curiosity, creativity, enthusiasm, interest in helping students and the ability to motivate them, teaching effectiveness, and cooperative, harmonious relationships with colleagues. Comprehensive evaluations of faculty therefore must use subjective as well as objective measures.

Faculty professional development is its own reward and is the basis for decisions made with regard to the reward system of the University, which includes merit salary increases, tenure, and promotion to higher academic rank. The department seeks to provide professional support to faculty, to the extent that resources allow, in the form of clerical help, computer access, and support for professional travel and scholastic supplies.

Faculty professional development assumes that senior faculty will provide leadership by example and by assistance to junior faculty. However, the final responsibility for faculty achievement rests with each individual faculty member.

2. Tenure and Promotion Expectations

[Revised March, 2007]

The following departmental guidelines are designed to supplement the Faculty Handbook guidelines. Those guidelines are available in the Faculty Handbook.

- Teaching

[Revised October, 2007]

The primary mission of UNCW's College of Arts and Sciences is teaching its students. Therefore, teaching effectiveness is the primary criterion for tenure and promotion in the College. Faculty must be well-trained, knowledgeable, skillful, and enthusiastic presenters of knowledge. Teaching involves not only the transmission of knowledge, but also the development of the students' desire for knowledge, of the skills for acquiring knowledge and for critical evaluation, and of the attributes that enable students to assume responsible positions in society.

Teaching involves all aspects of the educative process both inside and outside the classroom. In addition to formal instruction in courses, teaching activities include direct involvement with and instruction of students outside the classroom setting in such contexts as honors projects, field work, independent study, thesis advising, student research and individual academic assistance. PAR instructors are expected to be present in all classes for which they have not been excused for professional reasons or which they must miss due to illness or some other extenuating circumstance. In PAR classes other than logic or language classes, some form of written work, e.g. essay exam questions or assigned essays, is expected to be part of the evaluation method, rather than using only multiple choice, T/F or short fill-in-the-blank answer tests for evaluation. (Typically there will be a difference between lower and upper division classes in this regard, but some student writing, to be determined by the instructor, is appropriate for lower level classes too.)

Excellent teaching also requires time and effort every semester for review, revision and development of effective course materials, format, and presentation to ensure rigor, range and depth of coverage of subject matter and the effective evaluation of student progress.

Teaching content and performance shall be formally evaluated from a variety of perspectives, including course evaluations by students and peer evaluation of teaching performance and course materials such as syllabi, tests, sample assignments, and course handouts. Teaching-related activities outside the classroom setting and other evidence of teaching competence shall also be considered. Such evidence might include evaluations by alumni and the accomplishments of students who have worked closely with a faculty member. Candidates may invite members of the department to visit their classes as part of the tenure and promotion process.

For Permanent Tenure

[Revised June, 2006]

The award of tenure is based primarily on teaching effectiveness. Evidence of teaching effectiveness will include the following: acceptance of teaching assignments to meet departmental program needs; preparation for and meeting assigned classes; keeping office hours and being available to students; evidence of course development and revision to remain current in the discipline; student evaluations which reflect a stimulating and informative classroom environment; evidence of rigor, range and depth of coverage of the subject matter and in evaluation of student progress; and indications of supportive and fair behavior in relationships with students. When a faculty member who has served two years or longer at the rank of assistant professor is recommended for permanent tenure, he/she will also be recommended for promotion. Accordingly, when there is a recommendation for conferral of tenure but at the rank of assistant professor, the recommendation will explain the special or unusual circumstances for not also recommending promotion.

For Promotion to Associate Professor

For promotion to the rank of associate professor, a faculty member is expected to demonstrate the ability to communicate ideas and knowledge effectively in different contexts, which might include large and small classes; lecture, seminar and directed individual study; instruction at both the introductory and advanced level. In addition to the criteria for tenure described above, evaluation at this level will include evidence of skills and commitment to counseling or advising students as well as involvement in teaching activities beyond the formal classroom setting.

For Promotion to Professor

Teaching excellence is expected for promotion to the rank of professor. It is expected that such excellence will be reflected in teaching performance and content and in teaching activities outside the classroom. Teaching excellence can also be demonstrated by the sharing of teaching skills through such activities as the mentoring of junior faculty, attendance and presentations at teaching workshops, and papers on teaching models and techniques.

- **Research Accomplishments**

Research accomplishments are defined as original investigative or creative activities in one's academic discipline that advance the field of knowledge and which enrich society and contribute to the quality of teaching. Research accomplishment may appear in a variety of forms including books, book chapters, articles, reports, software, external grants for the production of original work, and papers presented at professional meetings, particularly when these products are subject to professional review by peers in one's own disciplinary/methodological field.

Professional research is important not as a mere addition to teaching as another criterion of professional development, but because the profession of teaching at the university level depends for its legitimacy upon the claim to expertise in a field of knowledge. Professional research provides the basis for the acquisition and preservation of such knowledge. Peer review of research offers the most objective means available to justify the claim to possess such knowledge, and thus to teach at the university level.

A continuous history of activity is more important in determining a faculty member's contributions than is a short period of intensive activity. A faculty member's research accomplishments will be evaluated for vitality, integrity, originality, and overall quality. This work may have either basic (pure) or applied significance.

