



AUBURN UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

GUIDELINES

Philosophy Department

Workload
Faculty Annual Review
Third-Year Review
Promotion and Tenure

9/30/11

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, AND PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

Approved 8/24/09, Updated 4/1/11, **Approved by Provost 5/11, Updated to reflect FHB changes 9/30/11**

The Department of Philosophy Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the Auburn University Faculty Handbook and College of Liberal Arts guidelines. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of these guidelines is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and guidelines for faculty assignments, faculty evaluation, and promotion and tenure at the departmental level. Department guidelines are intended to conform to those of the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (revised 6/17/11) and the College of Liberal Arts. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in these guidelines and in the University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is University, College, Department. Any reference to the Faculty Handbook in this document refers to the current version.

The Philosophy Department's faculty evaluation process is intended to guide faculty toward enhanced success; clarify faculty goals; inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the department; include faculty in discussions and decisions; and provide consistent and clear criteria for promotion and tenure recommendations, as applicable.

The faculty evaluation process in the College of Liberal Arts includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual workload assignment, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track and Clinical track positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure track faculty are subject to a third-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research, outreach, and service (as applicable to the faculty member's assignment) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance at any time before tenure. The focus of the third-year review for clinical track faculty is the faculty member's progress toward achieving promotion to associate clinical professor, yet still recognizing that clinical faculty are on continuing appointments that necessitate annual contract renewal. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in assigned areas of performance (such as clinical teaching, clinical outreach, service, scholarship, professional development) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance, effective at the conclusion of the annual contract in force.

Reference to "Tenure track" faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

The Appointment Letter

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, outreach, and service. Examples of appointment letters may be found at the following URL:

https://sites.auburn.edu/academic/COLA/CLA_Dean/cladeptguidelines/SitePages/Home.aspx

Annual Workload Assignment

Annual faculty assignments reflect that faculty members working in various disciplines contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and department chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

The College of Liberal Arts Workload Guidelines state:

Initial workload assignments for tenure-track faculty (TTF) are negotiated upon hire, and are distributed across all areas of responsibility; teaching, research/creative scholarly works, outreach, extension and service. Occasionally, administrative duties may also be included as a percent of a faculty member's workload if it is part of their normal assignment. Workload assignments may be adjusted on an annual basis during the annual review process to reflect any changes in a faculty member's assignment for the following year. The department head/chair meets with each faculty member during the faculty annual

review process to discuss and negotiate anticipated workload changes. The faculty member signs the annual review which includes the stated workload assignment for the following year to assure that every faculty member is aware of his/her responsibilities. The original signed annual review is to be kept in the departmental personnel file. Three copies are to be submitted to the Office of the Dean (one copy will be kept on file in the Dean's Office, one copy will be placed in the CLA's faculty personnel file and one copy will be delivered to the Office of the Provost).

Description of Types of Faculty Positions

Tenure Track Faculty (TTF)

The "typical" annual teaching assignment for "research active" TTF is 5 courses¹ (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 62.5% per year. Consistent with university guidelines, all research active TTF are assigned a minimum 25% research/creative/scholarly outreach² workload for promotion and tenure purposes. The annual teaching assignment for "highly productive" research TTF is 4 courses³ (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 50% per year. The status of highly productive research TTF requires the approval of the Dean. In situations where a tenured associate professor or professor is not fulfilling a 25% requirement for scholarly activity, the department chair will provide a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to ensure that a tenured faculty member has a 100% workload. In this case, the faculty member would be assigned a differential workload with a minimum of 10% research, in order to stay current in the field for teaching purposes. It is expected that the faculty member will receive an increase in the teaching load, with the understanding that he/she cannot be promoted just on teaching. Research productivity will be considered over a 3 year period. If a faculty member is not research productive for 3 years, then there will be an increase in the teaching load proportionally. During that 3-year period, if he/she does become productive and demonstrates that he/she can be productive for 3 years in research, then there will be a reduction in the teaching load to acknowledge the increase in research.

Clinical Track Faculty (CTF)

CTF are generally assigned teaching loads ranging from 5-8 courses a year (or department FTE equivalent). There is not a minimum research workload requirement. According to AU guidelines⁴ the clinician title series is a professional series for appointment of appropriately qualified individuals who contribute to the university's academic mission by participation in activities which (1) predominantly involve clinical practice, (2) are of contractually specified duration, and (3) operate under contracts, grants, generated income, or other designated funds. Note, however, that CTF are expected to teach in the clinical setting.

