MSU DENVER COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SCIENCES

Department of Philosophy

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Effective

August 1, 2026

Approvals:

Department Chair: Caleb Cohoe Digitally signed by Caleb Cohoe Date: 2026.01.30 16:01:56 -07'00' Date: January 30, 2026

Dean: Digitally signed by John Masserini Date: 2026.02.27 14:33:19 -07'00' Date: 2/27/2026

Provost: Date:

MSU DENVER College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

DEFINING FACULTY WORK: VALUES AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Faculty work comprises many intersecting roles, chief among them instructor, scholar, and engaged campus & community partner. These roles have been a foundational standard for decades in higher education. However, as faculty respond to the changing needs and expectations of students, colleagues, and others, the nature of these roles has changed and continues to develop.

The College of Letters, Arts and Sciences (CLAS) is a large academic unit that houses the foundation of human knowledge (arts, humanities, and sciences). Furthermore, we value the diversity within our programs and the contributions of each department. As such, it is essential that we establish guiding principles and values that align with and recognize the many ways faculty meet obligations and expectations tied to their roles.

The process for evaluation and review continues to be established, upheld, and governed by the Faculty Employment Handbook. As stated in this handbook, and in accordance with AAUP Guidelines, departments establish discipline-specific standards for teaching; research, scholarship, creative work; and service. Those discipline-specific standards are the fundamental tools used for our peer review and evaluation process.

The guiding principles and values listed below are intended to provide an overarching and aspirational view for faculty work in CLAS. Departments should view their own standards through the lens of these shared values as they continue to develop and enhance their specific quantitative and qualitative disciplinary expectations for faculty work standards.

Teaching & Pedagogy

Faculty in the CLAS deeply value teaching as an essential and deeply valued act, encompassing a significant aspect of their professional identity. CLAS faculty provide the foundation of human knowledge through the arts, humanities, and sciences. Faculty engage students in the learning process through pedagogy that provides a fundamental disciplinary knowledge. Additionally, they often demonstrate connection points and applicability of concepts through an interdisciplinary lens and reframe concepts for contemporary audiences through equity-minded and inclusive practices.

As experts in their respective fields, faculty are evaluated on the effectiveness and impact of their teaching through quantitative and qualitative measures. While those measures are department- and discipline-specific, CLAS faculty strive to include, but are not limited to, several of the following goals and principles in their teaching:

- Well-designed courses that clearly align learning outcomes for the course, degree, program, and general studies category/course outcomes where appropriate;
- Conveying their disciplinary expertise in an engaged teaching style, bringing enthusiasm for knowledge and intellectual inquiry to the learning environment. This is a faculty member's most effective approach to attracting and retaining students to the discipline and institution;

- Clear linkages between content, relevance, application, and practice;
- Intentional alignment between assignments, activities, and experiences to the learning outcomes and purpose of the course;
- Use of proven and effective teaching practices (High-Impact Practices as one example) when appropriate and effective;
- Developing and enhancing students' ability to demonstrate intellectual competencies and essential skills within and across disciplinary boundaries;
- Broadening disciplinary foci to include diverse perspectives, historically minoritized voices, anti-racist practices, and/or addressing the absence of marginalized populations within historically homogenized primary sources and/or fields;
- Modernizing and enhancing pedagogy with a focus on inclusive and equity-centered practices; use of new and accessible technology; high-quality low- and no-cost options for student materials (OER as one example); and intentionally designed educational experiences as it pertains to course delivery and modality;
- Effective academic guidance and mentorship in the form of availability through regular, consistent office hours and additional connection opportunities (e.g. hallway conversations, before and after class, separate appointments, etc.). Students are then provided an opportunity not only to discuss topics specific to a class, but also major/career aspirations, course recommendations, and post-graduation pathways. This work complements the work of our institution's professional advisors, with each department and/or discipline making determinations on implementation.

The teaching narrative portion of the Promotion, Retention, Tenure, and Post-Tenure review should move beyond the quantitative listing of courses taught, students enrolled, and SRI scores. These metrics, used broadly, can point to overarching themes and trends, but should not necessarily be used as the only indicator of effective teaching.

The narrative presents the opportunity for faculty to reflect on their teaching and report successes; highlight any modification or innovation in their classroom; describe the application of interdisciplinary approaches and connection points for students; or detail enhancements of current materials, experimentation with new approaches, and any tangible impacts the course might have had on the students, including aspects of DEI pedagogy and practice in these areas.

