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I. DEPARTMENTAL FUNCTIONS AND OBJECTIVES

The Philosophy Department at Oklahoma State University prides itself on its pluralism. It intentionally includes faculty representing a broad range of philosophical positions and approaches. Though individual members may have strong, clear, and detailed views about particular philosophical problems and methods, each person tolerates opposing views and has professional respect for their reasonableness. Accordingly, departmental policy is firmly committed to being participatory and democratic. Both in the conduct of its own business and in its teaching, writing, and participation in college and university affairs, the department strives to project an image of philosophy which esteems reasoned argument, productive imagination, moral sensitivity, and perspicacious insight rather than one which espouses any particular set of doctrines. This professional stance is appropriate for a department of philosophy at a public university with a land-grant history.

1. Academic Programs. The department believes that philosophy is not just for specialists. It is a fundamental liberal study providing analysis, organization, consistency, depth, and vision to a person’s intellectual and practical encounter with the world. Philosophy sharpens active intellectual skills, but it also reveals the complexity and richness of the human condition. It aims both to civilize and to liberate.

The graduate program leading to the M.A. in philosophy is one of only two programs in the state awarding a graduate degree in philosophy. (The University of Oklahoma awards both the Ph.D. and the M.A. in philosophy but is primarily interested in doctoral, not master’s-level, students.) Our graduate program is relatively small and tailored to the needs of diverse types of students: those who are considering advanced graduate work in philosophy, law, or some related field, and those who simply wish to enrich their own liberal education. Both thesis and non-thesis routes are available, with program options permitting extensive work in other areas of the humanities. Several graduate-level courses, in addition to independent study, have been and will continue to be offered each semester to meet the needs of our graduate students as well as the needs of graduate students in other departments.

The undergraduate major program leading to a B.A. is also small compared to many others in the college, yet it is solid. A double major is strongly encouraged by the department, for it both helps the student overcome the narrowness of many present-day academic programs and opens up additional possibilities for advanced study or employment, often without requiring much additional course work. Because of the broad nature of philosophy and the diverse possibilities for a major’s own course of study, required courses are held to a minimum. Few courses are intended for philosophy majors only. The B.A. in philosophy is a very flexible degree option, permitting at least 26 hours of coursework in other areas to meet major and general elective requirements.

Since its introduction in the 1970’s, the philosophy minor has become increasingly popular with students because it helps them overcome academic narrowness and also provides a second departmental identification. The department definitely is committed to the continuation of the minor.
Students in the graduate, major, and minor programs provide a focus for the intellectual life of the department. Their academic interests help to determine, for example, the selection of outside speakers brought to campus, the offering of special courses, and the inclusion of certain emphases in existing courses. Each program is mutually reinforcing and contributes to the quality of philosophy at OSU. Growth must be monitored, however, to prevent the loss of personal contact, which is necessary in philosophical training.

The vast majority of students enrolled in philosophy courses are non-philosophy majors who are served through the department’s upper and lower-division general education courses. Furthermore, the department’s potential minors, majors, and graduate students first encounter philosophy in lower-division courses because philosophy is not a standard part of a secondary school education. For these reasons, the department strives for strength and quality in these course offerings.

2. Faculty and Faculty Responsibilities. The department seeks to maintain a faculty with professional standing that supports the traditional pluralism highly valued in this department. It is expected that an individual faculty member will often have expertise in more than one area: for example, in both philosophy of religion and medieval philosophy or in both logic and the philosophy of science. There also will be, and should be, some overlap in fields of interest and training. In order to meet the needs of the academic program outlined in this section, with rare exceptions all faculty members should hold the Ph.D. or its equivalent, should participate in professional organizations, and should regularly contribute to the professional literature. Faculty are responsible for teaching, scholarship, and service/outreach.

II. DEPARTMENTAL MECHANISMS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISIONS

All personnel actions concerning reappointment, tenure, or promotion recommendations are to be initiated at the department level by the faculty member. The necessary documents to be forwarded to the Dean’s Office and subsequent levels of administration are as follows: The candidate will choose whether he/she will have access to (i) any material solicited from faculty not on the personnel committee; and (ii) letters from external reviewers at the beginning of the process, and these choices will be indicated on the (signed) official waiver forms. This decision shall be forwarded to whoever chooses to provide written assessments before these are written.

