

Department of Philosophy

**College of Letters, Arts and Sciences
University of Colorado Colorado Springs**

**Criteria, Standards and Evidence for Reappointment,
Promotion and Tenure**

July 1, 2020

CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Department of Philosophy

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 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 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 scholarly/creative work, and effective leadership and service to the department, the campus, the community, and our profession. The evaluation process assumes the 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 time spent at another institution shall be considered equivalent to work performed at UCCS, though no more than three years of prior work will count towards tenure. 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.

The primary unit criteria shall be used at every level of the review process, and the criteria shall be included in the candidate's dossier.

INITIAL REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) shall evaluate the teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service/leadership in the candidate's record in terms of how each is "on track for tenure," "not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate correction," or "not on track for tenure." The makeup and chairship of the PUEC are specified in the departmental by-laws. As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of the Department of Philosophy have elected not to have a vote of the primary unit faculty towards the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process. APS 1022 requires that the department chair submit a separate evaluation if the department chair does not serve on the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee.

1. Teaching:

The candidate's teaching shall be evaluated by multiple means that will include, but not necessarily be limited to, 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 and major/minor 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 curriculum development will be also taken into consideration.

2. Scholarly/Creative Work:

Our department emphasizes scholarly work that is novel, rigorous and substantive. We prize fundamental discovery, careful interpretation, and integrative studies that transform existing theoretical approaches and applied knowledge into philosophical projects that have worldly relevance. To this end, the candidate is expected to set out a well-designed research plan that is clearly situated within the candidate's field(s). This plan should convey the potential for continued development as a researcher and realistic progress toward publication. This might include drafts of a work in progress, presentations at professional meetings that could be or could lead to potential publications, book contracts in hand, and/or articles submitted for publication. We also recognize the scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research.

3. Service/Leadership:

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

COMPREHENSIVE REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee shall evaluate the teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service/leadership in the candidate's record overall in terms of how each is "on track for tenure," "not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate correction," or "not on track for tenure." As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of the Department of Philosophy have elected not to have a vote of the primary unit faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process. APS 1022 requires that the department chair submit a separate evaluation if the department chair does not serve on the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee.

1. Teaching:

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means that will include, but not necessarily be limited to, 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 updating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research and major/minor advisor, intern supervisor, and similar activities shall be considered. When interpreting student evaluations, course level, size, and content will be taken into consideration, as will other external factors (such as candidate age, race, and gender) that are known to have an impact.

a. A rating of "not on track for tenure" requires student evaluations that are well below the departmental average and other evidence of effective teaching.

b. A rating of "not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate correction" requires student evaluations that are below the departmental average and other evidence of effective teaching.

c. A rating of "on track for tenure" requires student evaluations that are at or above the departmental average, other evidence of effective teaching, and clear dedication to student learning.

2. Scholarly/Creative Work:

Our department emphasizes scholarly work that is novel, rigorous and substantive. We prize fundamental discovery, careful interpretation, and integrative studies that transform existing theoretical approaches and applied knowledge into philosophical projects that have worldly relevance. The candidate is expected to show progress in the execution of their research plan, and should convey how that plan has changed and developed since the initial reappointment review. This continuing research agenda should be well and clearly situated within the candidate's field(s).

a. A rating of "not on track for tenure" requires an absence of 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.

b. A rating of "not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate correction" requires less than 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.

c. A rating of "on track for tenure" requires three 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.

3. Service/Leadership:

The department recognizes service to the department, the campus, the community, and our profession. In evaluating service, the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

a. A rating of “not on track for tenure” requires little service responsibilities within the department and some service to the college, campus, community, or profession.

b. A rating of “not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate correction” requires some service responsibilities within the department and some service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession.

c. A rating of “on track for tenure” requires appropriate or extraordinary service responsibilities within the department and service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession.

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND/OR AWARD OF TENURE REVIEW

The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee shall evaluate the candidate’s teaching record, quality of scholarly/creative work, and service/leadership record via the three categories of “below expectations,” “meritorious,” or “excellent.” To be granted tenure, 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. As required by Regent mandate, the department will solicit three letters from respected scholars in the candidate’s field(s) of research.

