TENURE UNIT STANDARD ROUTING SHEET

In support of the following academic policy statements, tenure unit performance standards will be maintained and made publicly available by the Office of the Provost's Faculty Records Team. Per policy, each of these sets of standards will be reviewed every five (5) years, submitted to the Office of the Provost using this routing form for all signatures.

- APS 900417, Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
- APS 980204, Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)
- APS 820317, The Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Please note the following:

- Use a separate routing sheet for each set of tenure unit standards.
- Submit files in portable document format (PDF) only.
- Ensure the set of standards being submitted **_have been approved_** by the tenure unit **_and_** college dean.

Tenure Unit: Philosophy

College/Unit:

☐ CAM   ☐ COCJ   ☑ CHSS   ☐ COM   ☐ NGL
☐ COBA   ☐ COE   ☐ COHS   ☐ COSET

Standard:

◉ Promotion and Tenure   ○ Post-Tenure Review   ○ Faculty Evaluation System (FES)

Contact:

Name (first & last): Jorge G. Varela, Ph.D.

SHSU Email: jgv002@shsu.edu

Phone: 936-294-3052

Approved By:

_____
Department Chair

_____
Leif French (Dec 15, 2022 09:11 CST)
College Dean

_____
Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs

**Guidelines for Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty
Philosophy Program**

In accordance with APS 900417, faculty members in the Philosophy Program will be evaluated considering the following categories of performance: *Scholarly and/or Creative Accomplishment, Teaching, and Service.* The standards of performance can be found under each of these categories.

Scholarly and/or Creative Accomplishment

I. Definition of Scholarly Work That Contributes to the Discipline.

In accordance with APS 900417 5.5.01.a (2), the category of scholarly accomplishments consists of research and publications. Philosophers traditionally have disseminated their scholarship through refereed journal articles and refereed book chapters. However, in recent years it has been recognized that there is a diversity of ways to disseminate scholarship that are rigorous and fit within a philosophical research agenda (e.g., invited professional, substantive blog entries; digital humanities projects; pedagogical research that results in scholarly work that is shared with the public and/or peers). The Philosophy Program is committed to including these different forms of research as part of the evaluation of faculty. For this purpose, we have divided this diversity of research into two general categories and additional elements that help to evaluate the quality of faculty's work. All of the following are *examples of scholarly work that contributes to the discipline,* but it should be noted that philosophers are often called upon or expected to contribute to debates in other fields. As such, venues generally understood as homes for other disciplines have long been recognized as appropriate venues for philosophers to contribute to the discipline of philosophy.

A. **Primary scholarship** (not listed in any order of importance and not an exhaustive list)

1. Peer reviewed journal articles
2. Peer reviewed book chapters
3. Peer reviewed monographs
4. Peer reviewed textbooks
5. Peer reviewed articles in reference works
6. Peer reviewed academic presentations as presenter
7. Funded grants

B. **Secondary scholarship** (not listed in any order of importance and not an exhaustive list)

1. Peer reviewed edited books
2. Peer reviewed critical book reviews
3. Edited journals
4. Peer reviewed bibliographies
5. Peer reviewed academic presentations as commentator
6. Works under review

7. Works in progress
8. Scholarly work presented at conferences, in workshops, and other professional venues
9. Peer reviewed blog entries
10. Peer reviewed public philosophy

C. **Possible indicators of the quality of the candidate's scholarship** (not listed in any order of importance and not an exhaustive list)

1. Publication with high-quality presses and in high-quality general or specialized journals. (While it is ultimately up to the DPTAC to arrive at a conclusion as to whether the candidate's publication(s) are with high-quality journals or presses, candidates are strongly encouraged, if applicable, to address this issue in their narratives, offering explanation and/or documentation of why the presses/journals in question are high-quality in the context of the type of research undertaken by the candidate.)
2. Invitations to contribute to workshops, conferences, books, journals, and other outlets of scholarship
3. Journal rankings, acceptance rates, etc.
4. Funded research grants from prestigious institutions or in large amounts
5. Contracts with publishers
6. Inclusion of previous publications in anthologies
7. Citations in the published literature
8. Published discussion of publications, e.g., articles, book reviews, etc.
9. Publishing awards or prizes
10. Translations of their work into other languages
11. Author-meets-critics sessions in print or at conferences
12. Keynote speaker at a conference

D. **Leadership in scholarly work** (not listed in any order of importance and not an exhaustive list)

1. Editor of a peer-reviewed publication or special issue
2. Administrative position in professional organization
3. Keynote speaker invitation
4. Invitations to contribute to workshops, conferences, books, journals, and other outlets of scholarship

Any of the above will be recognized as evidence of professional competence and effectiveness in the field of philosophy.