1. Recommendation for Promotion or Reappointment Form

This form is to be completed by the Department Head with the necessary information supplied by the faculty member. The completed Personnel Action Form also is to be attached as stated on the form. The candidate shall receive a copy of the promotion and
reappointment form as it is sent to the Dean.

2. The candidate’s current vita

The *vita* shall describe in a professional manner the totality of accomplishments of the individual, not merely the individual’s most recent contributions.

3. A Letter from the Personnel Committee Concerning the Action

This letter is an expression of the views of the majority of the committee and must include the reasons for which the committee recommends the particular action. Minority opinions and also the opinions of non-voting members of the department shall be solicited and addressed in the letter. Non-voting members’ input shall be solicited by the chair of the personnel committee at least ten days in advance of the first meeting of the committee to consider a candidate’s file. The committee will consider any such solicited opinions in their deliberations, and they will be addressed in the letter to the Department Head. If multiple votes are taken, the letter should include the numerical results of the last vote only. The letter is to be signed by all committee members.

4. A Letter from the Department Head Concerning the Action

The purpose of this letter is to set forth the Department Head’s reasons for recommending or denying the action in question. Where the assigned duties of the candidate are specialized, differing significantly from normal departmental assignments, this shall be specifically indicated.

5. Supporting Evidence

A limited amount of evidence related to the reasons given for the recommendations regarding the candidate, including external peer review letters and annual Assessment and Development reports, should accompany the letters from the personnel committee and the department head. Additional evidence can be provided by the candidate (for example, selections from student evaluations, letters from colleagues in the department or from other departments or universities (provided they’re unedited), etc., but should be restricted to a reasonable amount of additional information. A copy of the departmental criteria shall be included in the RPT file along with the evidence.

### III. COMPOSITION AND OPERATION OF THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

1. Rationale

Personnel committees are essential to the fair and reasonable conduct of departmental affairs. They create a climate of representational or participatory democracy that is crucial to an academic environment, and provide a measure of protection for all parties involved in key decisions concerning faculty. For these reasons, the Philosophy
Department will have a Personnel Committee constituted along the following lines.

2. Composition

All members of the Philosophy Department, excluding the Department Head, will function as a committee in personnel matters, but only tenured faculty members (or, in cases of promotion to full professor, only full professors) can remain after a motion to proceed to final discussion and voting is approved. Members of the Personnel Committee who are voting on a candidate’s application for reappointment, promotion or tenure must be at the level being sought by the candidate or at a higher level. Tenure-track faculty members (excluding Department Head), who are not members of the Personnel Committee, are encouraged to participate in meetings during which applications for reappointment, promotion and tenure are being discussed. These non-voting tenure-track faculty members shall not be present when the Committee is voting on an application for reappointment, promotion or tenure. Faculty members applying for reappointment, promotion, tenure, or seeking faculty counsel from the personnel committee shall not be present at the meetings in which their case is discussed, nor can they vote on their case. In addition family members of such faculty as well as their regular collaborators (frequent collaborators, or any collaborator whose academic status or future is connected to the success of the candidate) are excluded from attending such meetings and from voting on their cases. Faculty who serve on more than one committee that is evaluating an application for reappointment, promotion or tenure (e.g., unit personnel committee and college level committee) may vote at only one level. The Committee may see fit to call in the Department Head and/or the candidate.

3. Election and duties of Chair

The Committee shall elect a chair whose term shall be two academic years. The election will be held at the first Personnel Committee meeting of the academic year. The Chair may not serve more than two terms consecutively. The authority of the chair is the same as that of any other committee member and powers of the chair are limited to executing the will of the committee. The usual responsibilities of the chair include scheduling meetings, contacting external peer reviewers for the purpose of securing external peer review letters, and formulating an initial draft of reappointment and promotion letters. All of these duties are subject to the will of the committee, and any or all of them may be delegated by the chair or by the will of the committee as expressed in a majority vote.