Research, Scholarship, & Creative Work

The creation, acquisition, and dissemination of new knowledge is a hallmark of higher education. CLAS faculty are actively involved in creating new knowledge within their fields, integrating existing knowledge to share with new audiences, and applying disciplinary knowledge and expertise to address contemporary problems. Within a college as large and diverse as CLAS, scholarly and disciplinary impact is vast and constantly developing. The products, venues, and vehicles for distribution of research, scholarship, and creative work vary widely across CLAS.

Despite these necessary distinctions, the overarching foci and scope of research, scholarship, and creative work (RSCW) in CLAS includes **one or more** of the following assumptions:

- Meaningful and recognized intellectual and/or artistic contributions to or across disciplines, typically involving a method of peer review and/or peer recognition through traditional publishing, invitations to prestigious venues, impactful disciplinary gatherings, or new and emerging modalities;
- Development, creation, or establishment of new trends or discoveries within or across disciplines (cross-, multi-, and interdisciplinary), recognized by peers and/or external

audiences for its impact, consequence, and potential to alter, enhance, support, or refute traditional or established assumptions within or across disciplines;
- Interconnectedness between RSCW and the content and/or practice of teaching. This includes, but is not limited to, using RSCW to inform course content, pedagogy, undergraduate research, and attract students to the discipline;
- Demonstrable impact of community-engaged scholarship that improves, enhances, or creates mutually beneficial outcomes for the public good (which may also intersect faculty work in their service category);
- Contributions that elevate the public and intellectual reputation of the institution, college, or department and aligns with the mission, vision, and principles of the institution, college, or department.

The RCSW narrative portion of the Promotion, Retention, Tenure, and Post-Tenure review is an opportunity to provide context for RSCW, not solely list activities. If we are to understand and value our colleagues work through peer review, it is important for the narrative to address the impact of work on a variety of audiences, including those outside MSU Denver; acknowledge academic work that may be forging new trends or ways of thought in our disciplines; recognize promising new mediums and modalities for the distribution of RSCW; and provide overarching reasons why the work is important and worthy of recognition.

Service

Service to the institution and profession is an essential facet of faculty work, it is expected of individuals in faculty roles, and much of service supports the academic institution's foundation of faculty governance. At its most basic level, it ensures that the governance and operational aspects of running an institution are in place and the academy continues to function and thrive. At a more meaningful level, service is how we give back to our students, our colleagues, and our disciplines. Furthermore, building networks, partnerships, and community is a foundational part of faculty work that takes time, care, and reciprocity. Building networks and partnerships through attending and organizing events as well as contributing to a network's communications helps actualize the university and college mission.

For service to be a consequential endeavor, the responsibilities should align with a faculty member's interests and passions whenever possible. It is important to acknowledge that service is not always visible, nor is it always tied to committees. When making service assignments, department chairs should assure that the work is equally distributed and truly valued in the evaluation process.

Service is recognized and evaluated as a **collection** of the following factors:

- **Time Commitment**. Estimate a proportion of time spent in conjunction with the service percentage expectation in a faculty member's workload. This can then be broken down into hours per week, weeks per semester, etc. Acknowledging that most academic work is cyclical, there will be weeks when time commitment for service is great, and weeks when it is far less.
- **Scope**. The nature of faculty governance and service lends itself to hierarchies among work that divides into groups: university, college, department/program; curriculum, policy, events; national, state, local; etc. Department guidelines should address scope of work when assessing service commitments and obligations.

- **Outcome & Impact**. Consider the product or outcome generated from the work and the impact on its intended recipients. Department guidelines should acknowledge impact through the lens of their disciplinary values, purpose, and common good.
- **Role**. Serving as a chair or leader of a committee, project, or engagement effort will typically increase the impact (and sometimes time commitment) of the service obligation for the faculty member. Defining roles on committees and in other service is an important element in establishing efficient, equitable, and meaningful service expectations.
- **Special Project or Task Force**. Serving on an ad-hoc group to solve long-standing or immediate issues beyond the typical role of a service commitment (committee, professional organization, community engagement group) typically increases the impact (and sometimes time commitment) of the service obligation.
- **Student Guidance and Mentorship (non-academic)**. CLAS acknowledges that women, faculty of color, LGBTQIA+ faculty, and other historically minoritized faculty groups often find themselves with increased time commitments serving students that identify with them. This work often falls under the category of "Invisible Service." Due to a need for service across the institution, a faculty member's entire service component cannot be exclusively dedicated to this type of service. It is, however, an important part of faculty work and should be acknowledged in a manner that best suits the different departments and disciplines in CLAS.

