

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on) 5/22/00

CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT PROCEDURES

(Approved by Faculty Vote) 5/22/00

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on) 5/22/00

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT): 5/2005

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: 5/2005

James Hamilton, Department Head

Date signed: 8/22/00

Peter Nicholls, Dean

Date signed: 9/1/00

James R. Coffman, Provost

Date signed: 9/25/00

*Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

Adopted on November 19, 1993, in accordance with the provisions in the *Faculty Handbook*, Sections C30-38.

Revised on November 29, 1995, to reflect a wider variety of means of evaluating teaching success.

Revised on February 28, 1997, to include a statement on minimum standards of productivity.

Section related to tenure criteria and standards, including relevant parts of annual evaluation criteria and standards, revised on May 22, 2002.

To be revised or continued without revision, by vote of the Philosophy Department, not later than May 30, 2002.

PREAMBLE

We realize that a statement of formal evaluation procedures and criteria is required for the assessment of faculty performance. It is our belief that other important functions of

these procedures and especially these criteria are to encourage the faculty to excel in its profession and to offer a mechanism for rewarding superior performance. (See the *Faculty Handbook*, Sections C30.1-C30.3.)

Statement of minimally acceptable levels of productivity for the Department of Philosophy at Kansas State University

Preamble

The system of tenure at Kansas State University is understood to be a means for providing senior faculty (1) the freedom necessary for the best use of their talents in pursuing excellence in scholarship and instruction and (2) sufficient economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. [See Appendix C of the KSU *Faculty Handbook*.] There is a concern in the state community that this system protects faculty who chronically underachieve; and, they believe, tenured faculty ought therefore be held to a set of standards of minimally acceptable expectations. In 1995, although no data--nor other evidence of any kind--have ever been offered to support the claim of even occasional abuse of the tenure system at any of the Regents institutions, the Kansas Board of Regents charged each Regents campus with coming up with a plan to respond to these concerns and to require establishment of standards of minimally acceptable levels of performance. In Spring 1996, the Kansas State Faculty Senate passed section C31.5 of the Kansas State University *Faculty Handbook* with a view to adequately responding to the Regents' charge. The Faculty Senate subsequently added sections C31.6, C31.7 and C31.8 to clarify elements of C31.5. These sections of the *Faculty Handbook* charge each unit of the University with establishing the relevant standards and procedures to comply

with the Regents' policy.

Procedures

Procedures for determination of inadequate performance, as measured against the standards detailed below, shall be in conformity to Sections C31.5 - C31.8 of the Kansas State University *Faculty Handbook*.

Standards

Every faculty member in the Department of Philosophy carries an instructional load consistent with the missions of the Department, which include service teaching to the College of Arts and Sciences and the University and an active major program with emphases in philosophy traditionally construed, pre-law, pre-ministry, pre-business, and interdisciplinary studies. Accordingly, each member has an annual assignment in instruction, determined by the head and the faculty, that typically includes teaching at both the upper-division and lower-division levels, and routinely involves advising and development both of new courses and of new content and methods for courses previously taught.

Because Kansas State University is a major research institution and the College of Arts and Sciences is the core of the University in both instruction and scholarship, the Department of Philosophy maintains standards of research excellence consistent with both those facts and with the fact it is an undergraduate only department. Every faculty member, accordingly, has an annual assignment in research. Minimal expectations include maintaining an ongoing active research program together with efforts towards the productive dissemination of research successes. Evidence of productivity could include

such things as the following: submission to refereed publications and conferences, publication in refereed journals, publication of books in philosophy, presentations to refereed conferences, presentation of invited comments at conferences, publication of invited papers to journals (including book reviews), invited presentations to other departments of philosophy, presentation of work in progress to the KSU Philosophy Department colloquium series, participation in reading groups in current research, or (where appropriate) seeking funding for research activities. [This list is intended to indicate the sorts of evidence of productivity typical in the profession, but it should not be construed as exhaustive. Special research assignments might occur in the department's efforts to maximize faculty time and talent that could produce non-typical but valuable evidence of productive dissemination of research successes.]