We affirm disciplinary and interdisciplinary collaboration in scholarship. The candidate is permitted, but not required, to include an explanation of their approach to scholarship that highlights relevant factors not addressed by these guidelines. These lists are not meant to be exhaustive; candidates may choose to include other forms of *documented* evidence for scholarship in consultation with the co-chair(s) of DPTAC. Moreover, the Philosophy Program recognizes the value of co-authored publications and does not treat these differently than other

publications. For that reason, publications co-authored with students may count as contributions in both the area of research/scholarship and the area of teaching, provided that these works are in each case evaluated in accordance with the standards relevant in each area.

Moreover, the Philosophy Program recognizes the publication of instructional materials as a contribution to research and scholarship. In accordance with APS 900417, such publications will be considered toward the evaluation of research contributions, but not toward the evaluation of teaching contributions.

In accordance with APS 900417 4.05, the Chair in consultation with the DPTAC may grant that up to the equivalent of two works of primary scholarship by a newly hired member of the Philosophy faculty who has taught at another university in a tenure-track/tenured position be counted toward that faculty's earning tenure at SHSU. The guidelines for determining prior service credit in hiring negotiations include, among other things, the number of publications and the quality of the publications and/or of the venues in which they are published, and the relevance of publications to the scholarly areas associated with the faculty position being filled.

Peer-reviewed is understood as having at least one academic peer, editor or equivalent, reviewing the substance of the scholarship.

We distinguish items related to scholarship that are *complete* from those that are *forthcoming*, and we distinguish these from *works under review* (works written *and* submitted) and from works *in progress*, which are written but not yet submitted. Thus, the following definitions of written scholarship obtain:

- *complete* items: written and published (in print or online)
- *forthcoming* items: written and accepted for publication, but as yet unpublished
- *under review*: written and submitted for review, but not yet accepted
- *works in progress*: written but not yet submitted for review

Note: Faculty members cannot count the same article as under review/forthcoming more than once. Peer reviewed journal articles can only be counted as *complete* once they are in print (including online) and cannot be counted twice (in print online and paper print).

Conference presentations include posters/exhibits, workshops, symposiums, round tables, paper presentations, panels, commentators, debates, etc. For a grant to count, the grantee must be listed as a PI, Co-PI, or Co-I. Here, *complete* items are presentations that have occurred whereas *forthcoming* items are those that are scheduled but have yet to occur. Presentation manuscripts under review or in progress do not count for credit toward merit or tenure and promotion.

Finally, these lists are not meant to be exhaustive. Candidates may choose to include other forms of *documented* evidence for scholarship in consultation with the Chair of the Department and may use items from **Category 3. "Possible indicators of the quality of the candidate's scholarship"** to add qualitative value to the evidence submitted. This in turn can be translated into quantitative value in consultation with the Chair. The relevant quantitative value here applies both to FES score in a given year and quantity of pubs over the review period.

II. Evaluation of growth in quality/significance of scholarly contributions

A. Associate Professor

In accordance with APS 5.01b the candidate must demonstrate a sustained pattern of peer-reviewed research/publications or scholarly work that contributes to the applicant's discipline and demonstrate evidence of growth in quality/significance of scholarly contributions. To demonstrate a sustained pattern the faculty member will provide evidence of scholarly work in one or more of the two areas described earlier (i.e., primary scholarship and secondary scholarship). However, a faculty member cannot meet expectations for two years in a row without providing evidence of at least one *complete or forthcoming* item (as defined above) belonging to categories a-e in the primary scholarship category.

To demonstrate evidence of growth in quality/significance of scholarly contributions, the candidate will provide *documented* evidence from the list of indicators of the *quality* of the candidate's scholarship as defined above.

In accordance with CHSS policy, the standards for tenure and promotion are aligned with the standards used for FES. The standards put forth in the FES documents thus should serve as an instrument to measure that the faculty member has obtained these goals. In order to meet expectations for earning tenure and promotion, the candidate will be expected to have performed at a level commensurate to achieving at least an average of a 3.0 Meets Expectations score in their FES for Research during the period of review. In addition, the candidate must present evidence of the equivalent of four works of primary scholarship, or two works of primary scholarship where one of those works is a peer edited monograph, at the end of the review period. When determining this calculation, it is important to consider the following: as stated, a single monograph counts the same as three other items of primary scholarship. Also, for these purposes, item e. "Academic presentations as presenter" will not count as a work of primary scholarship or equivalent because peer reviewed articles and book chapters can only count once they are in print.