4. Meetings

Meetings of the Personnel Committee shall be called by the Chair or by a majority of the members. In promotion and tenure matters, a quorum shall be three fourths of the eligible voting membership currently in residence, with a minimum of three members. If there are fewer than three members eligible to vote in a promotion or tenure case, the Department Head, in consultation with the Committee, will solicit faculty from similar departments or disciplines at the University to assist the Committee with both the review and recommendation. Active members of the Personnel Committee shall be allowed to
vote *in absentia*. In matters other than promotion and reappointment, a quorum shall be a majority of the Committee **currently in residence**.

5. **Action**

The Personnel Committee will entertain requests for reappointment, promotion and tenure as they come from the individual faculty member. It shall act on these matters according to established Departmental, College, and University policies, and then forward its recommendation to the Department Head, who shall provide the candidate with a copy of the recommendations. After the candidate has had an opportunity to respond to the recommendation (in the case of a negative Personnel Committee recommendation), the department head will compose his/her own recommendations, provide the candidate with a copy, and forward both sets of recommendations to the Dean of the College, whether or not the recommendation of the Department Head concurs with that of the Personnel Committee, unless a candidate decides to terminate his/her candidacy. The Department Head should send a copy of his/her letter containing his/her recommendation to the Personnel Committee and the candidate in a timely fashion, and no later than the date he/she sends the letter to the Dean.

6. **Confidentiality**

All discussions of the Personnel Committee shall be confidential.

7. **Notification of the Candidate**

The candidate shall be notified whenever he or she is eligible for tenure or promotion, and shall be invited to submit evidence supporting the candidacy. When Departmental recommendations are completed, the Department Head will inform the candidate of the recommendations and convey to the candidate copies of the letters concerning the action which have been prepared by the Personnel Committee and by the Department Head.

**IV. STANDARDS OF EVIDENCE CONCERNING TENURE AND PROMOTION**

1. **The Concept of Tenure**

Tenure is a guarantee of continued employment with all the academic rights of a faculty member until such time as that faculty member retires. Tenure may be revoked only for the reasons specified in Appendix D of the *Faculty Handbook* and according to the procedures articulated there. This means that the granting of tenure is an extremely serious commitment of the University and should not be recommended by a department unless it is confident that the University will benefit if the candidate were to spend his or her whole career at OSU. The criteria for tenure have been developed with this commitment in mind. In addition, when making tenure decisions, the philosophy department will attempt: 1) to ensure quality of instruction, 2) to contribute to the department’s reputation for scholarly research, and 3) to ensure that the department meets
its commitment to service/outreach.

2. The Concept of Promotion

Promotion is the changing of a faculty member’s academic title to that of a higher rank. Promotion is to be granted only when it is judged that a candidate is already performing at the quality level of the next higher rank. Unlike the non-academic world where someone is promoted to a different kind of job, in the academy, all ranked positions perform the same kind of job, though its scope and emphasis may vary during a faculty member’s career.

3. Evaluative Terms

Reappointment, promotion and tenure criteria cannot be precisely quantified but must meet standards of accountability. For purposes of this document, the following evaluative terms/ratings are applicable in ascending order: Inadequate, Satisfactory, Good, Excellent and Outstanding.

4. Evaluation of Performance in Teaching

The determination of the quality of performance in teaching may be based upon the following elements:

(i) Student evaluations
(ii) Exit assessments in which graduating Philosophy majors and minors are requested to provide written assessments of Philosophy courses and instructors
(iii) Peer review based on class visitation and/or judgments of course content, textual material, examinations, grading policies, etc.
(iv) Departmental, university, or national teaching awards
(v) Other relevant evidence, such as letters from students, letters from faculty before whose classes the candidate has appeared, reviews by teaching award panels, etc.
(vi) Submitted course Materials, such as syllabi, tests, handouts, etc.

It must be emphasized that no single element in this composite is to be regarded as decisive and no order of relative importance is intended.