A department as small as the Department of Philosophy at Kansas State University requires of its members a fair amount of committee work. Accordingly, unless special conditions obtain, each member is expected to serve at a minimum on several committees, as appointed by the head. In addition, faculty with tenure are encouraged to stand for election to College committees, to serve on University, College, and professional committees whose work relates either to their area(s) of professional expertise or to the general academic well-being of the department or profession, and to stand for election to Faculty Senate. [This list is intended to indicate the sort of service contributions that are typical for Philosophy faculty at KSU, but it is not to be construed as exhaustive. Special service assignments might occur in the department's efforts to maximize

faculty time and talent that could result in non-typical but valuable service to the department, college, university, or profession.]

Adopted by vote of the Philosophy faculty for inclusion in its document,

Department of Philosophy - Evaluation Procedures and Criteria
on 2/28/97

I. PROCEDURES

The following procedures adhere to the provisions in Section C of the *Faculty Handbook* and follow suggestions in *Effective Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments*.

Schedules in regard to tenure and promotion are set annually by the Provost. Schedules for annual merit evaluation and for mid-tenure review will be set out in this document.

Schedules for reappointment are governed by section C162.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

A special provision in this document as regards outside reviewers (for tenure and promotion decisions) requires that the candidate for promotion and/or tenure sign a waiver/no waiver of her/his right to view evaluations by on- or off-campus reviewers.

This provision supersedes the provision of a blanket "expectation" of confidentiality for peer reviewers set out in Section C35 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

A. Annual Evaluations

(See the *Faculty Handbook*, Sections C40-C48.3.)

(1) At the end of the calendar year each faculty member will prepare a Faculty Record listing his or her activities under the three headings of Teaching, Research and Service during that year. Appended to this Record may be other relevant materials such as off prints, teaching materials and evaluations, reviews and the like.

(2) The department head will announce to the faculty a date early in the new year by which the Faculty Record must be submitted to the department head. Adequate notice of this deadline must be given. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to submit the Faculty Record by that date.

(3) On the basis of the Faculty Record and other relevant materials the department head will prepare a written draft of the evaluation of each faculty member. The evaluation will include (a) a statement of the individual's responsibilities and the weight assigned to each, (b) a summary of the substantive evidence used to arrive at the evaluative judgments in each category, (c) succinct assessments of effectiveness in carrying out each responsibility, and (d) a statement of the overall evaluation which must be consistent with the weights assigned to the separate ratings.

(4) The department head will discuss the draft with each faculty member. This will be an opportunity to amend the draft.

(5) The department head will write a final evaluation of each faculty member. This evaluation will be the basis for the merit salary increase to be recommended by the department head. Each

faculty member will have the opportunity to review and discuss the final evaluation and will sign a statement that this has been done. The department head will then forward the evaluations to the dean. (But see also the *Faculty Handbook*, Section C46.4.)

(6) As soon as possible after the evaluation procedure the department head will meet with each faculty member individually to discuss the assignment of responsibilities for the new year and the relative weight to be given to each. Such things as courses to be taught and possible committee assignments will be discussed and agreed upon. Faculty members are encouraged at that time to present their research projects and expectations for the year. The final evaluation of research, however, will be based on the department's standard expectations rather than on whether or not personal expectations are met. Since the department has no graduate program, its primary responsibility must be undergraduate teaching, but at the same time it must be actively involved in research. The small size of the department means that no member can be devoted almost entirely to research or should be devoted entirely to teaching. We believe that in the absence of special circumstances neither of these should be more than 7/10s of an individual's responsibility. In the absence of special circumstances no more than 1/10 should be assigned to service.

The department head will then provide the faculty member with a letter stating those assignments and expectations. It is understood that by mutual agreement the terms of the assignments can be altered during the year as conditions require. These weighted responsibilities will be the basis for the final evaluation of the faculty member for the year.

(7) The extra-departmental procedure for annual evaluation is explained in Sections C47.1-C48.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

B. Reappointment

(see the *Faculty Handbook*, Sections C50.1-C56.)

(1) According to Section C162.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*, the following provisions govern the timing of decisions made by the departments and the colleges.