While the FES standards are relevant and applicable to the evaluation of overall fitness for tenure and promotion, the DPTAC must independently assess whether the candidate has met these standards, irrespective of the FES scores awarded by the department chair during annual review. In the event that a candidate for tenure and promotion has achieved a sufficient (3.0+) average in their FES for Research but the DPTAC finds that the candidate's research contributions do not meet expectations, the DPTAC must clarify in writing the rationale for this finding and show concretely why the candidate's contributions did not meet expectations.

Extenuating circumstances, such as illness or global pandemic, should be *documented* by the candidate and can be considered as a justification for a lower score in any given year.

Considerations of these documented factors will be discussed with the members of DPTAC and Chair of the Department.

B. Professor

In accordance with APS 5.02 the candidate must demonstrate leadership in peer-reviewed research/publications, grantsmanship or scholarly work that contributes to the applicant's discipline. Candidates must also demonstrate evidence of growth in quality/significance of scholarly or creative contributions and sustained contributions to the intellectual culture of the University.

- To demonstrate leadership in peer-reviewed research/publications, grantsmanship or scholarly work the faculty member will provide evidence of scholarly work following the indicators provided in "Leadership in scholarly work" described above.

- To demonstrate growth the candidate must provide evidence of scholarly work in one or more of the two areas described earlier (i.e., primary scholarship and secondary scholarship).

The *intellectual culture of the University* can take many shapes and forms. To allow for a variety of activities, the candidate will provide evidence of activities that have been developed and have contributed to the intellectual growth of faculty, students, staff and/or the community. To document this activity, the candidate must present a brief description of the aim of this activity, how it contributed to the intellectual growth of a particular group, and the length of the activity.

Note that in the case of post-tenure review, we take into account fluctuations in the relative emphasis on teaching, scholarship, and service across the career of the candidate. Changes in these areas or additional relevant factors must be included in the qualitative section of the evaluation.

In accordance with CHSS policy, the standards for promotion to Professor are aligned with the standards used for FES. The standards put forth in the FES documents thus should serve as an instrument to measure that the faculty member has obtained these goals. In order to meet expectations for earning promotion, the candidate will be expected to have performed at a level commensurate to achieving at least an <u>average</u> of a 3.0 Meets Expectations score in their FES for Research during the period of review. However, while the FES standards are relevant and applicable to the evaluation of overall fitness for tenure and promotion, the DPTAC must independently assess whether the candidate has met these standards, irrespective of the FES scores awarded by the department chair during annual review.

The goal of post-tenure research is different from tenure track research; the aim during the post-tenure period is to allow faculty members to explore new avenues of research some of which may not yield published results. The candidate must present evidence of <u>the equivalent of two *complete* works of primary scholarship at the end of the review</u>

period. As stated previously, for these purposes a monograph is the equivalent of three works of primary scholarship.

In the event that a candidate for promotion has achieved a sufficient (3.0+) average in their FES for Research but the DPTAC finds that the candidate's service contributions do not meet expectations, the DPTAC must clarify in writing the rationale for this finding and show concretely why the candidate's contributions did not meet expectations.

Extenuating circumstances, such as illness or global pandemic, should be *documented* by the candidate and can be considered as a justification for a lower score in any given year. Considerations of these documented factors will be discussed with the members of DPTAC and Chair of the Department.

III. Documentation Required

A. **Associate Professor:** Candidates are encouraged to submit the following documents for an evaluation of research:

1. A narrative that explains the development of the scholarship during the period examined. This narrative should be written for a wider and interdisciplinary audience and include a description of their main area of research, the different scholarly activities they have engaged in during the evaluation period and how they related to their main area of research, a description of any areas of their scholarly work they would like to highlight and a brief explanation of the significance of these accomplishments, any extenuating circumstances they faced during the evaluated period (if applicable), and, finally, a brief description of their plans for future work. In order to ensure a successful comprehensive narrative, the Philosophy program shall make available sample narratives and, where desired by the candidate, faculty mentorship in revising and refining the narrative.
2. A document containing links to the different scholarly works created during the review period. If it is not possible to provide an electronic link, a complete citation of the scholarly work is acceptable.
3. An updated copy of their C.V.
4. Submitted copies for each year of the review period of the fillable CHSS FES document and all supporting documentation appended thereto. Because the DPTAC evaluation is independent of the chair's FES evaluation, the final FES scores are not binding on DPTAC; the candidate is therefore encouraged to address in the narrative any areas in which they believe the FES scores they have received are lower than merited by the candidate's contributions.