For Permanent Tenure

Although the award of tenure is based primarily on teaching effectiveness, it is expected that faculty being considered for tenure will be able to demonstrate original work in progress and evidence of research as appropriate to the individual discipline. While we are reluctant as a department to set absolute quantitative standards of research achievement for tenure, it is expected that anyone tenured within the Philosophy and Religion Department will publish or have accepted for publication at least one article within a refereed professional journal/edited book of his/her field prior to the tenure decision, and be engaged in a research program promising further achievement.

For Promotion to Associate Professor

For promotion to the rank of associate professor, a faculty member is expected to have received some successful external review of original work. Here again, while we recognize the potentially overriding significance of qualitative measures for research achievement, it is expected that anyone promoted to associate professor within the Philosophy and Religion Department will publish or have accepted for publication several significant articles within refereed professional journals/edited books of his/her field prior to the tenure decision, and be engaged in a research program promising further achievements.

For Promotion to Professor

For promotion to the rank of full professor, a faculty member is expected to demonstrate a tangible record of professionally-reviewed substantial contributions to one's discipline. Although a candidate for the rank of professor is usually expected to present more tangible evidence of accomplishment than that expected at the associate professor rank, the difference in research expectations for a full professor is not solely quantitative. Greater quality, maturity, significance and originality of research accomplishment are expected at this rank. It is expected that anyone promoted to professor within the Philosophy and Religion Department will publish or have accepted for publication, subsequent to promotion to/or appointment as associate professor, a significant book-length monograph or comparable accomplishment within refereed professional journals/edited books of his/her field, and be engaged in a research program promising further achievements.

- **Service**

Service responsibilities of faculty are defined as formal and informal professional activities on behalf of the faculty member's department, College, University, profession

and the community at large. Expectations regarding service contributions increase as a faculty member's career progresses.

For Permanent Tenure

Service is essential for gaining permanent tenure, but no candidate should be so committed to service activities that inadequate time has been devoted to teaching and research achievement. It is possible for a very strong teaching record and research achievement to compensate for a weak service record; however, it is not possible for an especially strong service record to compensate for a record of weak teaching or weak research accomplishments.

Although service is accorded the least weight in the tenure evaluation, it is nevertheless an important component of the candidate's professional commitment. A smoothly functioning department, college and university depend upon individuals giving their time and energy to a wide variety of committees and other service activities. This service is also a means of learning about the department, the College, the University and the profession as a collegial process. Therefore, a reasonable record of departmental, College and University service is expected of any faculty member under consideration for tenure. There is no precise way to define "reasonable" because different committees and tasks require significantly different amounts of time and effort, but a candidate for tenure is expected to have established a solid record of effective involvement in this area. The quality rather than the quantity of service is of primary importance.

It is expected that most of the faculty member's early service contributions will be at the department level. During subsequent years, the faculty member should strive to make service contributions to the College and University as a whole, and eventually to the profession and to the community at large. Examples of such contributions may include but are not limited to the following.

- Department: department committee participation as specified by department policies; administrative duties; special assignments from the chair; and student advising. Active participation in department meetings and programs is expected of all faculty.
- College: participation in College-level committees and assignments.
- University: participation in University-level committees and assignments.
- Profession: participation in service functions to professional organizations, such as committee work and leadership, review of grant proposals, and manuscript review and editing for professional journals.
- Community: participation in local, regional, national or international community activities directly related to the faculty member's profession, such as lectures and presentations designed for the general public, news media interviews, and professional advice to nonprofit agencies.

For Promotion to Associate Professor

The criteria for promotion to associate professor include those for permanent tenure. In addition, the candidate must show evidence of growth in the service areas described above.

For Promotion to Professor

The criteria for promotion to the rank of professor include those for promotion to associate professor. In addition, the candidate must show evidence of leadership in the various service areas described above.

3. Scholarship and Professional Development

Scholarship and professional development are continuing expectations of every faculty member. They are defined as activities that maintain and enhance a faculty member's professional competence. It is understood that all faculty are expected to engage in individual study, such as reading the literature in one's field. Scholarship is continuing education throughout the faculty member's professional life and is demonstrated by the ability to organize, synthesize and evaluate effectively the work of others in such activities as department seminars and colloquia. Professional development includes advanced study as shown by attendance at and participation in formal course work, workshops and seminars. The manifestations of scholarship and professional development may be seen in published critical reviews of the work of others and in edited papers and books, but will be reflected primarily in growth and improvement in teaching, research accomplishments, and service contributions.

4. Process for faculty RTP applications

[Revised March 2006, in accord with the UNCW Faculty Senate approved proposals]

Candidates for promotion and tenure decisions will announce their intentions to the chairperson of the department no later than March 1 of the year prior to when they intend to go up for the decision. They will present their dossier to the chair no later than August 1. The chair will make the dossiers available to senior members of the department by August 15.

