

Department of Philosophy
College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

Revised June 2012

(4/17/2012)

CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Department of Philosophy

Approved by the Provost: May 28, 2009

Revisions Approved by the Interim Provost: June 20, 2012

INTRODUCTION

Standards and processes for reappointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty are governed by Article V and Appendix A of the Laws of the Regents. They are further delineated in a series of CU Administrative Policy Statements. Campus guidance is supplied in the University of Colorado at Colorado Spring (UCCS) Policy # 200-001. These documents require the establishment of departmental criteria that are to be used throughout the review process.

The criteria are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion, and tenure in the Department of Philosophy at the UCCS. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in our discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The department is committed to quality teaching, strong research/creative work, and effective service to the department, the university, the profession, and the community. The evaluation process assumes: possession of an appropriate terminal degree; competent education and training in the discipline; conduct that reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge; and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities.

When these criteria are applied to faculty who were granted time toward tenure, the work performed during the years granted toward tenure shall be considered equivalent to work performed at UCCS. While a faculty member's career record will be considered in personnel actions described here, the main emphasis of evaluation will be on work performed at UCCS and, in particular, progress since the last review. The department does not use a Faculty Responsibility Statement in its reappointment, promotion, and tenure process.

INITIAL REVIEW

The candidate's total record, including teaching, research and service, shall be evaluated. No specific rating in each area is required, but the record must show sufficient potential of future success to justify reappointment.

1. Teaching:

The candidate's teaching shall be evaluated by multiple means that will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation (See Appendix). In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered. The candidate is expected to show

potential for continued development as a teacher. Candidates should demonstrate that their courses are coherently organized and thoughtfully presented. Furthermore, candidates will be expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which will be good interaction with students, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be also taken into consideration.

2. Research:

Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work that integrates existing knowledge, and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. The candidate is expected to demonstrate a well-designed research plan and the potential for continued development as a researcher and progress toward publication. This might include drafts of work in progress, presentations at professional meetings, book contracts in hand, and/or articles submitted for publication.

3. Service:

The department recognizes service to the department, the campus, community, and our profession. At this stage, the candidate is expected to be involved in departmental meetings and activities.

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will each be evaluated separately as "below expectations," "meritorious," or "excellent." The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment. The candidate must be rated as at least "meritorious" in all three areas and must receive a rating of "excellent" in either teaching or research.

The review may also take into account issues of material bearing such as the strategic goals of the department, college, and campus. The department will solicit three letters from respected scholars in the candidate's field(s) of research as required by campus mandate.

1. Teaching:

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means that will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the Appendix to this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, intern supervisor, and similar activities shall be considered. In evaluating teaching course content, level and size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations.

- a. A rating of meritorious will require student evaluations that are at or above the departmental average and other evidence of effective teaching.
- b. A rating of excellent will require student evaluations that are above the departmental average, other evidence of effective teaching, and dedication to student learning.

2. Research:

Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work that integrates existing knowledge, and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research.

- a. A rating of meritorious requires reasonable progress toward tenure as demonstrated by submission of research proposals, professional presentations, publications, and by letters of evaluation of the candidate's work.
- b. A rating of excellent requires at least three publications, such as refereed journal articles, refereed book chapters, and other essay-length scholarly publications. Receipt of external peer-reviewed grants or contracts may be substituted for publications.

3. Service:

The department recognizes service to the department, campus, community, and our profession.

- a. A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and some service to the college, campus, community, or profession.
- b. A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and some service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession. In evaluating service the quality, quantity, and time commitment of service contributions will be considered.

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND AWARD OF TENURE

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will each be evaluated separately as "below expectations," "meritorious," or "excellent." The candidate must be rated as, at least, "meritorious" in all three areas and must receive a rating of "excellent" in either teaching or research. The department will solicit four letters from respected scholars in the candidate's field(s) of research as required by Regental mandate.