B. **Professor:** Candidates are encouraged to submit the following documents for an evaluation of research:

1. A narrative that explains the development of the scholarship during the period examined. This narrative should be written for a wider and interdisciplinary audience and include a description of their main area of research, the different scholarly

activities they have engaged in during the evaluation period and how they related to their main area of research, a description of any areas of their scholarly work they would like to highlight and a brief explanation of the significance of these accomplishments, any extenuating circumstances they faced during the evaluated period (if applicable), and, finally, a brief description of their plans for future work. In order to ensure a successful comprehensive narrative, the Philosophy program shall make available sample narratives and, where desired by the candidate, faculty mentorship in revising and refining the narrative.

2. A document containing links to the different scholarly works created during the review period. If it is not possible to provide an electronic link, a complete citation of the scholarly work is acceptable.
3. An updated copy of their C.V.
4. Submitted copies for each year of the review period of the fillable CHSS FES document and all supporting documentation appended thereto. Because the DPTAC evaluation is independent of the chair's FES evaluation, the final FES scores are not binding on DPTAC; the candidate is therefore encouraged to address in the narrative any areas in which they believe the FES scores they have received are lower than merited by the candidate's contributions.

Teaching

I. Definition of Teaching

In accordance with APS 900417 5.5.01.a (1), the category of teaching as it applies to the Philosophy faculty consists of, among other things:

A. classroom instruction (in-person, online, and hybrid);
B. development of new courses, programs of study, and teaching methods;
C. dissemination of instructional materials;
D. academic advising;
E. and supervision of, mentoring of, and research collaboration with undergraduate and graduate students.

The Philosophy Program is committed to supporting faculty in choosing the teaching commitments that are most meaningful to them and their professional lives.

Because the Philosophy Program recognizes the publication of instructional materials as a contribution to research and scholarship, in accordance with APS 900417, such publications will be considered toward the evaluation of research contributions, but not toward the evaluation of teaching contributions. Moreover, the Philosophy Program recognizes the value of co-authored publications and does not treat these differently than other publications. For that reason, publications co-authored with students may count as contributions in both the area of research/scholarship and the area of teaching, provided that these works are in each case evaluated in accordance with the standards relevant in each area.

The Philosophy Program does not have an expectation that different teaching categories are only germane to different ranks; however, the Philosophy Program does recognize that faculty of different ranks will be in different positions to contribute to the Program in the category of teaching. Contribution to any aspect of teaching at any time and rank shall be considered meritorious, and the Philosophy Program is committed to allowing for professional development in the area of teaching, inclusive of, among other things, the development of new courses and teaching methods. Indeed, the Philosophy Program is committed to recognizing the merit of continuous efforts at refining and improving one's craft as a teacher, regardless of rank or years of service.

In accordance with APS 900417 4.05, the Chair in consultation with the DPTAC may grant up to three years of prior service in teaching to a newly hired member of the Philosophy faculty who has taught at another university in a tenure-track/tenured position. The guidelines for determining prior service credit in hiring negotiations include, among other things, the number of courses taught, comparison of the content of previously taught courses to Philosophy courses offered at SHSU, student evaluations and/or peer evaluations of teaching from the previous institution, and any professional development in the area of teaching that occurred in connection with service at the previous institution. The standards for assessing teaching contributions to the Philosophy program at SHSU must be used in assessing whether newly hired faculty merit credit for prior teaching service.

The artifacts that must be submitted for FES evaluation, DPTAC annual review, or tenure and promotion are detailed below, in §3. In general, there is no expectation that faculty must include artifacts substantiating participation in programs for professional development in the area of teaching or examples of instructional materials among these artifacts. However, it is acceptable for these bodies to request additional artifacts from faculty where appropriate if deemed necessary to complete evaluation. The candidate for tenure and/or promotion is permitted, but not required, to include in their submitted materials an explanation of their approach to teaching and any other relevant factors that are not otherwise included in these guidelines. The lists in §3 are not meant to be exhaustive, and candidates may choose to include other evidence in consultation with the co-chair(s) of DPTAC.

II. Evaluation of Teaching

In accordance with APS 820317 2.2.01, Chair's/Department's Evaluation of Teaching minimally includes periodic peer evaluation of teaching and is not based on or otherwise influenced by student evaluations. In accordance with APS 900417 5.5.01.b (1) and (2), evaluation of teaching effectiveness minimally includes Chair's/Department's Evaluation of Teaching and student evaluations. The Philosophy Program will not use a faculty committee with representation from all ranks to assist the chair in evaluation of teaching effectiveness; however, examples of suitable instruments for use in peer evaluation of teaching will be made available to faculty and examples of suitable alternative means of engaging in this activity are included on the Philosophy Program Teaching Rubric. The Philosophy Program recognizes a distinction between evaluating a peer's teaching and being the subject of a peer's evaluation of one's own teaching. The expectation will be that all faculty engage in the latter at least once per academic year and, when possible, the

peer evaluating one's teaching will be a member of the Philosophy Program, but evaluations by other peers, including members of other Departments or universities, are acceptable.