5. Evaluation of Performance in Research and Professional Activity

The determination of the quality of performance in research and professional activity will be based upon a composite picture involving the following elements:

(i) Books published and reviews of such books
(ii) Articles accepted in regional, national, or international journals
(iii) Grant proposals funded
(iv) Book chapters
(v) Edited books
(vi) Papers presented at regional, national, or international professional conferences
(vii) Lectures presented to other philosophy departments or other departments
(viii) Public lectures
(ix) Book reviews
(x) Service as a reviewer for a journal, conference, or publisher
(xi) Offices held in regional, national, or international professional societies
(xii) Books, articles, chapters prepared but not accepted for publication
(xiii) Grant proposals submitted but not funded
(xiv) Unsolicited letters concerning the quality of performance in the above categories from peers at other universities, or from other departments
(xv) Peer assessment of one’s philosophic acumen, as gathered from informal conversations, etc.
(xvi) Other relevant material or activities

Obviously, not all of these elements are equally important, and no order of relative importance is intended. Relative importance of these various elements in particular cases must be left to the professional judgment of the Personnel Committee and Department Head.

6. Evaluation of Performance in Service/Outreach

The determination of the quality of performance in Service/Outreach activities will be based upon a composite picture involving the following elements:

(i) Officially assigned extension activities
(ii) Unassigned teaching and public service activities such as credit/noncredit courses, short courses, workshops, seminars, and conferences
(iii) Proposals submitted for outside funding for extension/public service activities
(iv) Grants, awards, and contracts through agencies, business/industry, and private professional organizations
(v) Extension publications, such as contracted studies, course digests, short course manuals and other relevant activities
(vi) Nature and extent of Departmental, College, and University service functions (committee membership, being chair of a committee, faculty council service, special project director, adviser, graduate committee membership or supervising graduate work, supervising Wentz Projects, honors degree projects, etc.)
(vii) Willingness to serve when asked
(viii) Quality of the performance in fulfilling role responsibilities
(ix) Public lectures or leading public discussions
(x) Regular and/or important contributions to public service

No order of relative importance is intended here.
7. External Peer Review

The Philosophy Department shall require external peer review in all cases of promotion, in accordance with the following guidelines:

(i) The candidate’s areas of expertise should be determined, and peer reviewers should be selected accordingly. No external peer reviewer may be the candidate’s dissertation advisor or former student.

(ii) A list of at least six potential peer reviewers will be assembled by the Personnel Committee. The candidate should submit to the Personnel Committee a list of his/her own of similar length. The entire list of approximately ten to twelve possibilities will be shared with the candidate, who can request that one or more be removed because of possible conflict. The candidate’s request for omissions shall be honored unless the Committee determines that there is good reason for refusing to honor the request, and the candidate will be informed if his/her request is denied. The Personnel Committee shall solicit at least four peer reviews; two reviewers shall be selected from the Committee’s list and two from the candidate’s list.

(iii) The Committee shall secure a minimum of three letters with at least one from each list, and a maximum of four letters with at least two from each list. The peer reviewer shall be provided with all relevant information as decided by the committee after consulting with the candidate. This may include works in progress, works in circulation, or works in press. As quantitative criteria are included in the next section, and since the personnel committee and the department head are best able to gauge a candidate’s overall contributions, the peer reviewer (better able to review the quality of work in a particular specialized area) shall be asked to assess only the quality, not the quantity of the candidate’s work.

(iv) The implications of the Buckley Amendment are to be remembered. Candidates will have access to review letters unless they waive their rights.

(v) The candidate may place in his or her file unsolicited external peer reviews (in the form of letters, referee’s comments, etc.) provided they are unedited.

(vi) The Personnel Committee will normally attempt to find reviewers from peer institutions.

V. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION

1. Lecturers

Lecturers are appointed to teach undergraduate classes at the discretion of the Department Head. Their performance is monitored and evaluated, but they are not candidates for promotion or tenure.
2. Assistant Professor (Initial Appointment)

Any person appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor must hold the Ph.D. degree in Philosophy (or its equivalent), except in rare cases (in which a person is hired with the expectation that he or she will complete the Ph.D.), and must show promise for subsequent promotion to higher academic ranks (insofar as this judgment can be made on the basis of credentials, letters of reference, impressions made on visits to campus, etc.). Expectations concerning teaching, research and outreach during the initial appointment will be outlined in the appointment letter, but will usually be “research-oriented.” The initial appointment is for a period of four years.