Instructors/Lecturers

Instructors and Lecturers will be assigned 100% teaching loads of 8 courses per year. Any exceptions will need approval by the Dean. In addition to the definition of teaching stated in the Faculty Handbook, teaching in CLA includes: holding regular office hours, mentoring and advising students, keeping current in the field, attendance of departmental meetings relevant to teaching, participating in departmental life and the engagement of students.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF – as designated by HR)

NTTF may be assigned some teaching; but it cannot exceed one course per semester and three courses per year.

Appendix 1 outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

¹ A course is defined as a 3 contact hour course.

² "In terms of your questions, it is my understanding that the former Provost said that a tenure track faculty member on hire must have a minimum of 25% research, scholarship of pedagogy or outreach, or creative activity. Therefore, I will continue that tradition." - Email from Dr. Mazey sent to Paula Bobrowski 5/10/2009.

³ Ibid.

⁴ http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/clinician_positions.html#appointment

Workload adjustment for sabbaticals and leaves. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to research would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

[See Appendix 2 for Departmental Workload Guidelines.](#)

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status.

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

Performance Descriptors. The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be assessed a performance score of 4 - Exemplary (characterizing performance of high merit), 3 - Exceeds Expectations (characterizing performance of merit), 2 - Meets Expectations (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), 1 – Marginal (characterizing performance that may not be sufficient to justify continuation) or 0 – Unacceptable (characterizing performance not sufficient to justify continuation).

See Appendix 3 for Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart.

The annual review normally covers performance for the preceding calendar year. Research productivity will be considered over a 3-year period. Evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable, to their appointment.

[See Appendix 4 for Departmental Annual Review Guidelines.](#)

Written evaluation report

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

The unit head shall prepare a written report summarizing the major points of the conference. A copy of the report shall be provided to the faculty member within a month of the conference. If there are no objections, the faculty member shall be asked to sign it as confirmation of having seen it. If the faculty member does not agree with the material in the report, he or she may write a response to be appended to the report. A copy of the signed report and response, if there is one, is to be retained for the faculty member's departmental personnel file; another copy is to be given to the faculty member; a third copy is sent to the Office of the Provost. To the extent permitted by law, the report is to remain confidential, available only for the use of the concerned faculty member and any University officials who have supervisory power over the faculty member.

Third-Year Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Each department shall conduct a third year review of all its probationary faculty members. This shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member's third year. The head shall request a current vita and any supporting material the head or the faculty member deems appropriate prior to the review. The particular focus of this review is the faculty member's

progress toward achieving tenure. The review therefore must address the criteria for tenure set forth in this document. To be maximally useful to the candidate and the department, the review shall involve the entire tenured faculty. In order for it to accurately reveal the judgment of tenured faculty, it shall conclude with a vote on whether or not, in the judgment of the tenured faculty, the candidate is making appropriate progress toward tenure. The result of the vote shall be announced at the meeting. Faculty should understand that this vote is not a commitment to grant or deny tenure in the future.

The head shall prepare a written report covering the findings of the review, and characterizing the nature of the vote. The procedure described above for the report on the yearly conference shall be followed, with the difference that this report may be consulted by the tenured faculty when the faculty member is a candidate for tenure; otherwise, the report is to remain confidential [to the extent allowable by law].

See Appendix 5 for Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines.

Promotion and Tenure Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of 1) teaching and/or outreach and 2) research/creative work. He or she is further expected to demonstrate over a sustained period distinctive achievement in one of these areas or achievement in both areas comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years. In addition, he or she is expected to have contributed some service to the University. Candidates covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines will be evaluated accordingly. For candidates not covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines, the criteria for teaching, research/creative work, and outreach described below [see Appendix 1] shall be considered by the faculty in the evaluation of a candidate's performance and achievement. The candidate's employment conditions and academic assignments shall determine which criteria are most emphasized, and standards for promotion are based on the weights of each performance area as described in the letter of offer and subsequent annual evaluations. Credit shall also be given for contributions above and beyond specifically assigned duties.

