DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Policy Title:	Department of Philosophy Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Department Approval:	08/19/2018
College Approval:	08/30/2018

Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This set of guidelines contains the procedures and standards that govern the recommendations for promotion and tenure made by the Department of Philosophy. It is to be used in conjunction with the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual (College Manual) and the Georgia State University Promotion and Tenure Manual (University Manual). The policies, procedures, and standards of the College and University Manuals take precedence over and govern the material in this document.

2. In general, material found in the College and University manuals is not copied into these guidelines. Candidates should read these guidelines in conjunction with the College Manual.

3. A recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor will carry with it a recommendation for tenure. A recommendation of tenure for a person currently at the rank of Assistant Professor will carry with it a recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor.

4. This document must be reconsidered at least once every five years and will be reconsidered at any time if so requested by the Chair of the Department or by a majority of the tenured and tenure-track departmental faculty. Any changes in policies or procedures will require a two-thirds vote of the tenured and tenure-track members of the Department, and any changes in substantive standards will require a two-thirds majority vote of the tenured members of the Department.

II. PRE-EVALUATION PROCEDURES

5. The departmental promotion and tenure committees are composed following the rules in the College Manual. The promotion and tenure committees of the Department of Philosophy do not employ subcommittees. Each promotion and tenure committee will elect its chair and the chair has full voting privileges.

6. No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the Department Chair will remind all those who are eligible that they may apply for promotion.

7. No later than the date specified in the College Manual, all who wish to apply must inform the Department Chair that they wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure. At this time, candidates must provide the Department Chair with
> a current CV in the format specified in the College Manual and
> a list of eight possible outside reviewers.

8. For each reviewer the candidate must provide:
> organizational affiliation and addresses (both postal and email),
> rank,
> areas of concentration,
> major achievements,
> standing in the discipline, and
> the nature and extent of any personal and/or professional relationship with the candidate.

9. Candidates may not contact any of the individuals on their lists of outside reviewers concerning a possible request for an evaluation.

10. The Committee and the Department Chair will also compose a list of eight possible outside reviewers.

11. The reviewers must
> not be from institutions in Georgia,
> not have taught at the institution from which the candidate received her Ph.D. during the time the candidate was at that institution,
> have no more than an incidental relationship to the candidate,
> hold at least the rank sought by the candidate, and
> be employed at research universities in which the emphasis on research and scholarship is of a rigor similar to or higher than the Department's aspirational peer institutions.

12. In special circumstances (with written justification from the Department Chair and with the approval of the Dean), external reviewers may be used who are not affiliated with academic institutions or with academic institutions that are not research universities.

13. The Office of the Dean will select at least five reviewers. The Office of the Dean may ask the Department for additional names. In consultation with the Department Chair, the Office of the Dean may add names to the list of reviewers.

14. No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the candidate must provide the Chair of the Department with six copies of the professional development materials (i.e., publications and professional development statement) in the format specified in the College Manual. These materials will be forwarded to the outside reviewers. At this time, the candidate must also provide an electronic copy of these materials to each member of the departmental committee. Candidates are advised to align the format and number of their professional development materials (including the numbers on their CVs) so that the materials sent to the outside reviewers and the materials submitted to the department match.

15. No later than the date specified in the College Manual, the candidate must submit a complete dossier to the Department Chair. The material must be precisely in the format required by the College Manual.

16. Candidates should be aware that the format required by the College Manual is complex (and includes a detailed pagination system). The dossier includes three statements of interests and goals, one for professional development, one for teaching, and one for service. Candidates must allow sufficient time to write these statements and compose the dossier.

17. Candidates should include the student evaluation and numerical scores for all courses taught in the previous four years. These reports can be obtained from reports created for annual reviews.

18. In addition to the material required by the College, the Department of Philosophy requires that candidates submit a teaching portfolio that conforms to the Department's rules. The rules for this portfolio are the same as those for the annual review portfolios and candidates may be able to use substantial portions of their annual portfolio materials in the promotion and tenure dossier.

19. This portfolio must include:
>   -the charts from annual review narratives that include all courses taught by semester for the last four years, enrollments for each section, AB% by section, DWF % by section, and score on Q17 of student evaluations for each section.
>   -a list of all MA thesis students directed, MA thesis committee membership, honors theses directed, independent studies and directed readings during the period under review.
>   -the syllabi for all courses taught in the last four years,
>   -for each of these courses, the major assignments (papers and exams/tests), unless a course is taught multiple times with no significant changes.

20. At the candidate's discretion, the portfolio may include additional materials as evidence of teaching effectiveness. Such evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, peer evaluations, use of technology for teaching, student accomplishments, other course

materials providing evidence of teaching effectiveness, and materials from courses taught at previous institutions.

21. In this Manual, "all courses taught" refers to all those courses that, according to the College Manual, are included in the promotion and tenure dossier.