1. Teaching:

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the Appendix to this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and teaching needs of the department, including up-dating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research

advisor, intern supervisor, and similar activities shall be considered. In evaluating teaching course content, level and size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations.

- a. A rating of meritorious includes, but is not limited to, the following:
 - i. Student evaluation of teaching: FCQ and comments that indicate that students find the coursework consistently interesting and challenging. We pay equal attention to all questions on the FCQ forms, considering that philosophy classes often are more abstract and controversial than classes in many other disciplines.
 - ii. Peer evaluation of teaching: peer evaluation consistent with the claim that the faculty member is fully competent to teach lower and upper division courses in philosophy (see attached)
 - iii. Quality of thesis supervision: evaluation of the candidate's participation in the department's shared thesis supervision
 - iv. Student advising: evaluation of the candidate's participation in the department's shared student advising
 - v. Innovations in teaching: candidate has added or revised courses in philosophy curriculum or has introduced appropriate new course materials
 - vi. Effectiveness of students in succeeding courses: faculty member prepares students adequately for further course work in the department
 - vii. Preparation of course materials, primarily a syllabus: faculty member consistently is well-prepared, provides students with useful course materials, and is reasonably well-organized
 - viii. Obligations regarding scheduled courses: faculty member consistently meets classes and office hours as scheduled

Other means of evaluation found in the Appendix may be used.

- b. A rating of excellent includes, but is not limited to:
 - i. The above criteria are met in a superlative or supererogatory manner, above departmental average FCQs
 - ii. Receipt of teaching awards or other recognition of outstanding accomplishments in instruction

2. Research:

Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work that integrates existing knowledge, and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research.

- a. A rating of meritorious consists between four and six scholarly articles in reputable journals and other tangible evidence of an ongoing research program that the department is convinced will lead to excellent research performance at the time of promotion to Professor.

- b. A rating of excellent consists of the following: evidence of significant and continued contribution to one's field or fields, as represented by (i) the

publication of a scholarly monograph by a reputable press, **or** (ii) the publication of an edited book or textbook by a reputable press **and** six or more publications, such as refereed journal articles, refereed book chapters, and other essay-length scholarly publications. Receipt of external peer-reviewed grants or contracts may be substituted for publications. In rare cases, (iii) excellence in research may be substantiated by more than six peer-reviewed articles in reputable journals alone that have significant impact on the profession.

3. Service:

The department recognizes service to the department, campus, community, and our profession.

a. A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and service to the college, campus, community, or profession.

b. A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and exceptional service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession. In evaluating service the quality, quantity, and time commitment of service contributions will be considered.

PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will be evaluated as a whole as "below expectations," "meritorious," or "excellent." Promotion requires "a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and service." The candidate is expected to achieve "excellent" in teaching, "excellent" in research, and "excellent" in service. The department will solicit four letters from respected scholars in the candidate's field(s) of research as required by Regential mandate.

1. Teaching:

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the Appendix to this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered. In evaluating teaching, course content, level and size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a teacher since tenure must be demonstrated through development of new and revised curriculum, new pedagogical techniques, participation in professional

development, work with students outside the classroom, and other areas of teaching.

- a. A rating of meritorious includes, but is not limited to, substantive achievement of the criteria listed above.
- b. A rating of excellent includes, but is not limited to:
 - i. The above criteria are met in a superlative or supererogatory manner
 - ii. Receipt of teaching awards or other recognition of outstanding accomplishments in instruction

2. Research:

Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work that integrates existing knowledge, and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a researcher since tenure must be demonstrated through refereed publications, peer-reviewed grants, and other areas of research such as those in the Appendix. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity is less. Presentations at professional meetings and non-refereed publications may be considered as secondary evidence of ongoing research activity.