Appendix 1 outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

Regarding tenure, the AU Faculty Handbook states:

Auburn University nurtures and defends the concept of academic tenure which assures each faculty member freedom, without jeopardy at the department, college or school, or University level, to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, programs, policies, and institutions and guarantees faculty members the right to support, without jeopardy, any colleague whose academic freedom is threatened. Tenure establishes an environment in which truth can be sought and expressed in one's teaching, research/creative work, outreach work, and service. In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) research/creative work, 3) outreach and 4) service as described above under Promotion Criteria and, where applicable, in approved departmental guidelines, the candidate for tenure must also demonstrate potential to contribute as a productive and collegial member of the academic unit in all relevant areas.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should carefully read the Promotion and Tenure policies found in the AU Faculty Handbook. A timeline for the candidate's submission of materials for evaluation for promotion and tenure will be established each year by the Office of the Provost.

See Appendix 6 for Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty at Auburn are subject to post-tenure review as outlined on the Provost's website at the following URL: http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies/2009-11_post-tenured-review-policy.pdf

Appendix 1

Auburn University's Expectations for Teaching, Research, Outreach, and Service

Teaching

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Since a primary activity of the University is the instruction of students, careful evaluation of teaching is essential. Because of the difficulty of evaluating teaching effectiveness, faculty members are urged to consider as many relevant measures as possible in appraising the candidate. These include consideration of the candidate's knowledge of the subject and his or her professional growth in the field of specialization; the candidate's own statement of his or her teaching philosophy; the quality of the candidate's teaching as indicated by peer and student evaluations and teaching awards; performance of the candidate's students on standardized tests or in subsequent classes; the candidate's contributions to the academic advising of students; the candidate's development of new courses and curricula; the quality of the candidate's direction of dissertations, theses, independent study projects, etc.; and the quality of pedagogical material published by the candidate.

Research/Creative Work

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

A faculty member engaged in research/creative work has an obligation to contribute to his or her discipline through applied and/or basic research, through creative endeavors, or through interpretive scholarship. To a large extent, each discipline and each department must determine how much and what quality of research/creative work is appropriate for promotion (and/or tenure) and judge its candidates accordingly. In appraising the candidate's work, faculty members should consider the quality and significance of the work, the quality of the outlet for publication or exhibition, and, in cases of collaborative work, the role of the candidate.

Research and creative work ordinarily can be documented by a candidate's publications or performances/exhibitions. Publication subjected to critical review by other scholars as a condition of publication should carry more weight than publication that is not refereed. Nevertheless, all forms of publication, including articles intended for a non-academic audience, should be considered provided they are of high quality in relation to the purpose intended. Scholarly papers subjected to peer review and delivered at a regional or national conference and creative work subjected to peer review and performed or exhibited on a regional or national level should carry more weight than work done only on a local level.

Successful efforts in obtaining extramural support for research/creative work (as well as for teaching and outreach programs) should also be positively considered in evaluation of the candidate.

Outreach

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as outreach scholarship for purposes of tenure and promotion if all the following conditions are met: 1) there is a substantive link with significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns; 2) there is a direct application of knowledge to significant human needs and societal problems, issues, or concerns; 3) there is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise; 4) the ultimate purpose is for the public or common good; 5) new knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele; and 6) there is a clear link/relationship between the program/activities and an appropriate academic unit's mission. Outreach is not expected

of all faculty. Participation in this function varies from major, continuing commitments, as is the case with the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, through intermittent engagement for individual faculty as needs and opportunities for a particular expertise arise, to no involvement at all.

The commitment of faculty time to outreach is a decision to be made by the faculty member with the approval of the department in which the faculty member will seek tenure and/or promotion. It may be accomplished in the initial appointment, as is typically the case for Extension faculty, in annual work plans, or during the year in response to unexpected needs. In any case, this decision should be made with due consideration to the professional development of the faculty member, the expected public benefits of the outreach activities, and mission of the department and/or other supporting units. Departmental approval carries a commitment to assess and appropriately weigh outreach contributions in salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

Demands for quality in outreach are the same as in teaching and research/creative work; however, outreach activities are different in nature from other activities and must be evaluated accordingly. See Appendix 1 of Faculty Participation in Outreach Scholarship: An Assessment Model, which is available along with other publications on the assessment of outreach under "Outreach Publications" on the University web site. Department heads should request any material necessary from the candidate to facilitate faculty assessment of the type, quality, and effectiveness of the candidate's involvement in extension activities and evaluation of any resulting publications.