The Service narrative portion of the Promotion, Retention, Tenure, and Post-Tenure review is an opportunity to provide context for faculty work, as well as how it aligns with a faculty member's overall/future career trajectory and passions. If we are to understand and value our colleagues' work through peer review, it is important for the narrative to address the complex and varied intersection of service commitments. This will be presented as a collection of service work that can be both quantified and qualified, culminating as an impactful and meaningful part of the faculty portfolio.

I. Fore-matter

A. Mission Statement

The mission of the MSU 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 form 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 our 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 colleges, such as the College of Business, and other programs, including Computer Science, IDP, and the Linguistics minor, among others.

B. Our Goals and Student Outcomes

Upon completion of the major, students will be able to:

1. *Thesis*: Demonstrate the ability to state a thesis and create (in writing or orally) an argument for a philosophical position.
2. *Interpretation*: Recognize and explain a philosophical issue or problem and identify possible solutions.
3. *Logic/Language*: Recognize the structures of linguistic units by which they can become parts of formal arguments; demonstrate their validity or invalidity; and recognize different theories about both the formal and informal features of language by which language can be "about" the world.
4. *History*: Name and relate major positions, issues and figures and inscribe them within the historical continuity of disciplinary conversation.
5. *Analysis*: Analyze philosophical texts in order to break the argument, idea, or problem into its basic parts.
6. *Critique*: Assess strengths and weaknesses of philosophical argument; and consider/compare objections and counterarguments.
7. *Research*: Demonstrate the ability to locate relevant philosophical sources (especially "secondary literature") when information is needed; evaluate the authenticity and reliability of resources applied to a specific purpose; apply this research in a sustained philosophical argument.
8. *Synthesis:* Synthesize relevant philosophical views; and formulate sustained and considered philosophical arguments, including evaluating objections and counterarguments.

9. *Diverse Perspectives*: Recognize the contributions to disciplinary conversations from either authors outside the standard "Western Philosophical Tradition" or from people of color, women, or other minorities in the field.

II. General Standards of Performance

To clarify expectations, the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences has established a set of General Standards of Performance for all faculty within the College. Compliance with the Standards is a prerequisite to a satisfactory performance rating on faculty evaluations.

CLAS values and expects collegial, respectful, and professional interactions among all its employees. The following excerpt was taken from the American Association of University Professors Statement on Professional Ethics.

"*As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues.*

Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom."

Beyond expectations outlined in the Faculty Employment Handbook, Faculty member's contract, other applicable University Policies, and the Academic Calendar, faculty will:

- Perform all faculty responsibilities in a timely manner;
- Adhere to accepted standards of professional conduct as established by the Handbook and AAUP (referenced above);
- Be available by email or phone during their contractual period, which for full time faculty is the approximately nine-month period from one week prior to the beginning of classes in the fall semester to one week after the conclusion of final exams in the spring semester, excluding periods during which the University is closed for business;
- Fulfill instruction for assigned classes and submit grades by the University deadline; provide the chair with timely notice in the event that they cannot conduct a class (or classes); and, pursuant to written departmental policy, arrange, when possible, for instruction to be provided when they cannot be present — either by a substitute or by class assignment;
- During the first week of class, present to all students attending class a syllabus containing the course description, grading criteria, CLAS syllabus policies, and special notices required by law or institutional policy;
- Adopt procedures as necessary to assure that adequate and accurate records of student performance are maintained;
- Establish, post, and hold office hours as required by the Faculty Employment Handbook.
- Provide assessment measures for all academic assignments and requirements to evaluate students' performance.
- Participate in committee work, scholarly activities, service, and other appropriate professional activities, as appropriate by category of assignment (CAT I, II, or III);
- Preserve syllabi and student records for all classes for one calendar year after the end of the semester in which the course was taught;
- Respond in a timely fashion to email and other communications by students, colleagues, and administration during their contractual period.