3. Assistant Professor (Reappointment)

An Assistant Professor will be reappointed for a second three-year term only if he or she has demonstrated the potential to be promoted to Associate Professor at the time of the second reappointment. This potential is to be judged on the basis that the candidate

(i) merits a rating of (at least) good in teaching, and
(ii) demonstrates progress in research and extension (see Section IV of this document) for information concerning what shall count as evidence in these judgments).

It must be remembered that the first reappointment decision comes at a time in the individual’s career when the bulk of demands pertain to candidate’s teaching duties. So, it is expected that a new assistant professor may need some time to establish his/her teaching and research programs. However, there should be sufficient evidence of research and teaching success to indicate that the candidate is likely to conform to departmental expectations by the time of the tenure decision. (See section IV of this document for information concerning what shall count as evidence in these judgments)

4. Associate Professor

As this is an RPT document, the usual time frame for meeting the various criteria is 3-5 years. Since A&Ds, on the other hand, are evaluated each year, the faculty member and department head need to consider progress toward the 3-5 year benchmarks. **All tenure track assistant professors are (unless otherwise indicated in their offer letter) assigned to the ‘Research Orientation’ (criteria given below). After tenure, the faculty member, in consultation with the department head and personnel committee, may elect to be assessed in one of the other three orientations (criteria described below).**

An Assistant Professor shall be promoted to Associate professor only if he or she is performing at the appropriate levels. This is to be judged on the basis that the candidate

(i) merits a rating of at least excellent in research and at least one other area, and
(ii) merits a rating of at least good in the third area.
5. Associate Professor (Tenure Decision)

Promotion to Associate Professor automatically confers tenure. It may happen, however, that a person is appointed for an initial five-year term as an untenured Associate Professor as the result of previous experience elsewhere. At the end of this term, a tenure decision must be made (promotion or reappointment automatically confers tenure). Such an individual is to be granted tenure only if he or she is currently performing at the level expected of an Associate Professor.

6. Professor

Any person appointed or promoted to the rank of Professor must hold the Ph.D. degree in Philosophy (or its equivalent). In addition, the person must satisfy the following requirements:

(i) merit a rating of at least excellent in research and at least one other area (teaching, service/outreach), with at least a good in the remaining area.
(ii) or, merit a rating of outstanding in research, and at least a good in the other two areas.

It would ordinarily be assumed that a candidate for promotion receives at least a grade of excellent in the particular workload orientation he/she has. The distinction between the level of achievement expected of an Associate Professor and a Professor in this regard is one of consistency of achievement over several years, quality (measuring up to higher standards of excellence than those appropriate to the Associate), and quantity. The individual’s performance must demonstrably exceed what is sufficient to gain entry to the rank of Associate Professor. The final determination of such matters must of necessity be determined by the professional judgment of the Personnel Committee and Department Head. No general formula can be relied upon.


The department understands the need for flexibility in applying the following criteria. A faculty member can be performing at higher or lower levels than indicated in one area, balanced by higher or lower performance in another (as long as performance in the lower areas is at least ‘Good’ as explained below). Someone in the Hybrid orientation, for example, may be making significant contributions to two of the three areas, and compensate for his/her performance in the third by extra teaching or extra service. Or, someone in the Research orientation may be involved in extra service, and be compensated by a course reduction. And so on. Generally, the faculty member, department head and (sometimes) the personnel committee will determine flexible and fair expectations, based on but not reducible to the following criteria, which are also to be taken as general guidelines rather than necessary or sufficient conditions.
“Inadequate” and “Satisfactory” performance criteria are the same for all workload assignments.

(a) “Inadequate” performance shall be taken to mean unsatisfactory completion of one’s budgeted duties as determined by output and qualitative evaluations made by the committee and/or peer reviewers. Because inadequate performance (or any category of performance) comes in different forms, no general formula can be relied upon for its measurement. Hence, the final determination of the rating of the candidate’s performance must of necessity be determined by the professional judgment of the personnel committee and the department head. For this reason, the departmental standards for inadequate performance (and all categories of performance) are best illustrated by paradigms, providing examples of what would count as satisfying performance expectations. (A convincing case needs to be made for criteria that substantially deviate from those listed as examples.)

i. Evidence for teaching performance meriting a rating of inadequate includes but is not limited to the following: a teaching record showing serious deficiencies as indicated by repeated poor teaching evaluations, continued student complaints and/or grade appeals, repeatedly dismissing or missing classes, or very poor peer reviews.

ii. Evidence for research performance meriting a rating of inadequate includes but is not limited to the following: failure to establish a pattern of consistent effort in submission of professional articles, presentations, and/or little or no success with submissions, production of papers, etc.

iii. Evidence for service/outreach performance meriting a rating of inadequate includes but is not limited to the following: repeated unexcused absences from department meetings, failing to perform allocated duties as a committee member, unwillingness to accept a fair share of committee assignments.