A. **Associate Professor:** In accordance with APS 900417 5.5.01.b (1), the candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate, among other things:

   1. sustained effective teaching and mentoring of students, documented by student evaluations and peer and chair review;
   2. an exemplary record of academic advisement and/or supervision of student research;
   3. sustained program support in the form of, among other things, contributions to the Philosophy curriculum, innovation in teaching methods, development of instructional materials, and/or participation in interdisciplinary programs;
   4. and participation in teaching-related professional development.

   In accordance with CHSS policy, the standards for tenure and promotion are aligned with the standards used for FES. The standards put forth in the FES documents thus should serve as an instrument to measure that the faculty member has obtained these goals. In order to meet expectations for earning tenure and promotion, the candidate will be expected to have performed at a level commensurate to achieving at least an <u>average</u> of a 3.0 Meets Expectations score in their FES for Teaching during the period of review. However, while the FES standards are relevant and applicable to the evaluation of overall fitness for tenure and promotion, the DPTAC must independently assess whether the candidate has met these standards, irrespective of the FES scores awarded by the department chair during annual review. In the event that a candidate for tenure and promotion has achieved a sufficient (3.0+) average in their FES for Teaching but the DPTAC finds that the candidate's service contributions do not meet expectations, the DPTAC must clarify in writing the rationale for this finding and show concretely why the candidate's contributions did not meet expectations.

   Extenuating circumstances, such as illness or global pandemic, should be *documented* and can be consider as a justification for a lower score in any given year. Considerations of these documented factors will be discussed with the members of DPTAC and Chair of the Department.

B. **Professor:** In accordance with APS 900417 5.5.01.b (2), the candidate for tenure and promotion to Professor must demonstrate, among other things:

   1. sustained effective teaching and mentoring of students, documented by student evaluations and peer and chair review;
   2. an exemplary record of academic advisement and/or supervision of student research;
   3. leadership in program support in the form of, among other things, contributions to the Philosophy curriculum, innovation in teaching methods, development of instructional materials, and/or participation in interdisciplinary programs;
   4. and participation in teaching-related professional development.

Leadership, in this context, is understood to include significant latitude on the faculty member's part in choosing forms of program support that are most meaningful to them and their professional lives. Leadership in this area may, for example, take the form of a wide range of activities or especially intense focus on a single or limited range of activities.

In accordance with CHSS policy, the standards for promotion are aligned with the standards used for FES. The standards put forth in the FES documents thus should serve as an instrument to measure that the faculty member has obtained these goals. In order to meet expectations for earning promotion, the candidate will be expected to have performed at a level commensurate to achieving at least an <u>average</u> of a 3.0 Meets Expectations score in their FES for Teaching during the period of review. However, while the FES standards are relevant and applicable to the evaluation of overall fitness for promotion, the DPTAC must independently assess whether the candidate has met these standards, irrespective of the FES scores awarded by the department chair during annual review. In the event that a candidate for promotion has achieved a sufficient (3.0+) average in their FES for Teaching but the DPTAC finds that the candidate's service contributions do not meet expectations, the DPTAC must clarify in writing the rationale for this finding and show concretely why the candidate's contributions did not meet expectations.

Extenuating circumstances, such as illness or global pandemic, should be *documented* by the candidate and can be considered as a justification for a lower score in any given year. Considerations of these documented factors will be discussed with the members of DPTAC and Chair of the Department.

III. Documentation Required

A. **Associate Professor:** Candidates are required to submit at least the following documents for an evaluation of teaching:

1. A narrative that explains the development of the candidate's teaching during the period examined. This narrative should be written for a wider and interdisciplinary audience and, as applicable, include discussion of courses taught, teaching strategies, professional development, student advising and/or mentorship, and contributions to curricular development during the evaluation period. This discussion should include mention of how the above relate to the candidate's development as a teacher, any special explanations of significant accomplishments, any applicable extenuating circumstances faced during the evaluation period, and, finally, a brief description of their plans for future work in the area of teaching. In order to ensure a successful comprehensive narrative, the Philosophy program shall make available sample narratives and, where desired by the candidate, faculty mentorship in revising and refining the narrative.
2. An updated copy of their C.V.
3. Submitted copies for each year of the review period of the fillable CHSS FES document and all supporting documentation appended thereto. Because the DPTAC

evaluation is independent of the chair's FES evaluation, the final FES scores are not binding on DPTAC; the candidate is therefore encouraged to address in the narrative any areas in which they believe the FES scores they have received are lower than merited by the candidate's contributions.