For faculty members whose services are to be terminated before tenure is attained, written notice shall be given them by the dean of their college. A faculty member on a regular appointment who has been employed less than one year shall be notified by March 1 if services are to be terminated the following June 1...A faculty member on a regular appointment employed for more than one year shall be given the same written notice by December 15 if services are to be terminated the following June 1. A faculty member employed two or more years shall be given the same written notice at least 12 months before the expiration of an appointment.

(2) The department head will notify each candidate for reappointment of the date by which s/he should submit documentation of her/his professional achievements in the evaluation period.

(3) Each candidate for reappointment will submit, on or before the date specified by the head, a file of materials for review by the eligible members of the department. This file should include a Curriculum Vitae, a statement of self-evaluation, and a statement of plans for at least the next

evaluation period. The file should also include evidence of activities in the areas of research, teaching, and service. Candidates for reappointment are expected to consult both the head, the *Faculty Handbook*, and *Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion* to determine what can be submitted as evidence of achievements.

(4) The head will make each candidate's file available to all eligible faculty members for review. Although the department head may solicit the reflections of any faculty member, only tenured faculty may vote on a reappointment decision. Prior to the vote of the tenured faculty, any member of the tenured faculty may request that a candidate meet with the faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the evidence of achievement submitted by the candidate.

(5) The head will call a meeting of the tenured faculty for the purpose of discussing and voting on the reappointment of the candidate(s). Vote on any candidate shall be taken only at such meeting and shall be by secret ballot. Faculty unable to attend for genuinely pressing reasons may request an absentee ballot. The department head shall absent her/himself for the final discussion and the balloting for each candidate. The tenured faculty will decide who shall count the ballots and report the result to the tenured faculty and carry the ballots to the head. The head will report the vote of the faculty to the candidate and explain in general terms both what points were under discussion and any matters the faculty want forwarded to the candidate. The head will report and explain her/his own recommendation.

(6) The head will present to the dean on or before the date specified by the dean: (a) the head's written recommendations and explanations regarding reappointment or non-reappointment for each candidate; (b) each candidate's complete file; and (c) the result of the vote of the tenured faculty.

(7) The extra-departmental procedure for reappointment is explained in Sections C54-C56 of the *Faculty Handbook*. Faculty members must be informed in writing of an

decision not to renew their reappointments in accordance with the 'Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment,' Appendix A of the *Faculty Handbook*.

C. Tenure and Promotion

(For tenure, see the *Faculty Handbook*, Sections C70-C116.2. For promotion, see Sections C120-156.2.)

NB: If the faculty member is not to be continued in service beyond the expiration of the probationary period, notice shall be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period.--*Faculty Handbook*, Section C162.3

(1) The timing of the steps to be taken by each candidate and by the department follows the schedule annually distributed by the Provost for tenure and promotion decisions. The timing in the following description of such steps reflects the pattern that has been set out in past years.

(2) In the Spring and Summer of each year the head will ask any regular faculty who could be candidates for tenure and/or promotion if they are interested in being put forward by the department in the next round. The head may also ask the advice of other faculty as to the merits

of potential candidates. The decision to put any faculty member forward for tenure and/or promotion rests with the head, except in the case of a faculty member in her/his last year on probationary status, who will be automatically reviewed for tenure. (See the *Faculty Handbook*, Section C110.)

(3) In late Summer and early Fall each candidate for tenure and/or promotion will submit to the head (a) a list of five names of potential outside reviewers (b) a current Curriculum Vitae, (c) a signed waiver/no waiver form of her/his right to view evaluations by on- or off-campus reviewers, and (d) copies/offprints of relevant and representative publications and, perhaps, work in progress. The head will also solicit names of qualified potential reviewers from other faculty in the department. The head will obtain at least four reviews; with reviewers equally divided between some suggested by the candidate and some suggested by the faculty. The head will send to those who agree to conduct reviews a copy of the candidate's Curriculum Vitae, a statement concerning the candidate's waiver/no waiver decision, and whatever copies of the candidate's work the reviewer might request.

In early Fall each candidate for tenure and/or promotion prepares materials to be submitted for review by the head and the eligible faculty. The Philosophy Department will utilize the standard documentation forms provided by the Provost's Office in assisting each candidate in determining the sorts of materials that are needed. Special mention should be made of the following items.