Except in the case of an RTP application of a department chairperson, recommendations for reappointment, tenure or promotion are initiated by the department chairperson after consultation with the assembled senior faculty of the department. The chairperson, prior to writing an evaluation, must assemble, consult with, and take an advisory vote of the senior faculty. Along with writing a detailed evaluation of the candidate, the chairperson must report the numerical results of the vote and state the chairperson's recommendation for or against the RTP action. At least five business days prior to forwarding the candidate's dossier to the dean, the chairperson must notify the senior faculty, by written or electronic means, whether the recommendation is for or against the action. If a majority of the department's senior faculty disagrees with the recommendation of the chairperson, they have the option to submit a separate elaborated recommendation. Only one such recommendation from senior faculty may be submitted, and it must be signed by a majority of the department's senior faculty. The chairperson's recommendation and separate senior faculty recommendation, if any, are forwarded as part of the faculty member's RTP dossier.

Neither the faculty member nor any person related to or having a romantic relationship with the faculty member may deliberate or recommend on the RTP action. Other persons

may recuse themselves if they believe their relationship with the faculty member prevents them from fair and objective consideration of the application.

The faculty member's RTP dossier consists of the application, supporting documentation, and the recommendations of the deliberate entities. Dossiers are evaluated and recommendations are made in the following sequence: (1) the Philosophy and Religion chairperson and Senior Faculty; (2) the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; (3) the UNCW faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (CRTP); (4) the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; (5) The Chancellor; (6) the Board of Trustees. Prior to evaluation by the CRTP, the dean transmits all materials to Academic Affairs, which is responsible for ascertaining that the applications are complete, that the required format has been used, and that dossiers are present for all faculty mandated for review. Academic Affairs then transmits copies of the dossiers to the CRTP.

All recommendations, whether positive or negative, are forwarded to the next deliberative entity. However, if the majority vote of the Senior Faculty and the recommendations of both the Chairperson and the Dean are all negative, the process stops and the faculty member's RTP application is denied. The faculty member may withdraw the application at any state in the process. The chairperson and dean must elaborate the reasons for their recommendations, but subsequent deliberative entities may forward their recommendations with or without elaboration, except that any negative recommendation that follows a positive recommendation at the previous level must be elaborated. The chairperson, dean and provost must each transmit written notification of their recommendations to the faculty member within ten business days of the recommendation. All such communications become part of the candidate's RTP dossier and are available to subsequent deliberative entities in the process.

5. Process for Chairperson's RTP Process

[Revised March, 2006]

The Philosophy and Religion Department policy for the chairperson's RTP process follows the guidelines approved by the UNCW Faculty Senate in 2004, namely that applications for tenure or promotion of the department chairperson follow the same process as for other faculty, except that the recommendation is initiated by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences after consultation with the assembled senior faculty of the department. The dean must report the numerical results of the senior-faculty vote along with the dean's recommendation. A majority of the department's senior Faculty may, at their option, submit a separate elaborated recommendation, according to the procedure stated above. Recommendations, whether positive or negative, then follow the same rout as for other faculty. However, if the majority vote of the senior faculty and the recommendation of the dean are negative, the process stops and the chairperson's RTP application is denied.

6. External Review Policy

[Revised January, 2007]

In accordance with the changes in RPT policy mandated by the Faculty Senate, while the Department does not normally utilize external reviews, the department's senior faculty

may, by majority vote, request them in individual cases. In addition, the candidate may request departmental solicitation of external reviews.

The department policy shall include the following guidelines for the solicitation and use of external reviews:

- three reviews will be sought, solicited by the chair of the department senior faculty committee evaluating the RPT candidate.
- if the senior faculty request the reviews, they shall consist of senior faculty in the discipline of the candidate (Philosophy or Religious Studies, respectively), and shall be chosen from a list of no more than three potential reviewers submitted by the candidate and no more than three potential reviewers submitted by members of the senior faculty, with the three to be selected voted upon by the senior faculty and including at least one of the potential reviewers submitted by the candidate.
- reviewers are to be advised of University and Departmental RPT guidelines as indicated in the Department Manual and in the UNCW Faculty Handbook, and are to be provided with a c.v. of the candidate.
- external reviews will play a secondary role in the RPT process, and shall be used primarily in those situations where the senior faculty determine that the research qualifications of the candidate cannot be sufficiently evaluated without the additional information that would be provided by external reviews, or where the candidate requests them.
- the external review process shall occur in a timely manner consistent with evaluation deadlines. In particular, if candidates intend to request reviews, they shall indicate this to the chair no later than March 1 of the year before they intend to go up for tenure or promotion.
- anonymity of reviewers is essential in assuring candid reviews, and reviewers shall be asked to submit a cover letter identifying themselves, their affiliation, and any personal or professional connection to the candidate, and shall be requested that their reviews contain no information identifying themselves.
- senior faculty and others making decisions on the candidacy shall have access to both the reviewers' identities and evaluations, but only the content of the reviews shall be made available to the candidate.

7. Mentoring Policy

[Revised March, 2006]

The Philosophy and Religion Department recognizes the value of mentoring tenure track junior faculty, as part of the process of academic growth and development. The chairperson of the department will assign, in the first semester the faculty member is at UNCW, a mentor from the senior faculty in that person's academic discipline, whether it is Philosophy or Religious Studies. The mentor will advise the junior faculty member on academic policy and other matters, involving orientation to the department and the university, or refer the faculty member to the chairperson or the appropriate source for questions they cannot answer. If the mentor relationship becomes unsatisfactory to either partner, they will inform the chair and a new mentor will be assigned.