(b) “Satisfactory” performance shall be taken to mean completion of one’s budgeted duties as determined by output and qualitative evaluations made by the committee and/or peer reviewers.

i. Evidence for teaching performance meriting a rating of satisfactory includes but is not limited to the following: a teaching record that shows no serious pattern of deficiency (as revealed in student teaching evaluations and/or peer review), or in which a serious deficiency has been addressed and satisfactorily improved.
ii. Evidence for research performance meriting a rating of satisfactory includes but is not limited to the following: a pattern of consistent effort in submission of professional articles with at least some success, papers presented at local venues, etc.

iii. Evidence for service/outreach performance meriting a rating of satisfactory includes but is not limited to the following: membership on and adequate participation in at least one department committee, regular attendance at faculty meetings.

(i) **Research Oriented Faculty:**

(c) “Good” performance shall be taken to mean more than satisfactory completion of one’s budgeted duties as determined by output and qualitative evaluations made by the committee and/or peer reviewers.

i. Evidence for teaching performance meriting a rating of good includes but is not limited to the following: a teaching record that shows consistently strong teaching evaluations and/or strong evaluations from peer review.

ii. Evidence for research performance meriting a rating of good includes but is not limited to the following: a pattern of consistent effort in submission of professional articles with a fair success rate (e.g., averaging one paper per year), papers presented at professional meetings, grants applied for but not funded, etc.

iii. Evidence for service/outreach performance meriting a rating of good includes but is not limited to the following: membership on and participation in more than one department committee.

(d) “Excellent” performance shall be taken to mean performance that is substantially beyond the minimal satisfaction of one’s assigned duties as determined by output and qualitative evaluations made by the committee and/or peer reviewers.

i. Evidence for excellent performance in teaching includes but is not limited to the following: nomination for university teaching awards for excellence in teaching, especially strong student teaching evaluations on a consistent basis and confirmed by positive evaluation via departmentally conducted peer review, a documented pattern of innovation in course development and design (e.g., creating new courses or successfully integrating new teaching techniques such as service learning into the classroom experience) combined with strong student evaluations.
ii. Evidence for excellent performance in research includes but is not limited to the following: publication of a book with a respected academic publisher as part of an ongoing research program, a pattern of consistent effort and accomplishment in submission of professional articles (1.5 substantial articles accepted per year, or a substantial article and a professional presentation per year).

iii. Evidence for excellent performance in service/outreach includes but is not limited to significant time spent and success attained in the following: heading major departmental committees, editing a professional journal, being an officer in a professional organization, heavy reviewing duty for professional journals, extensive and/or important contributions to community service, being on A&S or Faculty Council.

(e) “Outstanding” performance shall be taken to mean performance that is exemplary, as determined by output and qualitative evaluations made by the committee and/or peer reviewers.

i. Evidence for outstanding performance in teaching includes but is not limited to the following: multiple nominations for university teaching awards, a documented pattern of innovation in course development and design (e.g. creating a number of new courses, developing interdisciplinary courses) combined with strong student and/or peer evaluations, continual student mentoring.

ii. Evidence for outstanding performance in research includes but is not limited to the following: publication of more than one book with academic publishers over a five-year period as part of an ongoing research program, a pattern of exemplary effort and accomplishment in submission of professional articles (for example, averaging two or more major articles accepted per year in high-ranking professional journals), publishing articles or books receiving considerable national or international attention, receiving university research awards, etc.

iii. Evidence for outstanding performance in service/outreach includes but is not limited to: significant effort spent and success attained over extended periods of time in more than one of the following: heading major departmental committees, being an undergraduate or graduate advisor, editing a professional journal, being an officer in a professional organization, continual reviewing for professional journals, extensive and/or important contributions to community service.
(ii) **Teaching Oriented Faculty:**

