# DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
# CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES
# FOR EVALUATION
# OF FACULTY


## 2014


**Approved:**
**5 September 2014**

## I. Fore-matter

### A. Mission Statement

The mission of the MSU Denver Philosophy Department is to provide our students, ourselves, and our community with both formal and informal occasions to reflect upon and engage in, in a serious and systematic way, the great human conversation about the nature and meaning of human existence, with an eye to our correlative commitments to the concepts of truth, freedom and opportunity.

Philosophy holds fast to a pursuit of the truth and an examination in which no questions are barred and in which no result is unconsidered, regardless of their beauty, utility, political correctness, or popular appeal. Philosophy names the occasion for the mutual pursuit of truth by faculty and students. But in order to maintain a lively connection with and to contribute to the ongoing endeavor that is philosophy, an essential element of this mission of this department is the fundamental activity of continuing education and professional contributions in the forms of talks, communications, commentary, papers and monographs in our field. In our view, research and instruction are inseparable and so our Department upholds the unity of purpose inherent in the very notion of the teacher-scholar. Through its extracurricular activities, student organizations and the departmental colloquium, we also invite our students to take first steps in similar directions.

An education in philosophy is an education for life because it addresses questions and issues of enduring interest, in an engaged and sometimes practical way. Philosophical inquiry recognizes no pre-established limits or disciplinary boundaries in its critical examination of topics of human concern. It enlarges the student's horizon of ideas and encourages the student to critically examine and creatively extend these ideas in a free and open manner. The possibilities of unlocking human potential and increasing self-understanding follow from tools that increase individual autonomy and provide for the liberation from received opinions and empty custom. In this way, individuals may be prepared for a fuller and deeper civic participation and responsibility. Among philosophy's special gifts are enrichments to what are sometimes called "letters" or the "humanities" or "humane studies." On its humanistic side, the Department provides important and singular offerings to the University's General Studies requirements, as well as to such programs as Legal Studies.

Our Department is committed to providing academic programs of study, which feature curricular flexibility and individualized learning, with an eye to increased opportunity. The skills and abilities associated with the disciplinary rigor of the philosophy program – especially analytical and abstract thinking and clarity in thought and written exposition – are transferable to almost any conceivable human endeavor. Indeed the emphasis on logic and method are part and parcel of the self-identity of both philosophy and modern natural science. Hence, within and without the academy, it is important to note our discipline's ongoing contributions to mathematical logic, theoretical linguistics, cognitive psychology, computer science, artificial intelligence and statistics and game theory. Accordingly, the Department also assists a number of other colleges, such as the School of Business, and other programs, including Computer Science, IDP, and the Linguistics minor, among others.

### B. Our Goals

For our students to gain a detailed understanding, sophisticated appreciation and critical awareness:

1. ...  of the nature and complexity of human thought, of its critical and creative possibilities, and of the long-standing and continuing contributions (and reactions) to central defining moments in world civilization;

2. ...  of the core problems, issues, and approaches, first delineated and associated with philosophical inquiry, and of the ways in which different (sometimes unstated) assumptions shape, determine and constrain fields of human inquiry; and

3. ...  of the possible ramifications and innate complexity of even basic philosophical ideas, and the ability to adjudge and evaluate such notions in light of the purposive aspects of human existence.

## II.  Guideline to Achieving Tenure:

Teaching is job one and comprises the bulk of our time and effort.  We require generalists who are able to work not only in areas peripheral to their own but also in fields a bit beyond their comfort zone.  And yet we also require specialists, those with a clearly defined area of expertise.  And so you must be both: a generalist and a specialist.  Further, in the mind of the Department, good teaching always returns to original texts – and contexts, where practicable.  The relative percentage of lecture and discussion cannot be fixed but must vary from individual to individual and from circumstance to circumstance.  But since philosophy is rarely reducible to "information," techniques favoring the mere conveyance of such will scarcely find favor here.

The department has never had, nor does it now possess, a quantitative standard for academic publication.  The requirements of teaching and advising place a high burden on our limited time and energies.  There is nevertheless a long-standing tradition of writing, connectable with a specific set of expectations, concerning professional development.   And while these expectations are aimed at the highest level of achievement – one that goes far beyond any of the *Handbook* requirements – they express goals that can point the way for all faculty members to grow and develop in our profession; and, thereby, for untenured faculty to become practically aware of the strongest possible case for tenure.