[Revised January, 2007]

In accordance with the changes in RPT policy passed by the Faculty Senate, the department chairperson will annually provide senior faculty with a summary of the

assessments that the chairperson has given to the junior faculty of their progress toward tenure and promotion.

Peer Evaluation

1. Guidelines and Procedures

Peer evaluation in the Department of Philosophy and Religion takes place during every spring semester. The purposes of the evaluations are:

- to help in complying with the suggestions of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Accreditation Committee that UNCW needs stronger evaluation procedures for its faculty;
- to assist the chairperson in making his or her annual report to the Dean;
- to provide members of the department with an opportunity to showcase their activities and accomplishments for the year.

The evaluations are made on the basis of three general areas, Teaching, Research, and Service, and correspondingly consist of three separate numerical scores. Each of these general areas are broken down into more specific categories explained below.

The evaluation committee makes its decisions for each department member available to that individual and presents all of its decisions to the Chairperson. In the evaluation of the Chairperson, as a member of the department, the results shall be forwarded to the Dean as well as to the Chairperson.

2. Composition of the Evaluation Committee

The peer evaluations are conducted by a committee consisting of four members. The committee is selected on the basis of several criteria. Efforts shall be made to reflect the diversity of the department. Ideally the committee should consist of two members from philosophy and two members from religion. The committee should also be comprised of department members representing different academic ranks.

The four members of the committee are appointed by the chairperson. The terms of service will be for one or two years. The chairperson should try to rotate the appointments such that each year the committee will consist of two new members and two veteran members (i.e., those who served the previous year). No one should serve for more than three consecutive years unless this is approved by a unanimous vote of the other department members.

The chairperson is ineligible to serve on the Peer Evaluation Committee. Further, no individual committee member is eligible to evaluate him/herself. Therefore, in four cases each year, evaluations are carried out by a committee of three.

3. The Basis for Evaluation

In an effort to preserve each department member's time and minimize excess paperwork, the primary document for Peer Evaluation is each individual's Annual Report to the

Chair. If the department member wishes to fill out a different questionnaire, that is acceptable; however, an effort should be made to be as thorough as possible.

In addition, supporting documentary evidence, such as books, journals, off prints of articles, acceptance letters, supplementary student evaluations, thank-you notes, etc., should be included. These will be promptly returned by the Committee.

Each department member should submit a brief (approximately one-page) self-evaluation, assessing his or her own accomplishments for the past year and plans for the upcoming year. The self-evaluation should also include a numerical score for teaching, research, and service, as described below.

Presenting one's report to the committee is an opportunity to demonstrate one's contributions in teaching, research, and service. Those who fail to submit any questionnaire, materials, or self-evaluation to the committee are evaluated nonetheless. It is thus in the interests of each department member to cooperate in this departmental effort and to make his or her case to the evaluation committee.

Evaluations are made on the basis of written materials. If a department member requests a personal meeting with the evaluation committee, efforts will be made to set up a mutually convenient appointment.

4. Criteria for Evaluations

The format for the Annual Report to the Chair provides a guideline for the criteria involved in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. (The format for the annual report is appendix A of this document.)

- For instance, under Teaching, one submits representative syllabi, exams, other pertinent course materials, and evidence of other activities relevant to teaching.
- Under Research, one includes all scholarly publications such as books, refereed journal articles, chapters in books, as well as papers presented at professional meetings, works in progress, grants, and evidence of other activities relevant to research.
- Under Service, one includes service to the university (e.g., committee assignments, faculty senate, sponsorship of student organizations); professional service (e.g., memberships, conferences attended, offices held); community service (e.g., public lectures, media presentations, and participation in civic affairs or educational events). It would be helpful to the evaluation committee to know approximately how much of the department member's time each of these service listings requires.

5. Method for Evaluations

The evaluation committee rates each department member in each of three categories using a *four-item* scale. In addition, the committee should also include a written evaluation or explanation of the numerical rating. The scale to be used is the following.

“NA” **Not Applicable** (This rating should be given, for example, when leave of absence, special research grant, or some other circumstance precludes service, or frees the department member from teaching assignments.)

“1” **Below Average** (This rating should be given when teaching or research is below department standards or when no appropriate service was done.)

“2” **Good** (This rating should be given when efforts are considered appropriate to the individual's professional development, that is, when they are within the parameters of the ‘departmental average.’)

“3” **Excellent** (This rating should be given when efforts are considered to be noteworthy, or outstanding.)

Philosophy and Religion Chairperson

1. Job Description and Responsibilities

The chairperson of the Department of Philosophy and Religion serves the departmental faculty as a leader, organizer, and facilitator, acts as the department’s representative to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and other administrators, and administers the programs and supervises the staff of the department.

2. Term of Office

The chair of the Department of Philosophy and Religion serves for a term of three years, which may be renewed. The term begins July 1 following appointment by the Dean. [See the section on selection process below.]