22. The Chair of the Departmental Committee will call a meeting(s) for the purpose of evaluating the candidate. Prior to the first meeting, the members of the Committee will familiarize themselves with these guidelines, the College Manual, and all of the candidate's materials. The Department Chair may attend all meetings of the Committee and may answer questions about these guidelines, the College and University Manuals, and other Department, College, and University policies. Apart from this, the Department Chair attends as an observer and may not take part in the committee evaluation process in any way.

23. The Chair of the Committee will bring a complete copy of the candidate's dossier to all the meeting(s). All members of the committee are expected to attend all committee meetings.

24. The Chair will begin the Committee's first meeting by reminding all members of the Committee that the deliberations of the Committee are confidential. The only information the candidate should receive about the deliberations are the letters sent forward to the Department Chair.

III. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

25. According to the College Manual, a candidate will be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor if and only if the candidate is evaluated as excellent in professional development, excellent in teaching, and good in service. A candidate will be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor if and only if the candidate is evaluated as excellent in professional development, excellent in teaching, and very good in service.

III.A. Evaluation of Professional Development

Overall Standards

26. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, a candidate must be evaluated as excellent in professional development. In this context, excellence in professional development is defined as
>   (a) having a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of knowledge in philosophy,
>   (b) establishing a national reputation and
>   (c) having a professional development trajectory that indicates a high probability of timely and successful progress towards the rank of professor after promotion to associate professor.

27. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, a candidate must be evaluated as excellent in professional development. In this context, excellence in professional development is defined as
>   (a) having a distinguished record of achievement in philosophy,
>   (b) having an established national/international reputation, and
>   (c) having a professional development trajectory that indicates a high probability of continued high quality and productive research.

Procedures

28. The Committee will divide the candidate's professional development materials into two categories, Category A and Category B. Generally speaking, Category A items are important, original, peer-reviewed publications of scholarly research and prestigious fellowships/grants. Category B items are other scholarly work significant to the philosophical profession. They encompass activities that draw attention to a scholar's work, items that indicate that a candidate is well-respected in the field, and intellectual contributions to the profession.

29. Paradigm Category A Items
>   Articles
>   Book chapters
>   Book review essays
>   Critical encyclopedia articles
>   Critical introductions to anthologies
>   Prestigious fellowships and grants
>   Scholarly monographs

30. In the remainder of this document, "articles" refers to Category A articles, book chapters, book review essays, critical encyclopedia articles, and critical introductions to anthologies. "Books" refers to scholarly monographs.

31. Paradigm Category B Items
    Anthologies edited
    Bibliographical monographs
    Blogs edited
    Book notes
    Book reviews
    Chair of the program committee for a conference
    Contributions to the popular media with significant philosophical content
    Commentaries on papers presented
    Editorial service to journal and book publishers
    Expository encyclopedia articles
    Honors and awards
    Substantial research collaborations with visiting scholars
    Invitations to be a visiting scholar
    Other fellowships and grants
    Papers presented
    Review of programs and candidates at other institutions
    Translations of books and articles

32. Book review essays are article-length works that contain sustained critical discussion. Book reviews are standard-length reviews of the work of others. Book notes are short reviews of the work of others. For examples of book review essays, book reviews, and book notes, see the journal *Ethics*.

33. A candidate may receive credit for a critical introduction to an anthology in Category A and credit for editing the anthology in Category B.

33a. Some books and articles are intended to be accessible to the non-specialist or to engage scholars seeking a critical synthesis of a field, while also advancing scholarship. An example of a book of this type is Jennifer Uleman's *An Introduction to Kant's Moral Philosophy* (Cambridge University Press, 2010). For examples of articles of this type, see the articles in the Blackwell Companions series. These items are included in Category A.

34. In rare instances, a translation or edited anthology may be of such significance to the field that it belongs in Category A.

35. Category A fellowships and grants are prestigious external awards of money that normally include funds for at least one course buyout (as determined by the buyout policy of the College). Category B fellowships and grants are less prestigious awards of money that normally do not include funds for a course buyouts. For example, NEH Fellowships are in Category A, while NEH Summer Seminar grants and GSU's internal grants are in Category B.

36. In cases of collaborative efforts (e.g., coauthored articles), the candidate must submit a statement indicating the share and nature of the work she contributed to the item. Candidates are encouraged to submit statements from their co-authors that clarify the nature of their collaboration. The default view is that the candidate will get full credit for collaborative items in

which the candidate is the primary author and for collaborative items in which all authors have contributed as full and equal partners. However, a member of the committee may reduce her view of collaborative items if she concludes that the candidate's contribution did not rise to the level of a single-authored item.

37. The physical form of a publication (e.g., in paper or online) is not relevant to Category A or B status.

38. If there is any dispute about whether an item is in Category A or Category B, the view of the Committee will be decided by majority vote. If the vote is tied, the item will be assigned to Category B.