In what has historically been a small department with a high teaching load, several important imperatives have emerged.  There must be a certain degree of flexibility in curricular offerings; and this must be coupled with a willingness to share courses, even those closest to one's own areas of special expertise. The individual faculty possess distinct identities and developed aptitudes, but we believe that it benefits both faculty and students if the same course is taught by different instructors and, thereby, that no instructor remain rigidly within the walls of his professional expertise.  Similarly, our program has an abiding commitment to liberal (or general) education.  One important expression of this commitment lies in the impulse to "build bridges" to other programs and disciplines.  Others lie in the development of courses of study that take philosophy to the limits of the discipline and which explore territory and topics at this hinterland.

Especially in a small and close-knit department, professional development is an essential element of both successful teaching and of a vital intellectual community.  Because we affirm the unity of the teacher and scholar, the ability to both create and articulate new courses and new patterns for our program is tightly connected with professional development.  In like manner, the department has placed a high premium on the ability of individual faculty members to construct a wide-ranging and potentially innovative and fruitful *research program of investigation and of writing*.  Such a program, though it may stem from

interests that led to one's dissertation, is unlikely to remain strictly within that narrow ambit: instead it should encompass those interests and yet ultimately outstrip them. As the program develops, it should become pursuable for a number of years to come, although it may evolve in ways that cannot now be foreseen or anticipated. Hence, while there is no necessity that this research program issue (directly or immediately) in publication, the need to spell out and to share this program, and its fruits, with the department as a whole has been of central importance. In summary: while teaching at MSU Denver may mean that you publish less, especially at the beginning, than your peers at other institutions, the need for reflection and expression of that program remains pertinent.

Practically speaking, this suggests active engagement with, as well as general participation in, the department colloquium series. This may include, as well, special workshops devoted to curricular or other program issues. Furthermore, while it is not a strict requirement of the dossier process, it should be obvious that the more one can express the nature and scope of one's intellectual project, your colleagues will be better prepared to estimate and articulate your special contribution to our collective effort. Here too the department places a premium on those who can relate their corner of the philosophical world to the department, to the discipline and to the humanities, as components of a liberal education.

An academic department is not a collection of independent contractors but, instead, requires the effective interconnection of its members, who form a unique community. The special significance of the contribution that each individual makes to that collective endeavor should be plainly apparent to all of its members. While the bulk of this discussion has concerned professional development, the importance of service to the continued good health of the department also requires emphasis. All in all, the common purpose of our department, as stipulated in our department mission and goals, must be kept always in view.

**III. Criteria for Performance Evaluations**

**A. Teaching**

The Handbook clearly states: *Teaching is a complex and reflective human activity that, in the higher education context, is offered in a forum that is advanced, semi-public, and essentially critical in nature. No single definition can possibly suffice to cover the range of talents that go into excellent teaching or that could be found across the board in the varied departments and disciplines of an entire college. Good teachers are scholars, researchers, inventors, scientists, creators, artists, professionals, investigators, practitioners or those with advanced expertise or experience who share knowledge, using appropriate methodologies, and who demonstrate and encourage enthusiasm about the subject matter in such a way as to leave the student with a lasting and vivid conviction of having benefited from that interaction.*

*Effective teachers typically maintain high academic standards, prepare students for professional work and development, facilitate student achievement, and provide audiences for student work. Some might add that the best teaching transmits specific skills or enhances talents that students possess, while others would note that good teaching develops habits of mind or provides models of scholarly, scientific, artistic or professional behavior and inquiry much more important than particular information. Faculty typically aspire to a number of other civic purposes in the classroom that may also include encouraging their students to long for the truth, to aspire to achievement, to emulate heroes, to become just, or to do good, for example.*

Instruction is only a part of what teaching involves but because it is the most observable and measurable, it obtains a highlighted role in the evaluation of teaching (although no one should ever confuse excellent instruction with good teaching!). Therefore, the Handbook goes on to explain that, at the instructional level, *the most important responsibilities of a teacher to his/her students* are as follows.

*(1)* **Content Expertise:** *To demonstrate knowledge and/or relevant experience:*

*Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matters in the relevant learning environment (classroom, on-line, hybrid, field work, etc.), which typically includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education.*

The Department deems some aspects of currency, revision and development to be in order. Teachers must be prepared to, for example, make changes in the courses as new developments in the field arise or incorporate research and/or attendance at professional conferences that resulted in changes in content or methods of teaching, as relevant. Courses should be revised, from time to time, by reworking texts, order, or assignments in individual courses or contributing to substantially changing the course syllabus.