3. Organization

- The chair must be aware of and attentive to departmental and university deadlines.
- The chair is responsible for developing and maintaining—with the advice and consent of the departmental faculty—departmental objectives, long-term planning, and on-going evaluation procedures.
- The chair is to administer the department budget in such a way that the instructional and research needs of individual faculty are balanced with departmental needs.
- The chair is to prepare departmental schedules and teaching assignments in such a manner that both the needs of individual faculty and the needs of the department as a whole are balanced.
- The chair is to schedule departmental meetings in a timely manner and to lead them efficiently and democratically.

4. Communication

- The chair should be accessible to faculty, staff, and students.
- The chair should provide leadership within the department, but with sensitivity to the wishes and needs of its various programs and disciplines.

- The chair should facilitate communication among departmental faculty, staff, and students, working to resolve conflicts if they appear.
- The chair represents the department to the college and the university administration, and should advocate the collective wishes of the department to the administration.
- The chair is responsible for relaying information and directives from the administration to the entire department. The chair should also attempt to keep the faculty informed of opportunities for curriculum development and research support.
- The chair is responsible for providing reports and recommendations requested by the college or the university, but should solicit input from department faculty on such reports and recommendations, as well as on hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions.

5. Personnel

1. The chair is responsible for coordinating evaluation of teaching, research, and service within the department.
2. The chair is responsible for hiring, supervising, and evaluating departmental staff and student workers.
3. The chair is responsible for submitting recommendations to the dean on hiring, promotion, tenure, and reappointment, and on merit pay increase in accordance with departmental and university guidelines.

6. Chair Recruitment

[Revised January, 2002]

The chairperson of the Department of Philosophy and Religion is appointed for a renewable three-year term by the Chancellor on the recommendation of the Provost and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, after consultation with the department.

Qualifications required in a chairperson ordinarily include:

- tenure and associate or full professor rank;
- at least three years of full-time service at UNCW (for internal candidates);
- evidence of effectiveness in teaching, a continuing pattern of achievement in research, regular professional service, and active professional development;
- leadership ability;
- administrative skills.

In the spring semester prior to a current chair's last year of service, the Dean will consult with the department's faculty regarding the option for a national search for the chair's replacement. That option is determined primarily by the availability of salary resources and a new position to support the outside hire. Should those resources be available and no other factors preclude an external search, the department will decide whether or not a national search is appropriate.

A national search is conducted according to the CAS Policy on Chair Recruitment (I-2-3-3 of the College of Arts and Sciences policy manual).

If an internal search is undertaken, the Dean will invite all tenured associate and full professors in the department to apply formally for the chair's position. All applicants should submit the following application materials: (1) a statement of administrative philosophy, (2) a summary of the applicant's research, (3) evidence of teaching effectiveness, (4) a curriculum vitae, and (5) a statement of the applicant's vision for the department's future. The inclusion of external references (or a list of references' names, addresses, and telephone numbers) is optional.

The Dean will appoint a senior faculty member to serve as the coordinator of the internal search. The internal search will begin in the first department meeting (that is, at least by the middle of September) of the Fall term of the third year of the existing chairperson's term. All eligible candidates within the department should indicate their interest in being considered. Each candidate will then have one week to submit the application materials to the coordinator of the internal search. Copies of the vision statements and the curriculum vitae must be distributed to all Philosophy and Religion faculty members at least two weeks in advance of the meeting at which a vote is to be taken.

Voting will be by secret ballot, with the winner receiving a simple majority of those voting. Only tenured faculty and those in tenure-track positions (but not on visiting appointments) are eligible to vote. Faculty eligible to vote may cast absentee ballots by indicating (normally in writing) their wishes to the internal search coordinator. (Faculty overseas may cast an absentee ballot via telephone.) The department's decision will then be relayed to the Dean, although faculty members will also be invited to send their own individual assessments directly to the Dean.

Should the Dean approve the department's recommendation, the Dean will recommend the applicant to the Provost for approval. Should the Dean discover during the internal search process problems that threaten the preferred applicant's potential effectiveness as the next chair, the Dean will follow the CAS Policy on Chair Recruitment (I-2-3-3) to address these problems.

If the current chair wishes to renew for an additional term, the chair should notify the Dean. The Dean will solicit the advice of the department faculty determining the renewal. Should sufficient opposition to the renewal exist within the department, the procedures for the normal search (external or internal) will apply and the current chair can participate as a candidate for the position.

7. Assistant Chair

An assistant chair—who will chair meetings and otherwise perform the duties of the chair in the chair's absence—should be selected by the chair.

The duties of the assistant chair are those designated to that person by the chairperson with the advice and consent of the faculty of the department.

Hiring Procedures for Tenure Track Positions

The Department of Philosophy and Religion is subject to and abides by all federal and state regulations, all University of North Carolina policies, and all UNCW policies and procedures concerning employment. The following points of procedure are designed to supplement such institutional procedures at the departmental level.