Evaluation of Category A

39. The Committee will do the following for each and every item in Category A.

39a. First, the Committee will discuss what, if anything, the outside reviewers say about the item. After the discussion, each member will announce whether, in her view, the outside reviewers, taken as a group, judge the item under consideration to be poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, outstanding or (if the item is not discussed by a sufficient number of outside reviewers) none of the above.

39b. Second, the Committee will discuss the prestige of the venue of the item (e.g., the journal in which an article appeared, the press which published a book or chapter, the agency awarding a fellowship). After the discussion, each member will then announce whether, in her view, the venue of the item under consideration is poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, outstanding or (if the member feels that she does not have enough information about the venue to make a reasonable judgment) none of the above. Candidates are encouraged to consult with tenured faculty for information about which journals and presses they consider excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor.

39c. Third, the Committee members will discuss their own judgments of the item in question. Issues to be discussed include (but are not limited to):
> the views of the outside reviewers,
> the prestige of the venue,
> the originality of the item,
> the importance of the item,
> the soundness of the arguments presented,
> the clarity of the writing,
> the nature of the review process that led to the publication of the item (or the granting of
>> a fellowship, grant, or award),
> the nature of the collaboration (if the item is co-authored), and
> the impact of the item (e.g., citations, discussions in others' work, reviews, reprinting).

39d. Fourth, each member will announce whether, in her professional judgment, the item is poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, or outstanding. The Chair may wish to keep a list of the rankings provided for each item for use when writing the Committee's letter(s).

40. The Department recognizes that there is a loose hierarchy of venues, that the impact of an item is influenced by the prestige of its venue, and that venue is one important indicator of the quality of an item. In addition to informing the Committee's judgment of the quality of an item, publication in prestigious venues is desirable in itself. In cases where the prestige of the venue does not match the overall view of outside reviewers, it is the judgment of the Department that the view of the outside reviewers is usually a better indicator of an item's quality.

41. In general, to qualify as at least good, an item must make a positive contribution to the field of philosophy. In general, to qualify as very good or excellent, an item must make a significant positive contribution to the field of philosophy. The qualifier "outstanding" is reserved for genuinely exceptional items, of a sort only rarely achieved in philosophy.

Evaluation of Category B

42. The Committee Chair will compile a written list of all of the candidate's Category B items. A copy of this list will be given to each member of the Committee. The Committee will then discuss its holistic evaluation of the candidate's Category B professional development. Each member will then announce whether, in her view, the candidate's Category B professional development (as a whole) is poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, or outstanding.

43. Generally speaking, a rank of excellent in Category B requires that the candidate has, on average, more than one Category B item per year and that the candidate has produced a variety of different kinds of Category B items.

Holistic Professional Development Evaluation

44. The Committee will then discuss its holistic evaluation of the candidate's professional development. In addition to issues listed in paragraph 39c and the overall rankings of the items in Category A and of Category B as a whole, this discussion will cover at least the following issues: trajectory, overlap between items, and variations among the subfields with in philosophy.

45. In considering trajectory, the Committee will review the candidate's Statement of Interests and Goals for Professional Development and the outside reviewers' comments on the candidate's body of work, reputation in the field, and trajectory. They will also consider the timing of the publication/awarding of the items in Category A. For example, a significant drop off in publication rate might be a sign of poor trajectory.

46. In considering overlap, the Committee will discuss whether the candidates work contains significant repetition of arguments, ideas, or content.

47. In holistically evaluating the professional development record, the Committee will take into account variations in different subfields of philosophy (e.g., in some areas of philosophy, books

are more central than journal articles, in some areas, publications in non-philosophy journals is valued).

48. After following the procedures above, each member will announce whether, in her view, the candidate's professional development (as a whole) is less-than-excellent or excellent (as defined above).

Guidelines and Paradigms

49. Candidates need and deserve clear guidance about the Department's standards for tenure. This issue is sometimes raised in the form of a question: "How many publications do I need to get tenure?" It is not possible to state a minimum number of publications necessary or sufficient for meeting the standards of professional development required for tenure. However, the Department is able to offer the following guidelines and paradigms.

50. Guidelines Regarding the Evaluative Terms

Outstanding articles, published in first-rank journals and widely cited, will usually increase the
      chance that a candidate will receive an affirmative recommendation more than several
      lesser publications.
Excellent and very good articles usually increase the chance that a candidate will receive an
      affirmative recommendation. Excellent articles usually increase the chance of a positive
      recommendation more than very good articles.
Good articles usually do not decrease the chance that a candidate will receive an affirmative
      recommendation. They usually have a limited positive effect on the chance that a
      candidate will receive an affirmative recommendation.
Poor and fair articles usually reduce the chance that a candidate will receive an affirmative
      recommendation.