B. **Professor:** Candidates are required to submit at least the following documents for an evaluation of teaching:

1. A narrative that explains the development of the candidate's teaching during the period examined. This narrative should be written for a wider and interdisciplinary audience and, as applicable, include discussion of courses taught, teaching strategies, professional development, student advising and/or mentorship, and contributions to curricular development during the evaluation period. This discussion should include mention of how the above relate to the candidate's development as a teacher, any special explanations of significant accomplishments, any applicable extenuating circumstances faced during the evaluation period, and, finally, a brief description of their plans for future work in the area of teaching. In order to ensure a successful comprehensive narrative, the Philosophy program shall make available sample narratives and, where desired by the candidate, faculty mentorship in revising and refining the narrative.
2. An updated copy of their C.V.
3. Submitted copies for each year of the review period of the fillable CHSS FES document and all supporting documentation appended thereto. Because the DPTAC evaluation is independent of the chair's FES evaluation, the final FES scores are not binding on DPTAC; the candidate is therefore encouraged to address in the narrative any areas in which they believe the FES scores they have received are lower than merited by the candidate's contributions.

<div align="center">

Service

</div>

I. **Definition of Service**

In accordance with APS 900417 5.5.01.a (3), the category of service consists of:

A. service to students, colleagues, program, department, college, and the University;
B. administrative and committee service; and
C. service beyond the University to the profession, community, state, and nation, including academic or professionally related public service.

As such, for faculty in the Philosophy Program, service typically involves:

A. forms of program support,
B. service to the Department of Psychology and Philosophy,
C. service to the College of Humanities and Social Sciences,
D. service to Sam Houston State University,

E. service to academic and/or professional communities of philosophers and other scholarly communities in fields related to our academic specializations, and

F. community service in Huntsville and beyond that meaningfully relates to our profession and/or our affiliation with the University.

The Philosophy Program is committed to supporting faculty in choosing the service commitments that are most meaningful to them and their professional lives. All of the following are *non-exhaustive lists of examples of service work that are recognized as contributions relevant to standards for faculty tenure and promotion*:

A. **Service to the Philosophy Program** (not listed in any order of importance)

1. Regularly attending Philosophy faculty meetings
2. Serving on a program-level committee
3. Chairing a program-level committee
4. Participating in Philosophy job searches, including serving on or chairing search committees or attending candidate presentations and providing feedback to the search committee.
5. Facilitating SACS accreditation procedures
6. Coordinating course scheduling
7. Drafting and/or substantially editing documents and statements on behalf of the program
8. Mentoring new or junior program faculty
9. Work that substantially contributes to recruiting students to the program (e.g., recruiting new Philosophy majors and minors) and/or to diversifying the students served by the program.
10. Work that contributes to greater awareness in the broader campus community of philosophy course offerings and/or the benefits of studying philosophy (e.g., organizing "Meet a Philosopher" tabling)
11. Advising student clubs and organizations directly related to philosophy (e.g., the Philosophy Club and Phi Sigma Tau)
12. Coordinating specific degree programs where relevant (e.g., coordinating the Ethics Minor)
13. Organizing or coordinating campus events pertaining to philosophy or serving students/faculty in the Philosophy Program
14. Attending and/or participating in events hosted by the program or affiliated student groups (e.g., attending Philosophy colloquia, making invited presentations to Philosophy Club)
15. Serving as a peer evaluator of teaching to other Philosophy faculty

B. **Service to the Department of Psychology and Philosophy** (not listed in any order of importance)

1. Regularly attending Department of Psychology and Philosophy faculty meetings
2. Serving on a department-level committee

3. Chairing a department-level committee
4. Participating in Psychology job searches, including serving on or chairing search committees or attending candidate presentations and providing feedback to the search committee.
5. Drafting and/or substantially editing documents and statements on behalf of the department
6. Organizing or coordinating campus events hosted or co-hosted by the Psychology and Philosophy Department.
7. Attending and/or participating in events hosted by the department or affiliated student groups
8. Serving as a peer evaluator of teaching to Psychology faculty