- The chair is responsible for coordinating the hiring process with the university compliance officer and the office of the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.
- The chair is responsible for recommending appropriate members of the search committee to the Dean. The chair, working with the committee, prepares an announcement describing the position. The announcement will be published according to institutional guidelines.
- The committee receives and reviews all applications for the position. The committee submits to the chair of the department the names of candidates which it judges suitable for interview.
- If possible, a member or members of the committee will ordinarily interview candidates at professional meetings (e.g., APA, AAR).
- The committee recommends to the chair not less than three finalists to be brought to the campus for final interviews.
- Prior to the campus interviews, the dossiers of candidates are made available for faculty review in the departmental office.
- The campus interview includes at least a teaching demonstration, a seminar with faculty and students, and an interview session with the members of the department.
- After all candidates have been interviewed on campus; the chair will convene a meeting of the department to discuss the candidates and to arrive at a hiring recommendation.
- The chair is responsible for final action at the departmental level and for submitting a recommendation to the dean.

Senior Members

Senior members in the Philosophy and Religion department will be those individuals who are tenured at the Associate Professor or Professor rank. The responsibilities of the senior members include consulting with the Chair in the evaluation of candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In those cases in which the candidate is applying for promotion to the rank of Professor, only those members who are of the rank of Professor shall consult with the chair.

Travel Funds Policy

[Revised April, 2004]

The Philosophy and Religion Department recognizes the importance of faculty professional development and encourages its full-time members to participate in relevant professional meetings and conferences. Funding for such professional development shall be allocated with priority given to the following levels of participation, ranked in order of decreasing priority:

- (1) service to the department and/or the university (such as interviewing job candidates),
- (2) delivering a paper or a formal paper length written response to a paper or group of papers,
- (3) taking an active part in a pre-organized panel,
- (4) service to the profession, e.g., as an elected officer taking an active role in business meetings, as an organizer of a panel, seminar, or session,
- (5) delivering informal responses to paper(s),
- (6) participation in an ongoing seminar (i.e., a formally organized group, but one larger than a four or five person panel)
- (7) presiding at a session [introducing speakers],
- (8) attendance without formal participation.

In case of insufficient funds to support the requests of all faculty members with the same priority, the Philosophy and Religion Department, in accordance with the priorities set by Academic Affairs, recognizes the greater professional and financial needs of full-time, tenure-track junior faculty. However, the Department also recognizes the need for fairness and reasonableness in the allocation of travel funds: department members attending several conferences or professional meetings in one year, even with levels of participation with the highest priorities, should not expect funding for each conference or meeting. Similarly, because of the much greater costs of overseas conferences or meetings, faculty should not expect full funding when the Department's funds are limited. Moreover, the faculty member should apply for support through the Office of International Programs.

Each faculty member has the responsibility of informing the chair of the Department at the beginning of the academic year (or as soon as possible) of upcoming travel needs.

The Philosophy and Religion Department recognizes the desirability of helping to defray the travel costs of its majors who are presenting papers at professional meetings and conferences. These students should apply for support from sources outside the department as well.

Faculty Workload

[Revised November, 1997]

1. Definition

Faculty workload in the Department of Philosophy and Religion consists of the following professional activities: teaching, research accomplishment, service, and scholarship. Under almost all circumstances, full-time department members are expected to carry 100% annual workloads in which all of these components are reflected within the ranges given below.

2. Workload Parameters

- **Teaching activities**

The Department of Philosophy and Religion regards teaching as its primary mission. Therefore, it is expected that between 60 and 80 percent of faculty workload during a typical academic year will be committed to teaching activities, both in and out of the classroom.

A typical three-credit course involves preparation, teaching, grading and advising, and is assumed to require 10% of a department member's annual workload. Four, three-credit courses each semester in an academic year require 80% of annual workload. Recognition will also be given for other teaching responsibilities, such as Directed Individual Studies, Honors Project, etc., but these activities in themselves do not warrant a reduction in course load. Faculty who are not classified as research-active [see below], and who have no special administrative duties will teach four three-credit courses for each of the Fall and Spring semesters.

- **Research Accomplishment**

Research accomplishments advance knowledge in the department members' academic discipline, enrich society, bring recognition to UNCW, and contribute to the quality of teaching. Therefore, it is of great importance. It is expected that approximately 20–30% of faculty workload during a typical academic year will be committed to research activities in one's academic discipline.

To be considered research-active, a faculty member must be engaged in a project leading to professional publication and/or be qualified as a member of the graduate faculty. Research-active faculty will teach three three-credit courses during every semester they continue to be engaged in such a project.

- **Service**

Service responsibilities of department members are defined as formal and informal professional activities on behalf of the department, College, University, the department member's particular field or profession, as well as the community at large. It is expected that service activities will constitute approximately 10–20% of a faculty member's annual workload.

In the event that a faculty member is assigned special administrative duties within the department such that service becomes more than 20% of their annual workload, a reduction of one three-credit course for each semester of such service may be warranted.

- **Scholarship**

Scholarship and professional development are activities that maintain and enhance a department member's professional competence. Because the results of scholarship and professional development are reflected primarily in growth and improvement in teaching, research accomplishments and service contributions, scholarship activities are regarded as components of the other aspects of faculty workload.