*(2)* **Instructional Design:** *To re-order and re-organize this knowledge / experience for student learning:*

*Effective teachers design course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences that are conducive to learning.*

The Department deems that syllabi must be ordered and clear, activities coherent, grading and other expectations explicit, and that, indeed, every component of the course contributes to the purposes for which the course is offered. Those purposes include their place in our

program, including purposes of assessment, and the state learning objectives. Consequently, a clear specification of the desired learning objectives, and of the means through which they will be assessed, on course syllabi, and of texts and other materials designed to enable students to meet the learning objectives, and of class assignments should assist in indicating that all are clearly aligned with the desired objectives.

*(3)* ***Instructional Delivery:*** *To communicate and "translate" this knowledge / experience into a format accessible to students:*

*Effective teachers communicate information clearly, create environments conducive to learning, and use an appropriate variety of teaching methods.*

The Department deems that good instruction demands attention to each of the three aforementioned criterial marks.

*(4)* ***Instructional Assessment:*** *To evaluate the mastery and other accomplishments of students:*

*Effective teachers design assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensure fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provide constructive feedback on student work.*

The Department deems that "appropriateness" of instructional assessment  may be evidenced by, for example, but are not limited to: techniques designed to help students improve their mastery of the material and their powers of self-examination, self-criticism and self-improvement, e.g., written assignments with the possibility of subsequent revision; and/or the creative combination of multiple and diverse modes and moments of assessment.

Furthermore, the Department suggests that early and complete qualitative and quantitative discussion and reports be made to students as well as the following: accurate and complete records of student progress; clear criteria, made comprehensible to the students, for the assignment of grades to individual assignments; and the returning of assignments in a timely fashion.

*(5)* ***Advising In and Beyond the Classroom:*** *To provide guidance for students as they pursue undergraduate and post-baccalaureate education and/or employment:*

*Effective advisors interact with students to provide career guidance and information, degree program guidance and information (e.g., advice on an appropriate schedule to facilitate graduation), and answers to questions relating to a discipline.*

The Department deems that student interaction for the express purposes of the main content of student advising should be evidenced by, for example, primarily (i) complete and concise records of advisees and the specific information and advice proffered or (ii) the regular review and adjustment of CAPP reports or assistance in the creation of materials suitable for use as advising information, including information relating to either graduate or vocational endeavors.  Examples of what comes under this heading may also include, but are not limited to, providing letters of recommendation or working with students in discipline-related activities, such as student organizations, competitions or conferences.

### *A Note on SRIs*
The Handbook elaborates, quite clearly, *how* the information contained in dossiers is to be *considered*; it states:

... the duties of higher education professionals are complex and diverse. **No one source can adequately reflect an individual's performance or carry the burden associated with important personnel decisions. Therefore, the review process requires multiple sources of information** that encompass the complex and diverse work of faculty; **collectively these data should present a holistic picture** of individual faculty as each seeks tenure and/or promotion [our emphases].

Consequently, we tend to view the numerical data, provided by the SRIs, as just *one* component, among many, that simply cannot be singled out for special consideration without clearly violating the preceding, guiding words of the Handbook on how dossiers are to be considered and evaluated.

Furthermore, we must rely quite heavily on the discussion of teaching, also found in the Handbook. It is, after all, *teaching* that we are evaluating and the SRIs provide only a (1) **student** (2) **rating of** (3) **instruction (and *not* an *evaluation* of *teaching*)**. Instruction is delimited as a small subset of competences that serve merely as a *sine qua non*: they are necessary but not sufficient conditions for good teaching. But the two "global" questions of the SRIs in no way plug into any of these separable categories, in all events.

Finally, 'deviation from the departmental mean' is a completely inadequate standard, with no Handbook validation, that threatens to unduly punish those in a high performing department, such as ours.

Therefore, we both exercise and commend due caution in the proper use of that numerical data.

Additionally, we urge a thorough consideration by all practitioners of the art of teaching of the following guiding words:

> Teaching is even more difficult than learning. We know that; but we rarely think about it. And why is teaching more difficult than learning? Not because the teacher must have larger store of information, and have it always ready. Teaching is more difficult than learning because what teaching calls for is this: to let learn. The real teacher, in fact, lets nothing else be learned than – learning.