Service

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

University service includes participating in departmental, college or school, and University governance and committee work, assisting in the recruitment of new faculty, and developing and assisting in the implementation of new academic programs. Faculty should note particularly distinctive contributions to University life on the part of the candidate, including service to the candidate's profession, such as offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; and editorships and the refereeing of manuscripts.

Appendix 2

Departmental Workload Guidelines for Tenure-Track Faculty

The Department's Workload Guidelines are the CLA Workload Guidelines.

Appendix 3

Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart

DEPARTMENT (insert name here)											
Faculty	Instruction		Research		Outreach		Service		Administrative		TOTAL SCORE
Name	Workload %	Performance Score	Workload %	Performance Score	Workload %	Performance Score	Workload %	Performance Score	Workload %	Performance Score	
<i>Example</i>											
Dr. X	0.63	4	0.25	3	0.07	3	0.05	3	0	0	3.63

Performance Score/Criteria	
0	Unacceptable
1	Marginal
2	Meets expectations
3	Exceeds expectations
4	Exemplary

Appendix 4

Departmental Annual Review Guidelines

Annual Evaluation

Faculty

Faculty members are evaluated annually, following the guidelines set by the Faculty Handbook. Faculty members submit a current c.v., highlighting activities from the previous calendar year, along with any additional material that the faculty member would like to have considered. The Chair may also request to see supporting evidence for any item listed on the c.v. The Chair reviews the c.v.s along with other relevant material (e.g., teaching evaluations, peer reviews, year-end reviews from previous years, etc.), and then schedules a meeting with each faculty member.

At the meeting, the Chair and the faculty member jointly review the material relevant for the review. This meeting is the faculty member's opportunity to further explain the submitted materials and their significance to the Chair. The Chair shall make an initial, general evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Promptly after the meeting, the Chair shall provide the faculty member with a formal, specific evaluation in writing in accordance with the process found in the Faculty Handbook. An unfavorable annual review for tenure-track faculty may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation at any time prior to tenure.

Although the evaluation targets the current year, the evaluation is both retrospective and prospective: The evaluation of each faculty member will take into account past evaluations and stated goals. The distance traveled in retrospect or prospect is decided in part by the faculty member's past evaluations and stated goals—but usually it will be a moving two- to four-year window.

Tenured and untenured faculty members shall be assessed on research, teaching, outreach and service (as those categories are understood in the Faculty Handbook). Faculty will receive a score between 4 (Exemplary) and 0 (Unacceptable) for each area assessed. Each score is to reflect a faculty member's success relative to the expectations of the department; the score is not relative to the success of other members of the department. Each score will then be multiplied by the workload percentage assigned to each area for that faculty member and totaled for the overall evaluation. The overall evaluation will be one of the following: Exemplary, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Marginal, or Unacceptable. Untenured faculty shall also be evaluated on their progress toward tenure and promotion.

Teaching

Evaluation of teaching relies primarily on direct measures, such as Peer Reviews and student learning assessment, and secondarily on indirect measures, such as student

evaluations and stated teaching goals. The department considers student evaluations to be useful only when considered along side other information. Excellent teachers might receive low student evaluations; poor teachers might receive very high student evaluations. To appropriately use student evaluations, the chair must attempt to determine why the student evaluations are as they are. Did a faculty member receive high student evaluations because she sparked in her students a deep interest in philosophy, or was it because she was perceived as lenient? Did another faculty member receive low student evaluations because she was disorganized and unclear, or because she was perceived as challenging?

Aside from classroom performance, other things like independent work with students on papers, teaching awards (or nominations), new preparations, etc., may also be relied on. Faculty members are also expected to work collaboratively in the area of teaching. This is especially important with respect to assessment.

Given the importance of Peer Reviews in evaluating teaching, faculty members are required to participate in a yearly peer evaluation process designed to assess their teaching performance. Information gained through the peer evaluation process will be used in annual evaluations, to support the applications of faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure, and to assist faculty in addressing any issues that need special attention.

The chair shall determine the Peer Review schedule. Only tenured faculty may serve as reviewers. Where possible, the Chair shall avoid having a faculty member peer reviewed by the same person more than once in a three-year period. The Chair should also avoid, where possible, having two members of the department peer review each other during the same year.