(c) “Good”

i. Evidence for teaching performance meriting a rating of good includes but is not limited to the following: a teaching record that shows consistently strong teaching evaluations and/or strong evaluations from peer review, exploration of alternative pedagogical tools, evidence of student mentoring, introduction of a new course, nominations for university teaching awards.

ii. Evidence for research performance meriting a rating of good includes but is not limited to the following: a pattern of consistent effort in submission of professional articles with some success (e.g., averaging 1 publication over a 3-year period), papers presented at professional meetings, etc.

iii. Evidence for service/outreach performance meriting a rating of good includes but is not limited to the following: membership on and participation in more than one department committee.

(d) “Excellent”

i. Evidence for excellent performance in teaching includes but is not limited to the following: consistent and repeated nominations for university awards for excellence in teaching, especially awards for excellence in teaching, especially strong student teaching evaluations on a consistent basis and confirmed by positive evaluation via departmentally conducted peer review, strong student mentoring, documented pattern of research directed at classroom techniques, repeated innovation in course development and design (e.g. creating new courses or successfully integrating new teaching techniques such as service learning into the classroom experience) combined with strong student evaluations.

ii. Evidence for excellent performance in research includes but is not limited to the following: a pattern of consistent effort and accomplishment in submission of professional articles, just under 1 substantial article accepted per year, or more than one professional presentation per year would be examples of excellent research.

iii. Evidence for excellent performance in service/outreach includes but is not limited to significant time spent and success attained in the following: heading a major departmental committees, contributions to community service, being on A&S or Faculty Council.
(e) “Outstanding”

i. Evidence for outstanding performance in teaching includes but is not limited to the following: receipt of university teaching awards, documented pattern of research directed at classroom techniques, a documented pattern of innovation in course development and design (e.g. creating a number of new courses, developing interdisciplinary courses) combined with strong student and/or peer evaluations, continual strong student mentoring, strong student testimonials.

ii. Evidence for outstanding performance in research includes but is not limited to the following: a pattern of exemplary effort and accomplishment in submission of professional articles, averaging at least 1 professional article per year.

iii. Evidence for outstanding performance in service/outreach includes but is not limited to significant effort spent and success attained over extended periods of time in more than one of the following: heading major departmental committees, being an undergraduate or graduate advisor, extensive and/or important contributions to community service.

(iii) Service/Outreach Oriented Faculty:

(c) “Good”

i. Evidence for teaching performance meriting a rating of good includes but is not limited to the following: a teaching record that shows consistently strong teaching evaluations and/or strong evaluations from peer review.

ii. Evidence for research performance meriting a rating of good includes but is not limited to the following: a pattern of consistent effort in submission of professional articles with some success (e.g., averaging 1 publication over a 3-year period), papers presented at professional meetings, etc.

iii. Evidence for service/outreach performance meriting a rating of good includes but is not limited to the following: membership on and participation in more than one department committee, pattern of successful outreach or public service.

(d) “Excellent”

i. Evidence for excellent performance in teaching includes but is not
limited to the following: especially strong student teaching evaluations on a consistent basis and confirmed by positive evaluation via departmentally conducted peer review, introduction of new courses.

ii. Evidence for excellent performance in research includes but is not limited to the following: a pattern of consistent effort and accomplishment in submission of professional articles, just under 1 substantial article accepted per year, or more than one professional presentation per year would be examples of excellent research.

iii. Evidence for excellent performance in service/outreach includes but is not limited to significant time spent and success attained in the following: heading a major departmental committees, significant contributions to community service or outreach, application for grants to support departmental service/outreach activities, etc.

(e) “Outstanding”

i. Evidence for outstanding performance in teaching includes but is not limited to the following: nomination for university teaching awards, a documented pattern of innovation in course development and design (e.g. new courses, developing interdisciplinary courses) combined with strong student and/or peer evaluations, continual student mentoring.

ii. Evidence for outstanding performance in research includes but is not limited to the following: a pattern of exemplary effort and accomplishment in submission of professional articles, averaging at least 1 professional article per year.

iii. Evidence for outstanding performance in service/outreach includes but is not limited to receiving grant support for departmental service/outreach activities; community-recognized service/outreach activities; successfully coordinating and expanding departmental service/outreach activities, etc.