51. Guidelines for All Promotions

Category B items, no matter how numerous, do not substitute for Category A items.
Because the quality of publications is a vital consideration, the publication of a large number of
      articles is no guarantee of an affirmative recommendation.
A set of publications scattered over many topics is often considered less impressive than a
      cohesive body of work.
Although the primary criterion for promotion and tenure is the production of Category A items,
      candidates who do not rank as excellent in Category B are not likely to receive an
      affirmative recommendation.

52. Guidelines and Paradigms for Promotion to Associate Professor

A candidate with no book and fewer than six very good articles is not likely to receive an
      affirmative recommendation unless at least one of those articles is outstanding.
One paradigm of a candidate who meets the professional development standards for promotion
      to associate professor is someone who, in Category A, has published six very good
      articles, and, in category B, has published two encyclopedia articles and has given five
      presentations at universities outside Georgia.
Another paradigm of a candidate who meets the professional development standards for
      promotion to associate professor is someone who, in Category A, has published a very
      good book and two very good articles, and, in Category B, has two book reviews and has
      refereed for journals five times.

Another paradigm of a candidate who meets the professional development standards for promotion to associate professor is someone who, in Category A, has published a very good critical synthesis of a field (one that advances scholarship) and four very good articles, and, in Category B, has a book review, an encyclopedia article, and four presentations.

53. Guidelines and Paradigms for Promotion to Professor

According to the College Manual, "both the quality and number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of professor substantially surpass those required for recommendation to associate professor."

According to the College Manual, no material that was included in the dossier for promotion to Associate Professor may be included in the dossier for promotion to Professor.

A candidate with no book and fewer than eight very good articles is not likely to receive an affirmative recommendation unless at least one of those articles is outstanding or several are excellent.

(The following paradigms assume that a candidate is seeking promotion to professor in a timely fashion, excluding any time for university-approved leaves.)

One paradigm of a candidate who meets the professional development standards for promotion to professor is someone who, in Category A, has published an excellent book and four very good articles, and in Category B, has five encyclopedia articles and has given eight presentations at universities outside Georgia.

Another paradigm of a candidate who meets the professional development standards for promotion to professor is someone who has, in category A, won a fellowship, published eight very good articles that develop a view that is influential in the literature, and in category B, has edited an anthology, has given six presentations at conferences outside Georgia, and writes a well-received philosophy blog.

Another paradigm of a candidate who meets the professional development standards for promotion to professor is someone who, in Category A, has published a very good critical synthesis of a field (one that advances scholarship), two excellent articles and four very good articles, and in Category B, has given ten presentations (some of which are international), and has organized a conference.

III. B. Evaluation of Teaching

Overall Standards

54. To be recommended for promotion and/or tenure, a candidate must be evaluated as excellent in teaching. An evaluation of excellent in teaching will be given only if the candidate's trajectory in teaching indicates a high probability of continued excellence in teaching.

55. With respect to teaching, the term "excellent" has the same meaning for candidates for promotion to associate professor and for candidates for promotion to full professor.

56. The evaluation of teaching is based on five factors:
    rigor,
    quality of course content,
    course organization,
    non-course teaching, and
    student perceptions.

Procedures

57. The Committee will thoroughly discuss the candidate's performance relative to each of the five factors. Every member of the Committee will then announce her evaluation of the candidate. The evaluations are: poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, and outstanding.

58. Student evaluations are used in the assessment of student perception. The material in student evaluations is also relevant to the evaluation of the other four factors. For example, written student evaluations that consistently indicate that a candidate's courses are badly organized are a relevant consideration in the evaluation of organization. For example, written student evaluations that consistently indicate that the challenging nature of the course material motivated students to work hard are a relevant consideration in the evaluation of both rigor and quality of course content.

Rigor

59. Rigor: Do the candidate's courses require an appropriate amount of effort of the students? The Committee will review the materials in the candidate's dossier and discuss the rigor of the candidate's courses.

60. Guidelines for Rigor

The amount of reading required is one factor relevant to rigor.
The amount and nature of the various course assignments is one factor relevant to rigor.
It is possible for a course to be too rigorous. For example, a Phil 2010 course which required five
      five-page papers would be too rigorous.
A Phil 2010 course which has only multiple-choice and fill-in-the-blank exams would show
      evidence of poor rigor.
A course with a variety of appropriately difficult assignments would show evidence of excellent
      rigor.

61. Every member of the Committee will announce her evaluation of the candidate with respect to rigor.

Quality of Course Content

62. Quality of Course Content: Does the candidate assign appropriate, interesting, and high-quality materials in her courses? The Committee will review the materials in the candidate's dossier and discuss the quality of the content of the candidate's courses. In this context, "content of a course" refers to the readings assigned and the materials in the teaching portfolio.

63. Guidelines for Quality of Course Content

A course which used *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance* as its primary text would show
      evidence of poor quality of course content.
An introductory course that assigned only Heidegger's *Being and Time* would show evidence of
      poor quality of course content.
An introductory course that assigned only Rawls' *A Theory of Justice* would show evidence of
      poor quality of course content.
A course in which exam questions were not clearly written would show evidence of poor quality
      of course content.
A course with confusing power point slides would show evidence of poor quality of course
      content.
A course which used a collection of high-quality readings which are of interest to many students
      would show evidence of excellent course content.