- a. A rating of meritorious consists of tangible evidence of an ongoing research program, including:
 - i. Publication of one or more scholarly monograph(s) by a reputable press(es) since promotion to Associate Professor or since tenure, whichever is more recent.
 - ii. Ongoing output of peer-reviewed articles in reputable journals
 - iii. In addition to (i) and (ii), other forms of recognition for the high quality of the research.
- b. A rating of excellent consists of the above plus evidence that one has achieved a favorable, national or international reputation in one's field or fields.

3. Service:

The department recognizes service to the department, campus, community, and our profession. In evaluating service the quality, quantity, and time commitment of service contributions will be considered. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in service since tenure must be demonstrated. We recognize that different faculty at this level will fulfill this requirement differently. The Appendix lists some types of service that may be considered.

- a. A rating of meritorious includes, but is not limited to, the following:
 - i. University committees and administrative service
 - ii. Service to the profession and discipline
 - iii. Consultation and public service
 - iv. Chairing the department

b. A rating of excellent includes, but is not limited to, the above criteria being met in a superlative or supererogatory manner, qualitatively or quantitatively.

POST-TENURE REVIEW

Recognizing the many different ways in which post-tenure faculty contribute to the University, we define “meeting expectations” for purposes of post-tenure review as consisting of three elements, each of which must be met: 1) having achieved a rating of “meeting expectations” or higher on each of the College’s annual merit reviews included in the time period under review, 2) making substantial progress toward the goals in the faculty member’s current professional plan, and 3) having submitted an acceptable professional plan which indicates an ability to achieve “meeting expectations” or higher ratings in the future. If a faculty member is deficient in meeting these standards, the committee shall consider the total record of the faculty member during the review period to determine whether strengths in some time periods or some activities compensate for the deficiency such that a rating of “meeting expectations” is still appropriate. Ratings of “exceeding expectations” or “outstanding” will be awarded for exceeding these standards.

APPENDIX:

Examples of Appropriate Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

A. Teaching

1. student evaluation of teaching
2. teaching awards and other outstanding accomplishments in instruction
3. peer evaluation of teaching
4. alumni evaluation
5. student advising
6. innovations in teaching
7. creativity in teaching
8. participation in teaching-related subject activities
9. effectiveness of students in succeeding courses and/or in the pursuit of graduate education and/or in careers
10. student supervision in professional experience activities, internships, and/or independent studies
11. evaluation of student performance in departmental examinations and assessments
12. preparation of course material, including the syllabus
13. student development/encouragement (centers of excellence, library knowledge, learning disability recognition, encouragement of students)
14. course organization
15. new course development
16. teaching improvement activity (workshops, conferences)

17. role modeling and mentoring based on a teaching experience on any educational level
18. teaching contribution at any institution in addition to the University of Colorado
19. risk factor involved in the teaching venture
20. contributions of teaching to diversity

B. Research

1. peer judged publications
2. papers presented at professional conferences
3. recognition by other scholars of research and publications
4. creative work
5. unsponsored research
6. grants and contracts (sponsored research)
7. professional reputation (both inside and outside university)
8. evidence of capacity for future achievements
9. participation in career development activity (workshops, conference, summer schools, etc)
10. long-term research projects
11. expert and technical consultation of research projects
12. role modeling and mentoring of research on any educational level
13. risk factor involved in the research venture
14. cultural and societal impact
15. contribution to diversity

C. Service

1. departmental, college, campus and university committees
2. chairing the department
3. administrative service (such as program director, chair, center director ...)
4. service to the profession and discipline (local, state, national, international level)
5. consultation and public service
6. reviewing research proposals
7. reviewing books in scholarly journals
8. reviewing grant proposals
9. refereeing manuscripts
10. participation at professional conferences, specifically organizational activities (organizational activities, local planning committees, site visit details, activities involved in local, regional and national meetings, etc.)
11. membership in and/or office-holding in professional associations.
12. service contribution to education at any level and at any institution in addition to the University of Colorado
13. contribution to diversity
14. participation in faculty governance

This is a list of suggestions and is NEITHER all-inclusive nor a list of requirements. Items are not ranked or grouped in any order of importance.