(iv) Hybrid Oriented Faculty:

(c) “Good”

i. Evidence for teaching performance meriting a rating of good includes but is not limited to the following: a teaching record that shows consistently strong teaching evaluations and/or strong
evaluations from peer review.

ii. Evidence for research performance meriting a rating of good includes but is not limited to the following: a pattern of consistent effort in submission of professional articles with some success (e.g., averaging 1 publication every two years), consistent pattern of papers presented at professional meetings, etc.

iii. Evidence for service/outreach performance meriting a rating of good includes but is not limited to the following: membership on and participation in more than one department committee.

(d) “Excellent”

i. Evidence for excellent performance in teaching includes but is not limited to the following: nomination for University Teaching Awards, especially strong student teaching evaluations on a consistent basis and confirmed by positive evaluation via departmentally conducted peer review, innovation in course development and design (e.g. creating new courses or successfully integrating new teaching techniques such as service learning into the classroom experience) combined with strong student evaluations.

ii. Evidence for excellent performance in Research includes but is not limited to the following: a pattern of successful publications, averaging 1 publication per year, more than 1 professional presentations per year, etc.

iii. Evidence for excellent performance in service/outreach includes but is not limited to significant time spent and success attained in the following: heading a major departmental committee, contributions to community service, being graduate advisor, being on A&S or Faculty Council.

(e) “Outstanding”

i. Evidence for outstanding performance in teaching includes but is not limited to the following: consistent and repeated nominations for university teaching awards for excellence in teaching, especially strong student teaching evaluations on a consistent basis and confirmed by positive evaluation via departmentally conducted peer review, repeated innovation in course development and design (e.g. creating new courses or successfully integrating new teaching techniques such as service learning into the classroom experience) combined with strong student evaluations, strong student mentoring.
ii. Evidence for outstanding performance in research includes but is not limited to the following: publication of a book with a respected academic publisher as part of an ongoing research program; a pattern of consistent effort and accomplishment in submission of professional articles, e.g. 1.5 substantial articles accepted per year, or a substantial article and a professional presentation per year would be examples of excellent research.

iii. Evidence for outstanding performance in service/outreach includes but is not limited to significant time spent and success attained in the following: heading major departmental committees, significant contributions to the department, college or university, pattern of community service.

8. Professionalism and RPT Decisions

In accordance with the College of Arts and Sciences Personnel Procedures Document (Revised A&S RPT 09/1/2015), professionalism may, in rare cases, be a factor in RPT decisions at any level. Professionalism becomes a relevant factor in RPT decisions when a faculty member’s attitudes and actions function destructively. This would include: those who behave maliciously toward their colleagues, students, the department, the administration or the university, those who create morale problems; those who, in most situations where issues are in conflict, take positions that are self-serving at the expense of other colleagues, and those who lack integrity in dealing with colleagues, students or the administration.

VI. OTHER MATTERS PERTAINING TO PROMOTION AND TENURE

1. Minimum Time in Rank

In general, a faculty member should be promoted when his/her qualifications and scholarly record match the criteria for the next rank. A precise number of years in rank should be a minor consideration.

2. Prior Service

Provided evidence of continuity of performance has been given (which might normally require two years or more in residence), achievement attained at another institution should be included fully in a review of a candidate for tenure or promotion. Credit for prior service must be agreed upon and explicitly stated in the offer letter.

3. Nonreappointment and Termination

Nonreappointment and termination shall be in strict conformance with the policies described in the Faculty Handbook.
4. Extensions to Probationary Period

The probationary period of a faculty member may be able to be extended whenever the faculty member takes a leave of absence without pay, takes an extended sick leave, or successfully petitions for a Family Medical Leave Act qualifying extension. The policies described in the Faculty Handbook will be strictly observed.

VII. PROCEDURE FOR AMENDING PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICIES OF THE PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT

Policies of the Philosophy Department concerning promotion and tenure shall be amended upon the approval of three-fourths of tenure track faculty members. Amendments must be consistent with College and University personnel policies.