Important Guidance on Guideline Years:

- *Category I and Category II faculty undergoing review for the purposes of retention or reappointment, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review may select to be evaluated according to guidelines implemented since their most recent review.*
  Specifically:

- *Tenure-track faculty applying for tenure may select to be evaluated according to guidelines in effect at the time of their hiring or any subsequent guidelines implemented prior to their tenure application.*
- *Tenured faculty applying for promotion to the rank of Professor may select to be evaluated according to the guidelines effective upon completion of their tenure review or any subsequent guidelines implemented prior to their promotion application.*
- *Tenured faculty applying for post-tenure review may select to be evaluated according to the guidelines effective upon completion of their most recent Tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review or any subsequent guidelines implemented prior to their post-tenure review application.*
- *Non-tenure track faculty may select to be evaluated according to guidelines in effect at the start of their contract term or any subsequent guidelines implemented prior to their reappointment application.*

III. 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 circumstance to circumstance. But since philosophy is rarely reducible to "information," techniques favoring the mere conveyance of such will scarcely find favor here. 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, they express goals that can point the way for all faculty members to grow and develop in our profession; and thereby, for untenured faculty members to develop 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 her or 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. Interdisciplinary work is appreciated and valued.

Especially in a small and close-knit department, professional development is an essential element of both successful teaching and of a vital intellectual community. 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. 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 member 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.

IV. Criteria for Performance Evaluations

Preface: In addition to meeting the contractual responsibilities defined in the Faculty Employment Handbook, faculty teaching 24 credit hours per year with a 'typical' percentage breakdown, defined as 80% effort in teaching, 10% effort in scholarship, and 10% effort in service, are expected – at a minimum – to meet the following criteria in each of the three areas. Other faculty with differentiated percentages for effort in these three areas will have modified expectations that reflect those percentages. These will be written and included in the review letter from the department chair.

Faculty delineate their efforts in these three areas via a percentage effort breakdown. We assert and affirm that these percentages are explicitly not tied to "hours spent" or other direct time measurements, as effort is more complex than merely hours invested, and as such hours may not accurately reflect effort invested.

A. Teaching

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. Effective teachers are scholars, researchers, creators, 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 benefit their students. Good teaching transmits specific skills or enhances talents that students possess and develops habits of mind 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 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!). The responsibilities of a faculty member include the following:

- *Content Expertise Conveyed with Effective Pedagogies and Praxis*: Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matters in the relevant learning environment (classroom, online, hybrid, field work, etc.) They demonstrate their content expertise and/or relevant experience which typically includes proven skills, competencies, and knowledge in a discipline (s). This extends to the responsibility of integrating scholarly and professional activities in teaching.

- *Inclusive Pedagogy*: Effective teachers employ teaching practices that recognize and demonstrate structural and situational awareness of equity within and beyond the classroom. Consideration should be given to teaching practices rooted in empathy and responsiveness to students' lived experiences. Inclusive pedagogy includes teaching practices that prioritize thoughtful and reflexive evidence-based learning approaches to empower student reasoning and critical thinking.
- *Instructional Design*: Effective teachers construct frameworks for learning tied to specific disciplinary or interdisciplinary knowledge, experiences, or concepts. They communicate these frameworks through course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiential learning experiences for instructional delivery. The design should be conducive to equitable learning for all students in alignment with accessibility requirements.
- *Instructional Delivery and Learning Environment*: Effective teaching involves the communication of knowledge, experiences, and concepts into a format accessible to students within an inclusive space. Effective instructional delivery ensures that teachers show responsiveness to help students with varying abilities, identities, and lived experiences. They communicate information clearly, use an appropriate variety of learning-centered methods, and approaches, while using university supported technological tools, including the institution's learning management system (e.g. Canvas).
- *Assessment*: Effective teaching includes the evaluation of students' understanding, application, and analytical acumen of a subject. They design assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensure fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provide constructive feedback on student work. Furthermore, effective teachers engage in meaningful self-assessment, that may include peer review, program review, and student feedback. All sources of feedback for a faculty member's teaching ensure the opportunity for continuous improvement and professional development.
- *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. Regularly scheduled office hours must be held during the academic year. In recognition that faculty are available

through different modalities and that student-faculty appointments occur outside of office hours, faculty are expected to have a minimum of 20 minutes of office hours per week per one (1) credit hour taught. Thus, faculty teaching 12 credit hours would be expected to have four (4) office hours per week. With the approval of their chair and dean, faculty may conduct some, or all, of their office hours remotely so long as the offering of office hours and the modality through which those office hours are offered are reasonable and effectively meet the needs of students.

NOTE: Teaching performance will be evaluated based on the teaching done by a faculty member.A faculty member who teaches less than twelve (12) credit hours each semester will not be penalized for performing other critical duties needed by the Department, College/School, or University. Normally, these responsibilities will be delineated in and accounted for through reassigned time awards and evaluations and documented in the faculty portfolio management system (e.g. Watermark).