At a minimum, evaluators will comment on the following items when reporting on the classes they visit:

- a. Course syllabus: The course syllabus should be in general compliance with the structure required by the College of Liberal Arts, including but not limited to course objectives, required textbooks, additional print and/or electronic required or recommended materials, and grading procedure.
- b. Course packet: The packet should include, but not be limited to, materials developed or assembled by the instructor to enhance and supplement required materials, as well as sample tests and their relevance to the course objectives.
- c. Class preparation and interaction: Minimally, an instructor should demonstrate mastery of the material being taught and the ability to explain that material clearly. The reviewer should also comment on the instructor's efforts to promote class discussions and to create a comfortable learning environment.

Completion and use of peer evaluations: copies of the signed reports of peer evaluators will be given to the faculty member and the Department Chair **within ten working days from the date of the class visit**, and a copy will be placed in the faculty member's permanent file. Faculty members being evaluated and their evaluators must sign the peer evaluation form completed by the evaluators. If

necessary, they may add their own comments on the reports, or write separate responses to be attached to the evaluators' reports.

In addition to Peer Reviews, faculty may choose to be evaluated by specialists from the Biggio Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning. Evaluations by the Biggio Center can be used in annual reviews, but they cannot be substituted for peer reviews.

Research

Evaluation of research relies primarily on research newly produced, research continuing, research completed, and stated research goals. But other things like attending conferences and reading groups may also be relied on. To evaluate research, it is important that more than a list of publications be considered; it is important that quality of research be considered. A faculty member is successful as a researcher in a given year if the faculty member has published or publicly presented research, has produced or publicly presented research that is ready for publication, or has produced research that is ready for publication or public presentation, and has met stated research goals. As a general rule, a faculty member is successful as a researcher over a period of years only if research is published in reputable journals or with reputable publishers. In addition, faculty members are expected to work collaboratively in the area of research. And so positive contributions someone else's research counts as a positive contribution to research.

The department weighs quality over quantity. Work published in reputable journals or by reputable publishers or presented at reputable conferences will be weighed accordingly.

The Chair shall determine the reputation of any journal, press, or conference partly, but not exclusively, by appeal to journal rankings for the European Science Foundation and the Australasian Philosophical Association. Disagreements about the reputation of a journal, press, or conference will be settled by department vote.

Outreach

Faculty should consult the Faculty Handbook for specific guidelines of what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure consideration. For the purpose of annual review, the evaluation of outreach will be a measurement of the extent to which each of these criteria is met. In addition, faculty members are expected to work collaboratively in the area of outreach.

Outreach is not expected of all faculty members. The commitment of faculty time to outreach is a decision to be made by the faculty member with the approval of the Chair.

Service

Evaluation of service and collegiality will include the following:

1. participation in departmental, college, and University governance and committee work;
2. assisting in the recruitment of new faculty;
3. mentoring junior faculty;
4. contributing to the research of other faculty;
5. participating in department colloquia;
6. developing and assisting in the implementation of new academic programs;
7. service to the profession, such as offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies, as well as editorships and the refereeing of manuscripts.

The above list should be thought of only as common examples of what will count as service. Faculty members are also expected to work collaboratively in the area of service. The evaluation of service should take into account not only the amount of service, but also its quality, at least where the latter can be assessed. To assess service positively is to assess it as contributing positively to the mission of the Department, the University, or the profession.

Instructors

Instructors are evaluated annually by the faculty at a scheduled faculty meeting. Faculty will be given teaching evaluations, peer reviews, and current c.v.s for each instructor. Instructors are assessed primarily on teaching except in those rare cases where teaching does not make up 100% of an instructor's workload. Evaluation of teaching for instructors will be the same as it is for tenure-track faculty. Professional progress, which will include publications, submissions for publications, applying for permanent faculty positions outside of Auburn, professional presentations, etc., may also play a role in an instructor's overall evaluation score. The overall evaluation will be one of the following: Exemplary, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Marginal, or Unacceptable.

Appendix 5

Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines

The Third-Year Review Guidelines of the Department of Philosophy follow the guidelines and procedures set forth in the Faculty Handbook. It is highly recommended that the third-year review dossier follow the Promotion and Tenure format contain in the Faculty Handbook.