### *Insufficient Performance*
For example, someone who did not engage in any of the aforementioned and instead who never revised their courses or never created new courses or never participated in, at any level, in the departmental process of curriculum revision or in the improvement of their pedagogical abilities, who failed to supply a sufficiently detailed syllabus within the first week or relied upon an outmoded pedagogical paradigm, who failed to offer early and numerous possibilities for the assessment of student progress or failed to return graded assignments in a timely fashion, who did not consistently meet office hours or never participated in Departmental activities related to advising and/or was unable to offer either effective vocational or graduate advising, etc. would not meet the relevant standards and expectations

### *Required for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor*
For example, someone who did engage in most of the aforementioned and accomplished them to a high level of competence would meet the relevant standards and expectations.

### *Required for Promotion to Professor*

For example, someone who did engage in most or all of the aforementioned and performed those in a superlative fashion and who creates new enrichment opportunities for students, etc. would meet the relevant standards and expectations.

***Required for Post-Tenure Review***
Same as for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.


## B.  Scholarly Activities

The Handbook states: *Scholarly and creative activities are disciplinary or interdisciplinary expressions or interpretations that develop ideas, frame questions, create new forms of representation, solve problems, or explore enduring puzzles.*

*Purposes include, but are not limited to, the following: advancing knowledge or culture through original research or creative activities; interpreting knowledge within or across disciplines; synthesizing information across disciplines, across topics, or across time; aiding society or disciplines in addressing problems; or enhancing knowledge of student learning and effective teaching.*

*Typically, to be considered scholarship, findings should be disseminated to either peer review by disciplinary scholars or professional or governmental organizations; or critical reflection by a wider community, including corporations or non-profit organizations, for example.*

*In addition to these scholarly activities, and depending on the specific Department Guidelines, this category may also include activities in which the faculty member shares other knowledge with members of the learned and professional communities; continued education and professional development activities appropriate to professional status or assignments; and other activities specific to the faculty member's discipline or assigned responsibilities.*

The Department deems that "creative work and scholarly activity" may be evidenced by, for example, but not limited to:  professional publication; talks at professional conferences; book and literature reviews; comments on the aforementioned; work as referee for presses or journals; or engaging in a serious program of reading, and self-development, sharing the results with department members and with other faculty. Other activities, such as "continuing education" and "professional development" may be evidenced by, for example, but not limited to: additional course work or certifications; and/or attendance at national, local or departmental meetings and colloquia related to the discipline or the profession or grant writing activities and other funding proposals.

Additional requirements and desiderata are outlined in the attached Codicil A, adopted 7 March 2014.

***Insufficient Performance***
For example, someone who did not do any of the aforementioned  and instead never engaged in a program of reading, writing or sharing their scholarly activity with others, etc. would not meet the relevant standards and expectations.

***Required for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor***
For example, someone who did many or most of the aforementioned  and accomplished them to a high level of competence would meet the relevant standards and expectations.

***Required for Promotion to Professor***
For example, someone who did most or all of the aforementioned and performed those in a superlative fashion or who published in peer-reviewed journals or at prestigious university presses and/or served as invited keynote or plenary speakers at conferences and/or who was asked to organize panels or conferences, etc. would meet the relevant standards and expectations.

***Required for Post-Tenure Review***
Same as for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.


## C. Service

The Handbook states: *Faculty engage in service when they participate in the shared governance and good functioning of the institution; service to the institution can be at the program, department, school, or college level. Beyond the institution, faculty engage in service when they use their disciplinary and/or professional expertise and talents to contribute to the betterment of their multiple environments, such as regional communities, professional and disciplinary associations, non-profit organizations, or government agencies.*

The Department deems that "institutional" service may be evidenced by, for example, but not limited to: the fulfillment of departmental chores and responsibilities; membership in an active or ongoing committee or task force; conducting a specific activity as directed by the Chair or the Dean; mentoring a new faculty member; or peer review of both full-time and part-time faculty. Service beyond the institution – to the community, the state, the nation or the profession – may be evidenced by, for example, but limited to: work for community or professional organizations; serving as an officer or on the board of said organizations; giving a speech or participating in a round-table on contemporary public issues; or providing expertise to organizations, schools, media or other relevant entities.

***Insufficient Performance***
For example, someone who did not do any of the aforementioned and instead rarely attended department meetings and/or never served on committees or task forces or never performed any specific activity as directed by the Chair or the Dean, etc. would not meet the relevant standards and expectations.

***Required for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor***
For example, someone who did many or most of the aforementioned activities and accomplished them to a high level of competence would meet the relevant standards and expectations.

***Required for Promotion to Professor***
For example, someone who did most or all of the aforementioned activities and those in a superlative fashion or chairs or otherwise directs a committee or task force or who creates a new service opportunity of importance in the University, or who serves in a national or international level for a cause or profession, etc. would meet the relevant standards and expectations.