A Note on SRIs

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 We view the numerical data, provided by the SRIs, as just *one* component, among many, that simply cannot be singled out for special consideration given its severe limitations and biases.

It is *teaching* that we are evaluating and the SRIs provide only a (1) **student** (2) **rating of** (3) **instruction from what, given current collection methods, is unlikely to be a representative sample. Moreover, these ratings are given and collected in ways that display patterns of bias that make them unreliable. They are also not an *evaluation of teaching as such*.** Instruction is delimited to a small subset of competencies that serve merely as a *sine qua non:* they are necessary but not sufficient conditions of good teaching. But the two "global" questions of the SRIs in no way plug into any of these separable categories, in all events.

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

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

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 curricular 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 or 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 or all of the aforementioned and accomplished them competently 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 competently and who has created new enrichment opportunities for students (new courses, reading groups or student clubs, revising major or minor etc.) would meet the relevant standards and expectations.

Required for Post-Tenure Review

Same as Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

B. Scholarly Activities

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. 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.

Academic books include monographs, scholarly translations equivalent in length to a monograph, and edited volumes where the faculty member is responsible for editing the whole volume and contributes an introduction or essay. The authority to determine whether a given

work counts as an academic book lies in the Department PTR Committee. The department expects its members to follow best practices on authorship and scholarly integrity, in accordance with the guidelines found in the Recommendations for Scholarly Integrity in Publication included below.

Insufficient Performance

Someone who failed to engage in scholarly activities at the required level would not meet the relevant standards and expectations.

Required for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Sufficient for satisfying the Department's Professional Development requirement for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is 1) at a professional conference, giving a paper presentation of at least 20 minutes or participating in a panel lasting at least 60 minutes and 2) the acceptance for publication of one major peer-reviewed or invited article. Major publications include: a book chapter, a journal article, a substantial article (2500 words) for a major encyclopedia, (for instance, the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy), and other work determined by the Department PTR Committee to be equivalent to one. In addition, the submission of a major grant proposal (for instance, a substantial grant proposal to the NEH) is the equivalent of one publication. The department deems an academic book to be equivalent to three major peer-reviewed articles. **Any combination of two of the following may be substituted for the major peer-reviewed or invited article**: a paper presented at a major conference (for instance, a meeting of the American Philosophical Association), a substantial commentary at a conference on a book or a paper (thirty minutes or more), a shorter encyclopedia article (1000 words), a substantial book review (1500 words), or a substantial philosophical piece published in a recognized public venue (e.g. Aeon, New York Times). The authority to determine whether a given work satisfies one of these conditions lies in the Department PTR Committee.

Required for Promotion to Professor

Sufficient for satisfying the Department's Professional Development requirement for promotion to the rank of Professor is 1) at a professional conference, giving a paper presentation of at least 20 minutes or participating in a panel lasting at least 60 minutes and 2) the acceptance for publication of 1.5 major peer-reviewed or invited articles. Major publications include: a book chapter, a journal article, a substantial article (2500 words) for a major encyclopedia, (for instance, the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy), and other work determined by the Department PTR Committee to be equivalent to one. In addition, the submission of a major grant proposal (for instance, a grant proposal to the NEH) is the

equivalent of one publication. The department deems an academic book to be equivalent to three major peer-reviewed articles. **Any combination of two of the following may be substituted for the major peer-reviewed or invited article**: a paper presented at a major conference (for instance, a meeting of the American Philosophical Association), a substantial commentary at a conference on a book or a paper (thirty minutes or more), a shorter encyclopedia article (1000 words), a substantial book review (1500 words), or a substantial philosophical piece published in a recognized public venue (e.g. Aeon, New York Times). The authority to determine whether a given work satisfies one of these conditions lies in the Department PTR Committee.

Required for Post-Tenure Review

Sufficient for satisfying the Department's requirements of Post-Tenure Review is 1) at a professional conference, giving a paper presentation of at least 20 minutes or participating in a panel lasting at least 60 minutes and 2) the acceptance for publication of .5 major peer-reviewed or invited articles. Major publications include: a book chapter, a journal article, a substantial article (2500 words) for a major encyclopedia, (for instance, the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy), and other work determined by the Department PTR Committee to be equivalent to one. In addition, the submission of a major grant proposal (for instance, a grant proposal to the NEH) is the equivalent of one publication. Because our department values the pursuit of wisdom and the increased visibility and impact that result from an academic book, faculty members who publish a book can choose to be released from extra-departmental service for 2 years if they only count the book as two major peer-reviewed articles. **Any combination of the following may be used in full or partial substitution for the publication requirement at a weight of .5 of a major peer-reviewed article for each item**: a paper presented at a major conference (for instance, a meeting of the American Philosophical Association), a substantial commentary at a conference on a book or a paper (thirty minutes or more), a shorter encyclopedia article (1000 words), a substantial book review (1500 words), or a substantial philosophical piece published in a recognized public venue (e.g. Aeon, New York Times). **Any combination of the following may be used in full or partial substitution for the publication requirement at a weight of .25 of a major peer-reviewed article for each item:** a commentary of less than 30 minutes at a professional conference, participating in a panel at a professional conference lasting less than 60 minutes, a poster presentation of research. The authority to determine whether a given work satisfies one of the previous conditions lies in the Department PTR Committee.