64. Every member of the Committee will announce her evaluation of the candidate with respect to quality of course content.

Course Organization

65. Course Organization: Both in their plan and in their execution, how well organized are the courses? The Committee will review the materials in the candidate's dossier and discuss the organization of the candidate's courses. In this context, "organization" refers both to the organization of the course as a whole and to the organization of individual class meetings. It is demonstrated by features such as syllabi that present materials in a coherent order, well-structured handouts, and assignments that proceed in a logical order.

66. Guidelines for Course Organization

A course whose organization would be unclear to most students or a course which was not
     organized at all would show evidence of poor course organization.
An introductory course with all assignments due in the last four weeks of the semester would
     show evidence of poor organization.
A course with a clear plan and assignments appropriately distributed throughout the term would
     show evidence of excellent course organization.

67. Every member of the Committee will announce her evaluation of the candidate with respect to course organization.

Non-Course Teaching

68. Non-Course Teaching: How good are the quality and quantity of the candidate's non-course teaching efforts? The Committee will review and discuss the non-course teaching items in the candidate's dossier. This discussion must include all of the following (if they are present in the candidate's dossier) and may include forms of non-course teaching not listed below.

     Direction of master's theses
     Direction of honor's theses
     Textbooks
     Teaching awards and honors
     Pedagogical and curricular innovation (e.g., designing new courses, developing new
          teaching techniques)
     Articles related to teaching
     Membership on PhD dissertation committees
     Membership on master's thesis committees
     Direction of independent study and directed reading courses
     Direction of honors colloquia
     Student presentations and publications for which the candidate was instrumental
     Student honors, awards, fellowships, grants, and acceptance in advanced programs for
          which the candidate was instrumental
     Paper presentations related to teaching

69. Guidelines for Non-Course Teaching

While no fixed ranking of importance is possible, the list of non-course teaching items above indicates a rough ranking of the importance of various kinds of non-course teaching.
Direction of master's theses and direction of honors theses are equally important.
Direction of master's theses and direction of honors theses are significantly more important than direction of independent studies, teaching directed reading courses, and membership on master's or PhD committees.
A candidate ranked as excellent in non-course teaching typically directs, on average, at least one master's or honor's thesis per year.
Because the quality of direction is a vital consideration, the direction of a large number of theses is no guarantee of a ranking of excellent in non-course teaching. Examples of evidence relevant to quality of direction include student presentations for which the director was instrumental and evidence that a student's director does not respond to her emails.

70. Every member of the Committee will announce her evaluation of the candidate with respect to non-course teaching.

Student Perception

71. Student Perception: How good are the numerical and written student evaluations? The Committee will review all the materials in the candidate's dossier and discuss the student perception of the candidate's courses.

72. First, the committee will consider the numerical scores for all courses taught during the prior four years.

73. Next, the committee will consider the written student evaluations, their content, and whether they are consistent with the numerical scores. Lack of written comments will not be held against the candidate.

74. Guidelines for Student Perception

A candidate whose numerical scores are typically 4.3 or better is likely to be ranked as excellent in student perception. A candidate whose scores are typically in the 4.0 - 4.29 range is likely to be ranked as very good in student perception. A candidate whose scores are typically in the 3.7 - 3.99 range is likely to be ranked as good in student perception.
The type and level of course, patterns of course enrollment, and grade distributions are among the factors relevant to the evaluation of student perception and of numerical scores and written comments. For example, a pattern of decreasing course enrollments might be evidence of poor student perception. For example, scores are typically expected to be higher in graduate seminars than undergraduate courses. For example, high scores in a course where every student receives an A might be discounted.

75. Every member of the Committee will announce her evaluation of the candidate with respect to student perception.

Holistic Teaching Evaluation

76. The Committee will then discuss its holistic evaluation of the candidate's teaching. In addition to issues listed above, this discussion will cover at least the following issues: trajectory, conformity to teaching policies, and variations among the types of courses taught.

77. In considering trajectory, the Committee will review the candidate's Statement of Interests and Goals for Teaching. They will also consider the temporal patterns of changes in teaching. For example, a significant drop off in the direction of master's theses might be a sign of poor trajectory.

78. In holistically evaluating the teaching record, the Committee will take into account the conformity of the candidate's courses with University, College, and Departmental policies regarding teaching. These policies can be found in the Department's "Handbook for Instructors in the Department of Philosophy."

79. In holistically evaluating the teaching record, the Committee will take into account variations among the types of courses taught. For example, teaching larger courses may require skills different from those needed to teach seminars, and teaching introductory logic may require skills different from those needed to teach other introductory courses.

80. After following the procedures above, each member will announce whether, in her view, the candidate's teaching (as a whole) is less-than-excellent or excellent.