C. **Service to the College of Humanities and Social Sciences** (not listed in any order of importance)

1. Participation in Graduation and Graduation Reception
2. Serving on a college-level committee
3. Chairing a college-level committee
4. Participating in CHSS job searches, including serving on or chairing search committees or attending candidate presentations and providing feedback to the search committee.
5. Organizing or coordinating campus events hosted or co-hosted by CHSS.
6. Attending and/or participating in events hosted or co-hosted by CHSS or other CHSS programs (e.g., DiveIn-sponsored events)

D. **Service to the University** (not listed in any order of importance)
1. Serving on a university-level committee
2. Chairing a university-level committee
3. Serving on Faculty Senate
4. Participating in university-level job searches, including serving on or chairing search committees or attending candidate presentations and providing feedback to the search committee.
5. Editing SHSU-sponsored publications (e.g., *INQUIRY: Critical Thinking Across the Disciplines*)
6. Organizing or coordinating campus events hosted or co-hosted by the university..
7. Attending and/or participating in events hosted or co-hosted by the university or other colleges (e.g., serving as a faculty moderator at the Undergraduate Research Symposium).
8. Serving as advisor to a student organization not directly affiliated with philosophy.

E. **Service to the Profession** (not listed in any order of importance)

1. Refereeing manuscripts for academic journals, publishers, etc.
2. Editing a journal, a journal section, or a special issue of a journal
3. Editing a professional blog series or newsletter
4. Series editor for a book series

5. Serving on the editorial board for a journal, book series, or other academic publication
6. Active membership in a professional organization
7. Serving as a president of officer for a professional organization
8. Organizing conferences.
9. Organizing conference panels or sessions.

F. **Service to the Community** (not listed in any order of importance)

1. Serving the community in a manner meaningfully connected to one's scholarly interests or affiliation with academic communities.
2. Serving the community in a manner meaningfully connected to one's affiliation with the university and/or any of its programs or subunits.

The Philosophy Program does *not* have an expectation that different service categories are only germane to different ranks: service in any of the above six categories is a meritorious contribution regardless of rank.

However, the Philosophy Program *does* have slightly higher expectations for the service load of faculty at the rank of Professor than of faculty at the rank of Associate Professor and slightly higher expectations for the service load of faculty at the rank of Associate Professor than of faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor. In general, the expectation is that this higher expectation will be met with additional service work at the program level, consistent with APS 900417 5.5.01.b (2) which calls upon tenured faculty to demonstrate leadership in program support. However, because program support may also include examples of activities defined above as Service to the Department, Service to the College, and/or Service to the University, many of these tasks will be appropriate to meet tenured faculty's greater service expectation.

In accordance with APS 900417 4.05, the Chair in consultation with the DPTAC may grant recognition of up to three years of prior work in the area of service to a newly hired member of the Philosophy faculty who has taught at another university in a tenure-track/tenured position. The guidelines for determining prior service credit in hiring negotiations include, among other things: the amount of service previously performed; comparison to the service load of faculty in the SHSU Philosophy Program; relevance of the service work to the aims of the Program, Department, College, University, profession, and/or community; peer evaluations and/or letters of recommendation from those in position to comment on the faculty member's previous service contributions.

The FES evaluation will serve as an instrument specifying service tasks suitable to conforming to minimal standards and meeting expectations for faculty at all ranks, including stipulating performance standards that vary depending on rank.

In general, there is *not* an expectation that faculty must include artifacts substantiating service contributions among the materials submitted for FES evaluation, DPTAC annual review, or tenure and promotion.

However, it *is* acceptable for these bodies to request additional artifacts from faculty where appropriate if artifacts are deemed necessary to complete evaluation.

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion is permitted, but not required, to include an explanation of their approach to service to include relevant factors that are not otherwise stipulated in these guidelines. As stated above, these lists are not meant to be exhaustive, and candidates may choose to include other evidence of service in consultation with the co-chair(s) of DPTAC.

II. Evaluation of Contribution, Professional Competence, and Leadership in Service and Program Support

A. Associate Professor: In accordance with APS 900417 5.5.01.b (1), the candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate:

1. a sustained contribution to program support;
2. sustained and documented service to the University, profession, or community, as appropriate for the discipline; and
3. demonstrated effectiveness as a contributing member in accomplishing the goals of the Department/College/University.

The Philosophy Program views each of these requirements as being primarily fulfilled through the performance of service tasks defined above, though with the exception that many aspects of program support referenced in 5.5.01.b (1) will be tabulated in terms of an evaluation of the candidate's teaching (e.g., where the candidate engages in course and curriculum development, innovations in teaching methodology, electronic instruction development, or participation in interdisciplinary academic programs that are to improve the candidate's own teaching but not necessarily the teaching of other program faculty), and some aspects of demonstrated effectiveness as a contributing member involve evaluation of teaching and research.