C. Service

Since faculty service can take many forms, the Department's evaluation process differentiates between service *to the department* and service *beyond the department* and acknowledges a distinction between *major* and *minor* service activities. While not all service needs to result in measurable outcomes, all forms of service can and must be documented in a faculty member's portfolio.

Major and Minor Service Activities:

Some service activities represent major undertakings, involving substantial time commitments, often over the course of several months or semesters, such as leadership positions within a university-wide committee or a professional organization. Instances of minor service, such as peer reviewing an affiliate faculty's course or representing the department at an open house, may be less time consuming and may not result in concrete outcomes, but are no less essential for fulfilling the institution's mission.

Service to the Department:

Since all faculty are responsible for the shared governance of the Department, all are required to engage in activities deemed necessary for a well-functioning Department. Only under exceptional circumstances, and with the formal consent of the Chair and/or Department as a whole, can any member of the faculty be relieved from their obligations to attend meetings and engage in the major and minor service needed for the department's success.

Service Beyond the Department:

Faculty also make service contributions beyond the department level, to programs, the college, the university, the professional/scholarly communities to which they belong and/or regional communities, non-profits, and the broader public.

Examples:

> Examples of major department service include, but are not limited to, chairing a new faculty search committee, playing a lead role in revising course curriculum for General Studies approval, serving as a majors and minors advisor for a year or more, or developing a new course or program and guiding it through the approval process.

Examples of minor department service include, but are not limited to, serving as an active member on a new faculty search committee, organizing a talk for the department speaker series, representing the department at an open house or other recruiting event, or conducting a specific activity as directed by the Chair.

Examples of major service beyond the department may include, but are not limited to, chairing a college or university level committee, serving a multi-year term as an executive officer in a professional association, serving a multi-year term as an editor or editorial board member for a professional journal, or organizing a professional seminar or conference.

Examples of minor service beyond the department may include, but are not limited to, serving on a College, University, or Senate committee (including search committees), serving as a faculty senator for 2 years, giving a talk to members of the community on topics related to one's disciplinary expertise, sharing your expertise with media outlets, offering a class session to high school students or other community groups, serving for a year on a committee of a professional association, chairing sessions at professional conferences, or acting as a reviewer for an academic journal or academic press.

Insufficient Performance

Someone who failed to engage in service activities at the levels specified above would not meet the relevant standards and expectations.

Required for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A faculty member who has engaged in major department service at some point during the review period, minor department service as required by the Chair and Department, and some major and/or minor service beyond the department during at least half of the years under review, would meet the relevant standards and expectations.

Required for Promotion to Professor

Same as for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

Required for Post-Tenure Review

Same as for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

D. Miscellany

Required for Emeritus Status

To qualify as an Emeritus Professor in Philosophy, a retired faculty member must, in addition to meeting the requirements set forth in the Handbook:

1. Be nominated for emeritus status by the Department Chair or other tenured faculty member.
2. Be approved for emeritus status by a majority of the voting tenured faculty in the Department.

Required for Moving from Position of Junior Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

To move from a position of Junior Lecturer in Philosophy to Senior Lecturer, a Junior Lecturer must, in addition to meeting the standards set out in the Handbook:

1. Have taught at least three different courses for the Department.
2. Be approved for promotion by a majority of the voting tenured faculty members.

Classroom Observation Policy

Tenure-track faculty shall be observed by the Department Chair in the first year and at least twice pre-tenure by other senior members of the department.

Tenured professors shall be observed by the Chair at least once in each five-year PTR period and at least once by another tenured member of the Department.

In their first two years, full-time lecturers and affiliate instructors shall be observed every year, with at least one of those observations being by the Department Chair. Afterwards, affiliate instructors shall be observed by a program faculty member at least once in a three-year period.