81. Guidelines and Paradigms for Holistic Evaluation

The "Handbook for Instructors in the Department of Philosophy" contains paradigms of syllabi that the Department judges to be excellent.

A candidate with, on average, less than one master's or honor's thesis directed per year is not likely to receive an affirmative recommendation.

A candidate is not likely to be ranked as outstanding on a factor unless the candidate has earned a significant teaching award.

The more that a candidate's courses are out of conformity with University, College and Departmental policies, the less likely it is that the candidate will receive an affirmative recommendation.

A candidate ranked as very good on three of the five factors and excellent on the other two factors is not likely to receive an affirmative recommendation.

A candidate ranked as good on one of the five factors is not likely to receive an affirmative recommendation unless they are outstanding in at least one of the other factors and excellent in all the remaining factors.

A candidate ranked as poor or fair on one of the five factors is not likely to receive an affirmative recommendation even if they are outstanding or excellent in all the others.

One paradigm of a candidate who meets the teaching standards for promotion is someone who ranked as excellent on all five factors.

Another paradigm of a candidate who meets the teaching standards for promotion is someone who ranked as excellent on four factors and very good on one.

III. C. Evaluation of Service

Overall Standards

82. The evaluation of a candidate's service is primarily based on a consistent record of effective service to the Department, the College, and/or the University.

83. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, a candidate must be evaluated as good in service. An evaluation of good in service will be given only if the candidate's trajectory in service indicates a high probability that service work done as an associate professor will be very good.

84. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, a candidate must be evaluated as very good in service. An evaluation of very good in service will be given only if the candidate's trajectory in service indicates a high probability of continued very good work in service.

85. Intellectual contributions to professional organizations (e.g., serving on editorial boards, reviewing the promotion materials of faculty at other institutions, serving as chair of the program committee for a conference) count in the Professional Development Category B. Contributions to professional associations of an administrative nature (e.g., treasurer of a learned society, coordinating logistics of conferences) count in service.

Procedures

86. After reviewing the workload statements from the Department Chair (if any), the Chair of the Committee will announce whether the candidate has any teaching reductions for service. Candidates who have teaching reductions for service must do significantly more service than candidates with no such reductions. While it is not possible to measure such things with precision, the amount of service work done as a result of the teaching reduction should be equivalent to the amount of work required to teach a course.

87. The Committee will discuss the quantity of the candidate's service by reviewing all the service items in the candidate's dossier.

88. Every member of the Committee will announce her evaluation of the quantity of the candidate's service. The evaluations are: poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, and outstanding.

89. The Committee will then discuss the quality of the candidate's service. This discussion will consider at least the following factors:
      organization,
      effectiveness,
      leadership, and
      timeliness.

90. Every member of the Committee will announce her evaluation of the quality of the candidate's service. The evaluations are: poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, and outstanding.

Holistic Service Evaluation

91. The Committee will then discuss its holistic evaluation of the candidate's service. In addition to issues listed above, this discussion will cover (among other matters) the trajectory of the candidate's service work.

92. In considering trajectory, the Committee will review the candidate's Statement of Interests and Goals for Service. They will also consider the temporal patterns of changes in service. For example, a significant drop off in service work might be a sign of poor trajectory.

93. If the candidate seeks promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, after following the procedures above, each member will announce whether, in her view, the candidate's service (as a whole) is less-than-good or good.

94. If the candidate seeks promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, after following the procedures above, each member will announce whether, in her view, the candidate's service (as a whole) is less-than-very-good or very good.

95. Guidelines and Paradigms for Holistic Evaluation

To merit a ranking of good in service, a candidate should, at a minimum, serve on two departmental-level committees or fulfill other departmental service roles (e.g., organizing the colloquium series or advising the undergraduate philosophy club) each year.

To merit a ranking of very good in service, the candidate typically must engage in some college or university level service. She typically must also take on some leadership role in service, by doing things such as chairing departmental committees or committees in professional organizations.

A candidate for associate professor is not likely to receive an affirmative recommendation unless both the quantity and quality of service are good.

A candidate for professor is not likely to receive an affirmative recommendation unless both the quantity and quality of service are very good.

A candidate for professor who has done no College or University service is not likely to receive an affirmative recommendation.

One paradigm of a candidate who meets the service standards for promotion to associate professor is someone who has served on two departmental committees per year.

One paradigm of a candidate who meets the service standards for promotion to professor is someone who has served on three departmental committees per year and has served on one College or University committee per year.

IV. PROMOTION AND TENURE RECOMMENDATION

96. Each member will announce whether, in her view, the candidate merits tenure/promotion to the rank that the candidate seeks. Each member's announcement must be consistent with the member's previous announcements and the College and University policies. For example, a member of the committee may not hold that a candidate's teaching is very good and then hold that a candidate merits promotion.

97. Members of the Committee may not abstain. They must announce a view as to whether the candidate merits tenure/promotion to the rank that the candidate seeks.