1. Teaching:

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching that is evaluated by multiple means which will include, but not necessarily be limited to, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the Appendix to this document. This involves evaluating contributions to the breadth, depth, and teaching needs of the department as it serves our students. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate’s work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research and major/minor advisor, intern supervisor, and similar roles shall be considered. When interpreting student evaluations and evaluating the candidate’s teaching overall, course level, size, and content will be taken into consideration, as will other external factors (such as candidate age, race, and gender) that are known to have an impact. In evaluating teaching, the quality and quantity of teaching contributions will be considered.

a. A rating of meritorious includes, but is not limited to, the following:

i. Student evaluation of teaching: FCQs and comments that indicate that students find the coursework consistently interesting and challenging. FCQ’s provide a broad or general indication of a faculty’s teaching success but are not absolute as other factors such as gender and online play a role.

ii. Peer evaluation of teaching: peer evaluation consistent with the claim that the candidate is fully competent to teach lower and upper division courses in philosophy

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 the philosophy curriculum and/or has introduced appropriate new course materials into existing courses as reflected in the candidate's syllabi

vi. Preparation of students so that they succeed in courses: candidate equips students adequately for further course work in the department

vii. Preparation of course materials: candidate is consistently well-prepared, provides students with useful course materials, provides a clear syllabus, and is well-organized

viii. Obligations regarding scheduled courses: candidate consistently meets obligations regarding class time and office hours as scheduled.

b. A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level. Teaching that furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting will be considered.

i. "Demonstrated achievement" for teaching beyond one's immediate instructional setting may encompass any of the following: published writing, peer reviewed publications, public presentations, workshops, exhibits, digital formats, websites, or other forms of public pedagogy and public engagement which aim to educate, inform, and increase understandings among constituent groups. It also includes undertaking research with students, offering workshops, mentoring junior faculty, and truly everything related to teaching that occurs outside of the classroom.

2. Scholarly/Creative Work:

a. A rating of meritorious consists of the following: between four and six scholarly articles in reputable journals and other tangible evidence of an ongoing research program that the department is convinced merits this rating.

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.

Effort or promise of performance shall not be a criterion for excellence or meritorious performance. Demonstrated performance and outcomes are required for tenure.

In addition, a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work shall include evidence of impact beyond the institution.

3. Service/Leadership:

The department recognizes service to the department, the campus, the community, and our profession. In evaluating service, the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

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. Candidate will demonstrate that some of the service has been in a leadership role.

PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR REVIEW

The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee shall evaluate the teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service/leadership in the candidate's record 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 three letters from respected scholars in the candidate's field(s) of research as required by Regent mandate.

1. Teaching:

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, but not necessarily be limited to, 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 updating curriculum and course materials, as it serves our students. Again, when interpreting student evaluations, course level, size, and content will be taken into consideration, as will other external factors (such as candidate age, race, and gender) that are known to have an impact. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research and major/minor advisor, intern supervisor, and other similar roles shall be considered. Teaching accomplishment since tenure must be demonstrated through new and revised curricula, new and enhanced pedagogical techniques, work with students outside the classroom, and other areas of teaching growth.

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 being met in a superlative or supererogatory manner
 - ii. Receipt of teaching awards or other recognition of outstanding accomplishment in instruction

2. Scholarly/Creative Work:

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 the candidate has achieved a favorable national or international reputation in their field(s).

3. Service/Leadership:

The department recognizes service to the department, the campus, the community, and our profession. In evaluating service, the quality and quantity 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. student advising
5. innovations in teaching
6. creativity in teaching
7. effectiveness of students in succeeding courses and/or in the pursuit of graduate education and/or in careers
8. student supervision in professional experience activities, and/or independent studies
9. evaluation of student performance in departmental examinations and assessments
10. preparation of course material, including the syllabus
11. student development/encouragement (centers of excellence, library knowledge, learning disability recognition, encouragement of students)
12. course organization
13. new course development
14. teaching improvement activity (workshops, conferences)
15. role modeling and mentoring based on a teaching experience at any educational level
16. teaching contribution at any institution in addition to the University of Colorado Colorado Springs
17. risk factor involved in the teaching venture
18. contributions of teaching to diversity

B. Scholarly/Creative Work

1. peer-reviewed publications
2. papers presented at professional conferences
3. keynote invitations and other recognitions of scholarly impact common

4. recognition by other scholars of research and publications
5. creative work
6. unsponsored research
7. grants and contracts (sponsored research)
8. professional reputation (both inside and outside university)
9. evidence of capacity for future achievements
10. participation in career development activity (workshops, conferences, summer schools, etc.)
11. long-term research projects
12. expert and technical consultation on others' research projects
13. role modeling and mentoring of research at any educational level
14. risk factor involved in the research venture
15. professional, cultural, and societal impact
16. contribution to diversity
17. Pedagogical development grants
18. Design of public outreach materials based on expertise
19. Publications on pedagogical methods
20. Development of interdisciplinary programs or degrees
21. Authorship of textbook or other instructional materials
22. Evidence demonstrating use of publications for instruction outside our institution

C. Service/Leadership

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 Colorado Springs
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.

**College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences
Department of Philosophy RPT Criteria
Version History**

Version 1:

Approved by Philosophy faculty, 4/21/2020

Approved by the Interim Dean Rex Welshon, 4/22/2020

Approved by Provost Tom Christensen, 6/26/2020

Effective date, 7/1/2020