3. Faculty Reassignment Procedures

Pursuant to University and College guidelines on faculty reassignment, the Department of Philosophy and Religion procedures shall be as follows:

1. Eligible faculty submits by the appropriate deadlines applications to the chair for reassignment.
2. The chair convenes an ad hoc committee from those department members not applying for reassignment.
3. The committee rank orders the applications and sends this ranking to the chair.
4. The chair forwards the appropriate number of applications to the relevant University or College committee.

Post Tenure Review Policy

[FORMULATED OCTOBER 1998]

1. Procedure for Post Tenure Review

1. In the fall semester of each academic year, the department will elect a committee of peer evaluators consisting of three tenured department members, representing both philosophy and religious studies, if possible.
2. Those members of the department who are mandated for review or choose to be reviewed in the spring semester will be notified in writing by the department chair in September. The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences will provide a list of these members based on the UNCW Post Tenure Review Policy.
3. Each member being reviewed will prepare a post tenure review document [see below] and three copies of the document will be forwarded to the members of the peer evaluation committee by January 15.
4. The peer evaluation committee will review the document and will prepare their recommendation for the chair by March 1. A copy of the recommendation will also be provided to the department member under review.
5. The department chair will write the evaluation of the department member's performance based on the mission of the university, the college, and the department, and drawing on the advice of the peer evaluation committee.
6. The chair's evaluation will state whether the department member's overall performance has been satisfactory, exemplary, or deficient.

7. The chair will provide a copy of the evaluation to the department member under review and will meet with the department member to discuss the review. The department member has the option of attaching a written response to the evaluation and to appeal the evaluation to all the tenured members of the department, who shall form a committee of the whole to review the decision. Within a thirty-day period, the tenured members of the department shall vote on a recommendation to the chair, who will then review his/her evaluation. The department member has the option of attaching a written response to that evaluation.
8. The chair will forward a list of the members of the peer evaluation committee, a copy of the chair's evaluation, and the department member's response, if any, to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The department member and chair will sign the evaluation in acknowledgment of its receipt by the department member. The Provost will establish the date for the completion of this process.

2. Criteria for Post Tenure Review

In response to the university administration's mandate for Post Tenure Review, the purpose of post tenure review is to provide a clear and simple supplemental peer review process at the departmental level and to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance. It is also designed to identify those rare cases in which faculty members are deficient in the performance of their professional duties and to provide a viable plan whereby they may remedy those deficiencies.

While PTR is not a revalidation of the award of tenure, many characteristics of an institution's tenure policies remain relevant in judging the performance of tenured faculty. UNCW's "Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion and Award of Tenure" (Appendix C, Faculty Handbook) states:

"The primary concern of the university is teaching its students. Thus teaching effectiveness is the primary criterion for reappointment, promotion, and tenure."

It follows that teaching effectiveness should be the primary evaluation area in the post-tenure review of a faculty member.

The "Criteria for RPT" also states:

"It is essential also that the university faculty be composed of individuals with a variety of strengths. Heterogeneity among faculty in contributions to the university is crucial.... Fixed weightings to be used in determining the relative importance of these different areas should be avoided in making reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions."

Criteria for satisfactory faculty performance are professional competence; conscientious discharge of duties, taking into account distribution of workload as assigned by the department chair; and efforts to improve performance.

Criteria for exemplary faculty performance are sustained excellence in teaching, research/artistic achievement, and service; and professional performance that is substantially above expectations and that significantly exceeds the performance of most faculty.

Deficient faculty performance is performance that does not meet the criteria for being judged satisfactory, as stated above.

Annual evaluations for the period under review shall be given great consideration during PTR; faculty whose annual reviews have indicated satisfactory performance or better during that period shall normally be expected to receive a satisfactory evaluation or better under PTR.

3. Outcomes of Post Tenure Review

[Revised January, 2002]

In the case of performance judged to be exemplary, the results shall be documented for university award consideration. The chair shall also forward documentation of such performance to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Provost, and the Chancellor for appropriate recognition.

In the case of performance judged to be deficient, the chair shall forward to the faculty member a copy of the evaluation by the deadline set by the Provost. Within ten working days of receipt of the evaluation or within ten working days following the denial of an appeal of a finding of deficient, the chair and faculty member shall meet and, in consultation, begin to create a development plan. The plan shall include the following:

1. specific strategies and steps designed to lead to improvement
2. delineation of specific outcomes which constitute improvement
3. resources to be committed, if any
4. a specified timeline, not to exceed three years
5. a statement of the process by which performance under the plan will be evaluated and feedback provided to the faculty member, including a clear specification of who will conduct the evaluation, and
6. a clear statement of consequences should the improvement not occur.

The faculty member and the chair shall sign the development plan, and the chair shall forward a copy to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, who must approve any resources to be committed.

A development plan shall not be required of a faculty member who has received a satisfactory review.

4. Due Process in Post Tenure Review

[Revised January, 2002]

The Code states:

“A faculty member who is the beneficiary of institutional guarantees of tenure shall enjoy protection against unjust and arbitrary application of disciplinary penalties. During the period of such guarantees, the faculty member may be discharged or suspended from employment or diminished in rank only for reasons of incompetence, neglect of duty, or misconduct of such a nature as to indicate that the individual is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty” (VI: 603).