***Required for Post-Tenure Review***
Same as for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

# Recommendations for Scholarly Integrity in Publication
## as freely adapted from the
### *ICMJE Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing,*
### *and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals*

## A. Authorship

### 1. Why Authorship Matters

Authorship confers credit and has important academic, social, and financial implications. Authorship also implies responsibility and accountability for published work. The following recommendations are intended to ensure that contributors who have made substantive intellectual contributions to a paper are given credit as authors, but also that contributors credited as authors understand their role in taking responsibility and being accountable for what is published ...

### 2. Who Is an Author?

[It is recommended] ... that authorship be based on the following four criteria:

- Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
- Final approval of the version to be published; AND
- Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

In addition to being accountable for the parts of the work he or she has done, an author should be able to identify which co-authors are responsible for specific other parts of the work. In addition, authors should have confidence in the integrity of the contributions of their co-authors.

All those designated as authors should meet all four criteria for authorship, and all who meet the four criteria should be identified as authors. Those who do not meet all four criteria should be acknowledged ... These authorship criteria are intended to reserve the status of authorship for those who deserve credit and can take responsibility for the work. The criteria are not intended for use as a means to disqualify colleagues from authorship who otherwise meet authorship criteria by denying them the opportunity to meet … [the secondary criteria]. Therefore, all individuals who meet the first criterion should have the opportunity to participate in the review, drafting, and final approval of the manuscript.

The individuals who conduct the work are responsible for identifying who meets these criteria and ideally should do so when planning the work, making modifications as appropriate as the work progresses. It is the collective responsibility of the authors, not the journal to which the work is submitted, to determine that all people named as authors meet all four criteria; it is not the role of journal editors to determine who qualifies or does not qualify for authorship or to arbitrate authorship conflicts. If agreement cannot be reached about who qualifies for authorship, the institution(s) where the work was performed, not the journal editor, should be

asked to investigate. If authors request removal or addition of an author after manuscript submission or publication, journal editors should seek an explanation and signed statement of agreement for the requested change from all listed authors and from the author to be removed or added.

The corresponding [or lead] author takes primary responsibility for communication with the journal during the manuscript submission, peer review, and publication process, and typically ensures that all the journal's administrative requirements, such as providing details of authorship, ethics committee approval, clinical trial registration documentation, and gathering conflict of interest forms and statements, are properly completed, although these duties may be delegated to one or more co-authors. The corresponding author should be available throughout the submission and peer review process to respond to editorial queries in a timely way, and should be available after publication to respond to critiques of the work and cooperate with any requests from the journal for data or additional information should questions about the paper arise after publication. Although the corresponding author has primary responsibility for correspondence with the journal, [it is recommended] ... that editors send copies of all correspondence to all listed authors ...

### 3. Non-Author Contributors

Contributors who meet fewer than all four of the above criteria for authorship should not be listed as authors, but they should be acknowledged. Examples of activities that alone (without other contributions) do not qualify a contributor for authorship are acquisition of funding; general supervision of a research group or general administrative support; and writing assistance, technical editing, language editing, and proofreading. Those whose contributions do not justify authorship may be acknowledged individually or together as a group under a single heading (e.g. "Clinical Investigators" or "Participating Investigators"), and their contributions should be specified (e.g., "served as scientific advisors," "critically reviewed the study proposal," "collected data," "provided and cared for study patients", "participated in writing or technical editing of the manuscript").

Because acknowledgment may imply endorsement by acknowledged individuals of a study's data and conclusions, editors are advised to require that the corresponding author obtain written permission to be acknowledged from all acknowledged individuals.


## B. Conflicts of Interest

***Public trust in the scientific process and the credibility of published articles depend in part on how transparently conflicts of interest are handled during the planning, implementation, writing, peer review, editing, and publication of scientific work.***

A conflict of interest exists when professional judgment concerning a primary interest (such as patients' welfare or the validity of research) may be influenced by a secondary interest (such as financial gain). Perceptions of conflict of interest are as important as actual conflicts of interest.

Financial relationships (such as employment, consultancies, stock ownership or options, honoraria, patents, and paid expert testimony) are the most easily identifiable conflicts of interest and the most likely to undermine the credibility of the journal, the authors, and of

science itself. However, conflicts can occur for other reasons, such as personal relationships or rivalries, academic competition, and intellectual beliefs. Agreements between authors and study sponsors that interfere with the authors' access to all of a study's data or that interfere with their ability to analyze and interpret the data and to prepare and publish manuscripts independently may represent conflicts of interest, and should be avoided.