98. The Chair of the Committee will announce the count of the views of the members of the committee. The Chair will then announce the recommendation of the majority of the Committee. If the vote is tied (i.e., there is no majority), the Chair will announce this fact.

V. POST-EVALUATION PROCEDURES

99. If the Chair of the Committee is among the members of the majority of the committee, she will write a letter to the Department Chair expressing the majority's recommendation and providing a detailed justification of the recommendation. If there is a minority, the members of the minority will elect a member of the minority to write a minority letter to the Department Chair.

100. If there is a majority but the Chair of the Committee is not among the majority, the members of the majority will elect a member of the majority to write the majority letter to the Department Chair and the Chair of the Committee will write a minority letter to the Department Chair.

101. If the Committee vote is tied (i.e., there is no majority), the Chair of the Committee will write the letter for the group of which she is a member and the members of the other group will elect a member of their group to write a letter to the Department Chair.

102. Members of the Committee may write their own letters.

103. Every member of the Committee must sign precisely one letter.

104. When discussing professional development and teaching, the letters will not discuss the overall ranking of the candidate as poor, fair, good, or very good, excellent, or outstanding. They will merely indicate whether the candidate's professional development and teaching are excellent.

105. When discussing service, the letters will not discuss the overall ranking of the candidate as poor, fair, good, or very good, excellent, or outstanding. If the candidate seeks promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, they will merely indicate whether the candidate's service is good. If the candidate seeks promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, they will merely indicate whether the candidate's service is very good.

106. All letters will be given to the candidate at least three days before they are due to the Department Chair. At least two days before the letters are due to the Department Chair, the candidate may submit a request for corrections of factual errors. The candidate may not request any other corrections and the Committee is not obligated to make any changes.

107. The final versions of the letters of the Committee will be given to the Department Chair no later than the date specified in the College Manual. At the same time, copies will be given to the candidate.

108. The Department Chair will review the Committee's letter(s) and conduct an independent review of the candidate's qualifications in professional development, teaching, and service. In conducting this review, the Department Chair will use the criteria in this document. The Department Chair will write a letter to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee expressing her recommendation and providing a detailed justification of the recommendation.

109. The Department Chair's letter will be given to the candidate at least three days before they are due to the Office of the Dean. At least two days before the letters are due to the Office of the Dean, the candidate may submit a request for corrections of factual errors. The candidate may not request any other corrections and the Department Chair is not obligated to make any changes.

110. The Committee's letters, the Department Chair's letter, and the candidate's dossier will be delivered to the Office of the Dean on or before the date specified in the College Manual. At that time, a copy of the Department Chair's letter will be given to the candidate.

111. The remainder of the promotion and tenure process is described in College and University manuals.

APPENDIX I. ANNUAL REVIEW

112. The departmental policies regarding annual review are to be used in conjunction with and are governed by the annual review policies of the College and the University.

113. By the deadline set by the College, every member of the Department (including visiting faculty) will submit to the Department Chair the following materials:
a. A CV.
b. An annual report in the format specified by the College.
c. A 1-2 page narrative self-evaluation.
>This narrative should be written in the third person and include at least a paragraph on teaching, a paragraph on professional development, and a paragraph on service.
>The information on teaching must include a chart that indicates
>a. the sections taught by the faculty member,
>b. the enrollment of each of those sections and the number of students responding to question 17,
>c. the DWF and AB rates for those sections, and
>d. the average on question 17 for each section. Standard rules for rounding to the hundredths place will be employed.
>The paragraph(s) on professional development should include at least the titles of all items published as well as where and when they were published.
>The paragraph(s) on service should include an overview of the faculty member's service activities.
>Administrative contributions to professional associations (e.g., treasurer of a professional society) count in service. Intellectual contributions to professional organizations (e.g., memberships on editorial boards, memberships on conference program committees) count in the professional development.
>Faculty members are encouraged to include in their narratives any information relevant to putting their professional development, teaching, and service in context.
d. A teaching portfolio. This portfolio must include, from the relevant academic year:
>i. a list of all MA thesis students directed, MA thesis committee membersship, honors theses directed, independent studies and directed readings.
>ii. The syllabi for all sections taught.
>iii. for each of these courses, the major assignments (papers and exams/tests), unless a course is taught multiple times with no significant changes. Other course materials can be included if they provide essential evidence of teaching effectiveness.

114. These materials will be reviewed by the Departmental Executive Committee. Each member of that committee will individually and confidentially provide the Department Chair with their ranking of each faculty member using the terms of evaluation specified in the College's Annual Review Policy (i.e., poor, fair, good, very good, excellent, outstanding).

115. In making these recommendations, members of the Executive Committee will be guided by the Departmental P&T Review, Pre-Tenure Review, and Post-Tenure Review Guidelines.