(a) In recent years, the College has sought to stress the importance of the candidate's "statement of five year goals" in the standard documentation form. The department encourages its candidates to craft this part of the record with care and with a view to setting goals against a background of a thoughtful examination of the sort of research-planning that is characteristic of philosophy.

(b) In constructing the Curriculum Vitae and describing the research record, it is important to indicate, for clarity's sake, which items are refereed, which invited, and so on. It may even be wise to indicate acceptance rates, numbers of articles

published *per* year, and so on. This is useful for providing a solid basis for a fair assessment of the record by the department and for those outside the department who would review a positive decision made by the department.

(4) The head will make each candidate's file available to all eligible faculty members for review. The eligible faculty (see section 5) may solicit the reflections of any other faculty members. Prior to the vote of the eligible faculty, any member of the eligible faculty may request that a candidate meet with the faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the evidence of achievement submitted by the candidate.

(5) The head will call a meeting of the eligible faculty for the purpose of discussing and voting on the tenure and/or promotion of the candidate(s). Vote on any candidate shall be taken only at such meeting and shall be by secret ballot. Faculty unable to attend for genuinely pressing reasons may request an absentee ballot. The department head will absent her/himself for the final discussion and the balloting for each candidate. The eligible faculty will decide who shall count the ballots, report the result to the eligible faculty and carry the ballots to the head.

NB: "Eligible faculty" means only and all tenured faculty in the department in the case of

tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; in the case of promotion to Professor, "eligible faculty" means only and all individuals in the department already at the rank of Professor.

The head will report the vote of the faculty to the candidate and explain in general terms both what points were under discussion and any matters the faculty want forwarded to the candidate. The head will report and explain her/his own recommendation.

(6) The head will present to the dean on or before the date specified by the dean: (a) the head's written recommendations and explanations regarding tenure and/or promotion for each candidate; (b) each candidate's complete file; and (c) the result of the vote of the eligible faculty.

(7) The extra-departmental procedure for tenure is found in Sections C113-C115 of the *Faculty Handbook*; the extra-departmental procedure for promotion is found in Sections C153-155.

C: Mid-tenure Review

(See the *Faculty Handbook*, Sections C92.1-92.2; but also refer to the wider context of provisions regarding tenure, Sections C70-116.2.)

(1) Unless otherwise stated in the candidate's contract, mid-tenure review is to occur during the third year of appointment. The Philosophy Department will conduct mid-tenure review as an aspect of its reappointment decision for that year. The timing that follows is determined by this policy.

(2) The department head will notify each candidate for reappointment of the date by which s/he should submit documentation of her/his professional achievements in the evaluation period.

(3) In preparing materials to be submitted for review by the head and the eligible faculty, the candidate should be aware that the Philosophy Department will utilize the standard documentation forms for Tenure and Promotion provided by the Provost's Office. Special mention should be made of the following items.

(a) In recent years, the College has sought to stress the importance of the candidate's "statement of five year goals" in the standard documentation form. The department encourages its candidates to craft this part of the record with care and with a view to setting goals against a background of a thoughtful examination of the sort of research-planning that is characteristic of philosophy.

(b) In constructing the Curriculum Vitae and describing the research record, it is important to indicate, for clarity's sake, which items are refereed, which invited, and so on. It may even be wise to indicate acceptance rates, numbers of articles published *per year*, and so on. This is useful for providing a solid basis for a fair assessment of the record by the department and for those outside the department who would review a positive decision made by the department.

NB: This documentation is exactly like that for tenure and/or promotion, with the exception of letters of outside review.

(4) The head will make each candidate's file available to all eligible faculty members for review. Although the department head may solicit the reflections of any faculty member, only tenured

faculty may vote on a reappointment decision and on a mid-tenure review decision. Prior to the vote of the tenured faculty, any member of the tenured faculty may request that a candidate meet with the faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the evidence of achievement submitted by the candidate.