## C. Peer review

***Peer review is the critical assessment of manuscripts submitted to journals by experts who are usually not part of the editorial staff. Because unbiased, independent, critical assessment is an intrinsic part of all scholarly work, including scientific research, peer review is an important extension of the scientific process.***

The actual value of peer review is widely debated, but the process facilitates a fair hearing for a manuscript among members of the … [academic] community. More practically, it helps editors decide which manuscripts are suitable for their journals. Peer review often helps authors and editors improve the quality of reporting.

It is the responsibility of the journal to ensure that systems are in place for selection of appropriate reviewers. It is the responsibility of the editor to ensure that reviewers have access to all materials that may be relevant to the evaluation of the manuscript, including supplementary material for e-only publication, and to ensure that reviewer comments are properly assessed and interpreted in the context of their declared conflicts of interest.

A peer-reviewed journal is under no obligation to send submitted manuscripts for review, and under no obligation to follow reviewer recommendations, favorable or negative. The editor of a journal is ultimately responsible for the selection of all its content, and editorial decisions may be informed by issues unrelated to the quality of a manuscript, such as suitability for the journal. An editor can reject any article at any time before publication, including after acceptance if concerns arise about the integrity of the work.

Journals may differ in the number and kinds of manuscripts they send for review, the number and types of reviewers they seek for each manuscript, whether the review process is open or blinded, and other aspects of the review process. For this reason and as a service to authors, journals should publish a description of their peer-review process.

## D. Overlapping Publications

### 1. Duplicate Submission

Authors should not submit the same manuscript, in the same or different languages, simultaneously to more than one journal. The rationale for this standard is the potential for disagreement when two (or more) journals claim the right to publish a manuscript that has been submitted simultaneously to more than one journal, and the possibility that two or more journals will unknowingly and unnecessarily undertake the work of peer review, edit the same manuscript, and publish the same article.

### 2. Duplicate Publication

Duplicate publication is publication of a paper that overlaps substantially with one already

published, without clear, visible reference to the previous publication.

Readers of … [academic] journals deserve to be able to trust that what they are reading is original unless there is a clear statement that the author and editor are intentionally republishing an article (which might be considered for historic or landmark papers, for example). The bases of this position are international copyright laws, ethical conduct, and cost-effective use of resources. Duplicate publication of original research is particularly problematic because it can result in inadvertent double-counting of data or inappropriate weighting of the results of a single study, which distorts the available evidence.

When authors submit a manuscript reporting work that has already been reported in large part in a published article or is contained in or closely related to another paper that has been submitted or accepted for publication elsewhere, the letter of submission should clearly say so and the authors should provide copies of the related material to help the editor decide how to handle the submission.

### 3. Acceptable Secondary Publication

Secondary publication of material published in other journals or online may be justifiable and beneficial, especially when intended to disseminate important information to the widest possible audience (e.g., guidelines produced by government agencies and professional organizations in the same or a different language). Secondary publication for various other reasons may also be justifiable provided [that some relevant combination of] the following conditions … [is] met:

a. The authors have received approval from the editors of both journals (the editor concerned with secondary publication must have access to the primary version).

b. The priority of the primary publication is respected by a publication interval negotiated by both editors with the authors.

c. The paper for secondary publication is intended for a different group of readers; an abbreviated version could be sufficient.

d. The secondary version faithfully reflects the data and interpretations of the primary version.

e. The secondary version informs readers, peers, and documenting agencies that the paper has been published in whole or in part elsewhere—for example, with a note that might read, "This article is based on a study first reported in the [journal title, with full reference]"—and the secondary version cites the primary reference.

# Standards for Category II and III Faculty

# Philosophy Department

The instructor shall be deemed to **Meet Expectations** if he or she satisfies all of the following requirements and to **Fail to Meet Expectations** if he or she does not satisfy all of the following requirements.

1. Teaches his or her sections in accordance with the Department's Regular Syllabus.
2. Employs methods of teaching that are appropriate for the class.
3. Gives assignments that allow the sections of his or her class to meet the university general education requirements.
4. Receives SRIs that consistently approximate departmental averages.
5. Provides the department program director with a copy of the course syllabus and responds promptly to emails sent by the Chair or Program Assistant.
6. Cooperates with the Chair (or his designee) to rectify any problems with students that might arise inside or outside the classroom.
7. Meets all the standards for professional decorum as set out in the university handbook or by common sense.