116. A member of the Executive Committee will not evaluate herself.

117. Visiting Instructors are ranked only on teaching. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are ranked on teaching and service. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are ranked on professional development, teaching, and service.

APPENDIX II. PRE-TENURE REVIEW RATINGS GUIDELINES

118. The procedural rules regarding the pre-tenure review process are in the College Pre-Tenure Review Policy. This document covers the rating guidelines to be used in this process.

Professional Development

119. Poor: The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.

120. Fair: The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

121. Good: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion and tenure review, will leave him/her significantly below the guidelines specified above (Paragraphs 26-52) for excellence in professional development at the level of associate professor.

122. Very Good: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion and tenure review, will leave him/her modestly below the guidelines specified above (Paragraphs 26-52) for excellence in professional development at the level of associate professor.

123. Excellent: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion and tenure review, will put him/her at or above the guidelines specified above (Paragraphs 26-52) for excellence in professional development at the level of associate professor.

124. Outstanding: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion and tenure review, will produce an eminent reputation, as evidenced by national or international awards, national grants, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues, and so on.

Teaching

125. Poor: The faculty member's rankings in the five teaching factors specified above (Paragraphs 54-81) are mostly poor.

126. Fair: The faculty member's rankings in the five teaching factors specified above (Paragraphs 54-81) are mostly fair.

127. Good: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion and tenure review, will leave him/her significantly below the guidelines for excellence in teaching specified above (Paragraphs 54-81).

128. Very Good: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion and tenure review, will leave him/her modestly below the guidelines for excellence in teaching specified above (Paragraphs 54-81).

129. Excellent: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion and tenure review, will put him/her at or above the guidelines for excellence in teaching specified in above (Paragraphs 54-81).

130. Outstanding: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion and tenure review, will produce an exceptional teaching record, a teaching record of a kind rarely seen in junior faculty at any institution.

Service

131. Poor: The faculty member's rankings in the four service factors specified above (Paragraphs 82-95) are mostly poor.

132. Fair: The faculty member's rankings in the four service factors specified above (Paragraphs 82-95) are mostly fair.

133. Good: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion and tenure review, will put him/her at or above the guidelines for good in service but below the guidelines for very good in service specified above (Paragraphs 82-95).

134. Very Good: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion and tenure review, will put him/her at or above the guidelines for very good in service specified above (Paragraphs 82-95).

135. Excellent: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion and tenure review, will put him/her significantly above the guidelines for very good in service specified above (Paragraphs 82-95).

136. Outstanding: The faculty member is on a track that, at the time of promotion and tenure review, will produce an exceptional service record, a service record of a kind rarely seen in junior faculty at any institution.

APPENDIX III. POST-TENURE REVIEW RATINGS GUIDELINES

137. The procedural rules regarding the post-tenure review process are in the College Post-Tenure Review Policy. This document covers the rating guidelines to be used in this process.

The College policy states: "As part of this process, candidates at the rank of associate professor will be evaluated on evidence that his/her current trajectory in both professional development and teaching will support successful progress toward the rank of professor."

Professional Development

138. Poor: The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.

139. Fair: The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

140. Good: The faculty member is significantly below the guidelines specified above (Paragraphs 27-53) for excellence in professional development at the level of professor.

141. Very Good: The faculty member is modestly below the guidelines specified above (Paragraphs 27-53) for excellence in professional development at the level of professor.

142. Excellent: The faculty member meets the guidelines specified above (Paragraphs 27-53) for excellence in professional development at the level of professor.

143. Outstanding: The faculty member has an eminent reputation, as evidenced by national or international awards, national grants, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues, and so on.

Teaching

144. Poor: The faculty member's rankings in the five teaching factors specified above (Paragraphs 54-81) are mostly poor.

145. Fair: The faculty member's rankings in the five teaching factors specified above (Paragraphs 54-81) are mostly fair.

146. Good: The faculty member is significantly below the guidelines for excellence in teaching specified above (Paragraphs 54-81).

147. Very Good: The faculty member is modestly below the guidelines for excellence in teaching specified above (Paragraphs 54-81).

148. Excellent: The faculty member meets the guidelines for excellence in teaching specified above (Paragraphs 54-81).

149. Outstanding: The faculty member has done exceptional teaching, teaching of a kind rarely seen in senior faculty at any institution.

Service

150. Poor: The faculty member's rankings in the four service factors specified above (Paragraphs 82-95) are mostly poor.

151. Fair: The faculty member's rankings in the four service factors specified above (Paragraphs 82-95) are mostly fair.

152. Good: The faculty member meets the guidelines for good in service specified above (Paragraphs 82-95).

153. Very Good: The faculty member meets the guidelines for very good in service specified above (Paragraphs 82-95).

154. Excellent: The faculty member is significantly above the guidelines for very good in service specified above (Paragraphs 82-95).

155. Outstanding: The faculty member has done exceptional service, service of a kind rarely seen in senior faculty at any institution.