(5) The head will call a meeting of the tenured faculty for the purpose of discussing and voting on the reappointment of the candidate(s) who is/are being considered under the mid-tenure review provisions. Vote on any candidate shall be taken only at such meeting and shall be by secret ballot. Faculty unable to attend for genuinely pressing reasons may request an absentee ballot. The department head shall absent her/himself for the final discussion and the balloting for each candidate. The tenured faculty shall decide who shall count the ballots, report the result to the tenured faculty, and carry the ballots to the head. The head will report the vote of the faculty to the candidate and explain in general terms both what points were under discussion and any matters the faculty want forwarded to the candidate. The head will report and explain her/his own recommendation.

(6) The head will present to the dean on or before the date specified by the dean the standard materials that accompany a reappointment decision plus substantive reflections of the entire tenured faculty as regards the candidate's promise for tenure.

(7) Since the mid-tenure review occurs simultaneously with the reappointment decision made in the third year, the extra-departmental procedure for reappointment is in large part the same as that explained in Sections C54-C56 of the *Faculty Handbook*. Faculty members must be informed in writing of an decision not to renew their reappointments in accordance with the 'Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment,' Appendix A of the *Faculty Handbook*.

NB: The mid-tenure review process, in accordance with the *Faculty Handbook*, Section 92.1, is intended to "provide..the faculty member with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria. A positive mid-probationary review does not insure that tenure will be granted in the future; nor

does a negative review necessarily mean that tenure will be denied." Accordingly, the candidate should expect to receive fairly detailed commentary on her/his performance from both the department and the dean.

II. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION

A. General considerations and Annual Evaluations

The Department of Philosophy here sets out criteria and standards for performance for all of its faculty, regardless of rank and status. These are to be used, in the first instance, to guide the head in making annual evaluations.

Since these criteria and standards prescribe generally what shall count as satisfactory and excellent performance, they may also be used by the department as crucial elements to be considered in making reappointment decisions for non-tenured faculty and for assessing progress towards tenure and/or promotion. Subsequent sections are written with this in mind.

The Numerical Rating Scale

The department will use a numerical scale for assessing performance within each category, teaching, research and service. Each will be evaluated on a scale of 1 to 5. The numerical values will indicate the following general levels of performance:

1 = unsatisfactory performance that fails to meet the department's usual expectations.

2 = meets minimal expectations, but needs improvement.

3 = satisfactory performance that meets the department's expectations.

4 = goes beyond the usual expectations.

5 = definitely superior performance.

In what follows the department establishes standard expectations for each of the three categories.

I. Teaching

We are all aware of the problems in both the intelligent and intelligible evaluation of teaching. Necessity, however, demands that we agree upon criteria that will determine both the department's standard expectations and superior performance. Teaching evaluation shall ordinarily be considered on a two-year 'rolling average' basis. That is, the evaluation will be based on the average of the performance for the year under review and the preceding year.

The greater part of the teaching done in the Philosophy Department is in introductory courses that are populated by students who are required to take a philosophy course to satisfy degree requirements in the College of Arts and Sciences. There are special problems in teaching courses to such students, many of whom are reluctant and are there against their will. In addition these courses place largely unfamiliar demands of reading and writing on students. It is a rare instructor, indeed, who will receive 'rave' ratings from students on evaluation forms. While the department does require the faculty to evaluate all their courses using the department's approved form, the evaluations by themselves often do not accurately reflect the quality of an introductory course. For this reason the department will use student evaluations with caution, especially those of introductory classes.

The standard expectations of satisfactory teaching will be:

1. Classes are met regularly, the instructor is available to students and holds regular office hours. Examinations and papers are graded and returned to students in a reasonable time.
2. The courses include suitably challenging reading and writing assignments or, in the case of courses devoted to formal methods (such as logic courses), suitably challenging exams.

The departmental evaluation of teaching shall also, especially when looking for signs of

excellence in teaching, place emphasis on the intellectual content of a course as evidenced by reading lists, examinations and assignments, and the rigor of their marking. Additional evidence of surpassing the standard expectations may include such things as the following:

1. Imaginative design of courses or development of special teaching materials that further the serious study of philosophy, including the application of philosophy to other fields.
2. Work with students on an individual basis that leads to outstanding student performance, winning of scholarships, fellowships, special awards, etc.
3. Special recognition or awards for good teaching from outside the department.

4. Above average rating on student evaluation of courses. The evaluations should be from a majority of the students in the class.