Due process and the right of appeal as specified in The Code and the Faculty Handbook shall be guaranteed. The outcome of evaluation should be confidential—that is, confined to the appropriate university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated—and released only at the discretion or with the consent of the faculty member.

Following a denial of the department appeal, a faculty member may appeal a finding of deficient, a finding of non-compliance with a development plan, or the imposition of sanctions other than discharge, suspension from employment, or diminishment in rank to the Faculty Professional Relations Committee (FPRC). A faculty member may appeal the imposition of serious sanctions (discharge, suspension from employment, or diminishment in rank) to the Hearings Panel as specified in Chapter VI of The Code.

Appeals from a finding of deficient or from a finding of non-compliance with a development plan shall proceed according to the UNCW Post Tenure Review Policy, as revised in 2001.

5. Format for the Post Tenure Review Document

The document will include activities in each category since the last review. See Appendix C.

Appendix A

Format for a Faculty Member's Annual Report to the Chair

Academic Year [e.g., 2001-2002] Annual Report to Chair
 Time Span Covered by Report [e.g., May 2001 - April 2002]

Your Name
 Your Rank
 Department of Philosophy and Religion
 University of North Carolina at Wilmington

Date Submitted

NOTE: As an aid to those who will be applying for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, this report *for the most part* uses the categories and structure of the RPT application as outlined in the UNCW Faculty Handbook, Appendix C: "Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Award of Tenure."

NOTE: Sections I - III of the RPT form do not apply to annual reports.

NOTE: The last page, a summary of SPOT evaluations, goes to the chair alone.

IV Teaching

Courses Taught

Summer I 2001 — 00 courses	[Total Number] 00 students
Philosophy and Religion 000 (title)	00 students
Summer II 2001 — 00 courses	[Total Number] 00 students
Philosophy and Religion 000 (title)	00 students
Fall 2001 — 00 courses	[Total Number] 00 students
Philosophy and Religion 000 (title)	00 students
Spring 2002 — 00 courses	00 students
Philosophy and Religion 000 (title)	00 students

Teaching Evaluations

Peer Evaluations of Teaching – Classroom Visitation

Junior faculty only: please append.

Advisees

List of names ...

At this point, continue to use the categories and structure of the RPT application as outlined in the UNCW Faculty Handbook, Appendix C: “Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Award of Tenure,” beginning with the optional categories of Part IV, and followed by Part V (Research), and Part VI (Service).

At the end of the annual report, include the following sections:

Self-Evaluation

The Past Year

Goals and Plans

Numerical Self-Assessment

TEACHING 3 (excellent) / 2 (appropriate) / 1 (below average)
— [main reason for this assessment]

RESEARCH 3 (excellent) / 2 (appropriate) / 1 (below average) / Not Applicable
— [main reason for this assessment]

SERVICE 3 (excellent) / 2 (appropriate) / 1 (below average) / Not Applicable
— [main reason for this assessment]

Justification for Research Release in Workload

Describe current publications, current projects, where you are in your research plan, etc.

Teaching Evaluations

This should be provided to the chair, but not to the peer evaluation committee.

SPOT Question 16 number listed by course

P&R 000-00 0.00 [spot number]

P&R 000-00 0.00 [spot number]

P&R 000-00 0.00 [spot number]

Optional evaluation of your SPOT results

You may append selected individual SPOT forms if desired.

Appendix B
Format for Classroom Evaluation of Teaching

Department of Philosophy and Religion
Classroom Visitation Report

Instructor: _____ Course Number & Title: _____

Observer: _____ Date: _____

Class Topic and Format: _____

Evaluation of Instructor's Planning and Preparation

Evaluation of Instructor's Presentation

Clarity

Organization

Coherence

Audibility

Effective use of board or multimedia

Control of the classroom

Other

Interaction with Students

Maintenance of attention and interest

Student involvement

Responsiveness to students

Other

Were students prepared?

Were class objectives met?

Comments on Strengths and Weaknesses

Dated Signature of Observer

Appendix C

Format for Post Tenure Review Document

HEADING

- Name
- Rank
- Year of Last Review [promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review]
- Date

TEACHING ACTIVITIES:

- Courses taught (course number and name)
- Teaching and/or advising innovations (optional)
- The printed SPOT summaries by semester
- Other teaching activities the person under review considers pertinent (DIS courses and Honors projects would be included here.)

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES:

- A list of publications: books, refereed journal articles, manuscripts in press or in review, and book reviews
- A list of published abstracts and papers presented at professional meetings
- A list of grants and contracts
- Other research activities the person under review considers pertinent

PROFESSIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE:

- Committee assignments at the national, regional, university, or department levels
- Memberships and offices held in professional and honorary organizations
- Professional meetings attended
- Participation in civic, education, or other relevant events and activities based on the person under review's personal expertise
- Honors and awards
- Other professional service activities considered pertinent

ANNUAL PEER AND CHAIR EVALUATIONS BY ACADEMIC YEAR

SELF-EVALUATION

An assessment of professional performance in relation to the post tenure review criteria

[POLICY MANUAL ENDS]