An unfavorable third-year review may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation; however, a letter of non-continuation may be issued at any time prior to tenure.

Appendix 6

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The case for promotion to associate rests on research, teaching, and service. In the area of service, although duties for an untenured faculty member will not be eliminated, they should ideally be kept to a minimum. Nonetheless, any duties or offices that are undertaken will certainly be given due weight in promotion and tenure considerations. Also, although faculty members are not required to perform outreach, scholarly outreach can count towards tenure and promotion.

In the area of research, as a general rule, sustained scholarly production equivalent to 4-6 articles in reputable journals (or the book equivalent) in the candidates area(s) of expertise will be considered evidence of an emerging national reputation and adequate for promotion to associate professor and tenure. Fewer articles might be judged sufficient if the quality is outstanding, and more will be required if the quality is merely fair. The department relies primarily on three means for determining the quality and/or quantity of a candidate's work:

1. Outside referees: Since the department insures that outside referees have the stature and expertise to judge whether a candidate's work is of sufficient quality and quantity to justify tenure and/or promotion, considerable weight is given to the judgment of outside referees, and their judgment is essential to the process. Letters from outside referees for candidates for tenure and/or promotion will be solicited according to the Faculty Handbook.
2. Department faculty: The tenured faculty (if the candidate is being considered for promotion to full professor, then only the full professors) will jointly assess the quality and quantity of the candidate's work independently of the referees' reports and, if the work is published, the reputation of the journal or publisher. Agreement between the department's faculty (or the full professors when promotion to the rank of full professor is being considered) and the outside referees adds weight to the judgment of each; disagreement is cause for concern.
3. Journal and publisher referees: Refereed articles and books published in reputable journals or by reputable publishers undergo an extensive peer review process and the department respects the integrity of that process. Publishing a refereed article in a reputable journal or a book with a reputable press is strong presumptive evidence that it is of high quality. Publishing 4-6 refereed articles in reputable journals or a book with a reputable press is strong presumptive evidence that the candidate has satisfied research conditions for tenure and promotion. Consequently, for invited articles, the department will rely more heavily on outside referees and faculty evaluations. The department does not consider invited articles to be of less importance than refereed articles, everything else being equal.

No single means of evaluating a candidate's work is thought more important than the others. And although the standard means by which a candidate will satisfy the research requirement for tenure and promotion to associate will be to publish – author or co-author (in the case of co-authored works, it is the responsibility of the candidate to

demonstrate the extent of his or her contribution) – 4-6 articles in reputable places, other means are equally appropriate: a book published by a reputable press; 2-3 articles in outstanding (A+) journals; an article in an outstanding journal and 2-4 articles in good journals (B); 2-3 articles in very good journals (A) and a completed book manuscript currently under review and judged to be publishable by outside referees; 2-4 articles in good journals and a textbook; and so forth. The department will determine the quality of journals and publishers by using the following criteria: the reputation of the journal or publisher according to the faculty and the outside referees, the acceptance rates of the journals, and published rankings of journals and publishers (e.g., the rankings of the European Science Foundation and the Australasian Philosophical Association). The department recognizes that acceptance rates can be misleading, since some journals (e.g., *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*) receive submissions that are largely self-selected. The department also recognizes that some areas of philosophy (e.g., history of philosophy, aesthetics, feminist philosophy, applied ethics, etc.) are poorly represented in traditional journals and that these journals often have the highest ranking. Consequently, the evaluation of research published in such underrepresented areas must take this into account by determining the journal's ranking in relation to the area of research.

In the area of teaching, the most weight is to be placed on peer evaluations, although due consideration is also given to student evaluations. Teaching must routinely meet expectations.

The case for tenure involves all of the considerations relevant for promotion to the rank of associate professor. The criteria for attainment of tenured status are described in the Faculty Handbook. Candidates for tenure in the Department of Philosophy are normally considered at the same time for promotion to the rank of associate professor; the recommendations are linked, in that favorable recommendation for tenure, with its more extensive requirements, presumes favorable recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor.

For promotion to full, duplication of the research requirements for promotion to associate and sustained productivity over a period of years are evidence of a national reputation and are generally required. Further evidence of the candidate having achieved a national reputation is the testimony of outside referees. Candidates for full professor are also expected to have routinely met expectations with respect to teaching and service since having been promoted to associate.