Faculty may request that the evaluation of teaching take into account syllabi, tests, essay assignments, samples of graded assignments, and a classroom observation by the head or other faculty member. Such observations will take place once during the first year and once every other year thereafter. Faculty may request additional observations, and videotaped lectures can be substituted for in-person observations if the instructor so desires.

If the instructor so desires, the departmental evaluation of teaching should also take into account the instructor's own written assessment of the classes s/he has instructed.

II. Research

Each member of the department is expected to do research that will lead to publication or otherwise contribute to the cause of philosophy. To judge an individual's contribution to philosophical research on the basis of the number of pages published or the number of footnote citations his work receives is misguided. There also are good objections to putting forward criteria only in terms of numbers of articles published. This fails to take into account the wide variations in quality among different articles. The quality of a contribution cannot be judged simply by the prestige of the venue. Exceptional work is routinely found not only in the most prestigious journals but also in less prominent journals.

There are, nevertheless, some obvious distinctions to be made. All things being equal, a book is generally a greater contribution than an article and an article than a book review. A prestigious venue is a strong indication of exceptional quality. But the ultimate responsibility for assessing the quality and relative merit of the publications, presentations, etc. must lie with the professional judgment of the department, or (in the case of annual evaluations) the department head. The faculty member shall have the right to request the department to seek the opinion of respected colleagues in other departments on the merit of any particular contribution.

Finally, it characteristically takes a number of years to produce a worthwhile book, and the situation with articles can be similar, in that research can proceed in such a way that the result is

a number of articles, none of which are in a publishable state until nearly all are. Therefore, it is inappropriate to measure scholarly achievement, in a given calendar year, by rigid numerical standards.

Accordingly, the evaluation of research will be based on a three-year 'rolling average' basis. That is, the evaluation will be an average of the performance for the year under review and the previous two years.

It is recognized that much excellent philosophical work requires time to mature and that the work an individual is doing in a particular year, while it may not result in publication that year, can bear fruit in future years. The 'rolling average' method of evaluation is intended to take account of this fact of academic life. Clear evidence of significant work in progress, however, must be made available at the time of evaluation.

The department cannot prescribe the number of publications required for a "good" or "excellent" rating. We do believe, however, that one substantial philosophical article in a reputable journal during a three-year 'rolling average' period should be considered a "satisfactory" performance, and may justify a rating of "good" or "excellent," depending upon its quality.

Along with the usual list of research activities on the Faculty Record form, faculty members are encouraged to submit comments on their work from colleagues in other departments, reviews of their books, discussions of their work in other publications and the like that would be evidence of its value.

Grants and awards for research and publication in philosophy shall be considered marks of merit.

Research will be understood to include but not be limited to such things as

1. Publications: books, articles in refereed professional journals, invited articles in collections, discussion notes in journals and book reviews.
2. Meetings: papers read at professional meetings (refereed), invited papers, participation on panels, symposia, etc., serving as commentator on another's paper.
3. Other: commenting on work by others that leads to publication, papers presented to other departments by invitation, presentations at departmental colloquia and work in progress.

III. Service

The department does not have a service component that falls under what the Faculty Handbook calls "Directed service." All service activities relevant to the department fall under the heading "Non-directed Service." Activities included under this heading fall into three categories, (1) "Institution-based service," (2) "Profession-based service," and (3) "Public-based professional service."

Satisfying standard expectations in the area of service consists in a willingness to take on one's share of the burdens in this area in terms of committee work, whether at the level of

the department, the college, or the university, or in assuming other extradepartmental tasks.

Ways of exceeding the standard expectations include:

1. Superior performance in the realm of institution-based service such as serving as a chair of a departmental, college, or university committee that is in existence for a period of time, or special service on such a committee, e.g., being charged with the major burden of writing proposals, reports, etc.
2. Profession-based service such as holding office in a regional or national philosophical society; organizing a meeting or arranging a program of such a society; refereeing articles or reviewing manuscripts upon the request of responsible journals and publishers; evaluating colleagues in departments at other universities for promotion and tenure upon the request of the other institution.
3. Public-based professional service. For example, members of our faculty are *sometimes* invited to give talks and conduct discussions relying on their expertise as philosophers.

B. Reappointment

The criteria for re-appointment should be defined in direct relation to the criteria for tenure, since the question of whether to reappoint a probationary tenure-track faculty member boils down to the question of whether it is realistic to expect the faculty member to meet the criteria for tenure when the time comes. Meeting the criteria does not necessarily mean meeting a yearly quota as a percentage of the final goal.

I. Teaching

In accordance with the foregoing general remarks concerning reappointment, it is appropriate for the department to adapt 'retrospective' tenure criteria with regard to teaching, *viz.* that the faculty member perform satisfactorily in each probationary year, with some allowance made for 'false starts.'

II. Research

So far as research is concerned, in general terms, a favorable reappointment decision shall be conditional upon documented evidence of substantial progress in research since the previous evaluation, in the form of papers published, in preparation, or delivered to Department colloquia or other philosophical fora. The following points are offered as clarifications:

What will count as substantial progress will inevitably depend on the achievements of other, comparably-situated faculty members, what it is reasonable to expect in the light of the faculty member's teaching commitments for the year in question, and the degree to which the subject-matter of the research represents a new departure, requiring mastery of

a new literature.

Once again, in accordance with the general remarks concerning reappointment, it seems appropriate to spell out what counts as 'substantial progress' by adopting the 'retrospective' tenure criteria, duly adapted, i.e.: In the first four years of a probationary appointment, annual reappointment should be conditional upon the faculty member performing satisfactorily (performance that meets the

department's expectations). In the next 2 years, it seems appropriate to require that the faculty member go beyond the department's usual expectations for a single year's performance.

III. Service

The faculty member's service should meet the department's 'standard expectations.'

C. Tenure and promotion

Tenure and promotion to associate professor

The decision to grant tenure is a serious one for the department. The candidate for tenure and its attendant promotion to associate professor must have demonstrated considerable academic accomplishment as well as the promise of future accomplishment. The department's expectations include the following.

I. Teaching: Perform at least satisfactorily during the years of the probationary appointment. Should the performance be less than satisfactory during the early years of the appointment, evidence of definite improvement will be required in the remaining years.

II. Research: The evaluation will take into account both the quality and quantity of publications. No particular number of publications is necessary for meeting the research expectation. Nor is any particular number of publications sufficient for meeting the research expectation. Only publications with substantial philosophical value will be given any weight at all. Expectations of quantity will vary with the quality of the work. For instance, two articles of exceptional quality would normally meet the research expectation, or four articles of respectable quality, or one of very high quality and two of respectable quality. Other things being equal, a substantial book would be sufficient. Other philosophical work could help meet the research expectation by providing evidence of promise of a national or international reputation.

III. Service: It is expected that the service performed by the candidate will meet the standard expectations of the department.

Promotion to professor

The standards for promotion to professor must be substantially higher than for promotion to associate professor.

I. Teaching: The candidate must have established a solid record of successful teaching as

measured by student evaluations, the intellectual content and rigor of her or his courses, the development of teaching materials that further the serious study of philosophy, performance of her or his individual students, receipt of special awards, and the like.

II. Research: The candidate for promotion must not merely show promise of good work to come, but must have already produced a body of good work since the last promotion. A book published by a reputable academic press is evidence of such work. Alternatively, a substantial number of articles in respected refereed journals and papers presented at regional and national meetings (refereed) will be accepted as evidence.

The candidate must have established a national reputation in his field as evidenced by discussions of her or his work in the professional literature, invitations to present papers at meetings or at other universities, to contribute articles to edited collections, requests to referee manuscripts for journals and presses, to review the qualifications of faculty at other universities for tenure and promotion, and the like.

III. Service: In addition to satisfying the criteria for satisfactory service the candidate must have demonstrated a willingness to do whatever necessary departmental and college committee work that wants doing and a willingness to serve the profession by, e.g. serving as an officer in a professional society, helping to organize professional meetings, refereeing manuscripts, etc.

D. Mid-tenure review

The criteria for mid-tenure review, in all three categories, should depend upon the relative remoteness of the possibility, taking all relevant factors into consideration, of the faculty member's failing to get tenure when the time comes.