Any evidence of service to the profession (as defined above) during the review period will be taken as evidence of both professional competence and effectiveness as a contributing member of the profession.

In short, a candidate for tenure and promotion who is deemed to have met all expectations stipulated in the three areas of teaching, research, and service will be recognized as having demonstrated sustained contribution to program support, sustained and documented service, and effectiveness as a contributing member.

In accordance with CHSS policy, the standards for tenure and promotion are aligned with the standards used for FES. The standards put forth in the FES documents thus should serve as an instrument to measure that the faculty member has obtained these goals. In order to meet expectations for earning tenure and promotion, the candidate will be expected to have performed at a level commensurate to achieving at least an <u>average</u> of a 3.0 Meets Expectations score in their FES for Service during the period of review. Such

performance will be taken as sufficient evidence of having been a contributing member of the Department, College, and University. However, while the FES standards are relevant and applicable to the evaluation of overall fitness for tenure and promotion, the DPTAC must independently assess whether the candidate has met these standards, irrespective of the FES scores awarded by the department chair during annual review. In the event that a candidate for tenure and promotion has achieved a sufficient (3.0+) average in their FES for Service but the DPTAC finds that the candidate's service contributions do not meet expectations, the DPTAC must clarify in writing the rationale for this finding and show concretely why the candidate's contributions did not meet expectations.

Extenuating circumstances resulting in a lower FES average, such as those stemming from illness or global pandemic, should be *documented* by the candidate and can be considered as a justification for a lower score in any given year. Considerations of these documented factors will be discussed with the members of DPTAC and Chair of the Department.

B. **Professor:** In accordance with APS 900417 5.5.01.b (2), the candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor must demonstrate

1. leadership in program support;
2. sustained and documented leadership in service to the University, profession, or community; and
3. demonstrated leadership in accomplishing the goals of the Department/College/University.

The Philosophy Program views each of these requirements as being primarily fulfilled through the performance of service tasks defined above, though with the exception that many aspects of program support referenced in 5.5.01.b (1) will be enumerated in terms of an evaluation of the candidate's teaching (e.g., where the candidate engages in course and curriculum development, innovations in teaching methodology, electronic instruction development, or participation in interdisciplinary academic programs that are to improve the candidate's own teaching but not necessarily the teaching of other program faculty) and some aspects of demonstrated effectiveness as a contributing member involve evaluation of teaching and research.

Any evidence of service to the profession (as defined above) during the review period will be taken as evidence of both professional competence and effectiveness as a contributing member of the profession.

In accordance with CHSS policy, the standards for promotion to Professor are aligned with the standards used for FES. The standards put forth in the FES documents thus should serve as an instrument to measure that the faculty member has obtained these goals. In order to meet expectations for earning promotion, the candidate will be expected to have performed at a level commensurate to achieving at least an <u>average</u> of a 3.0

Meets Expectations score in their FES for Service during the period of review. Such performance will be taken as sufficient evidence of having been a contributing member of the Department, College, and University. However, while the FES standards are relevant and applicable to the evaluation of overall fitness for tenure and promotion, the DPTAC must independently assess whether the candidate has met these standards, irrespective of the FES scores awarded by the department chair during annual review. In the event that a candidate for promotion has achieved a sufficient (3.0+) average in their FES for Service but the DPTAC finds that the candidate's service contributions do not meet expectations, the DPTAC must clarify in writing the rationale for this finding and show concretely why the candidate's contributions did not meet expectations.

Extenuating circumstances resulting in a lower FES average, such as those stemming from illness or global pandemic, should be *documented* by the candidate and can be considered as a justification for a lower score in any given year. Considerations of these documented factors will be discussed with the members of DPTAC and Chair of the Department.

Because the FES rubric for Associate Professors is more demanding than that for Assistant Professors (because an associate professor must perform an additional major task in service of the program in order to meet expectations), averaging a 3.0 Meets Expectation score will be taken as *prima facie* evidence of having demonstrated sustained and documented leadership in the areas referenced above. However, to demonstrate sustained leadership, faculty will generally be expected to engage in at least one of the following Activities Demonstrating Leadership in Service for the majority of years during the period of review:

1. Activities Demonstrating Leadership in Service
2. Chairing a program-level committee
3. Facilitating SACS accreditation procedures
4. Coordinating course scheduling
5. Mentoring new or junior program faculty
6. Chairing a department-level committee
7. Serving on a college- or university-level committee
8. Chairing a college- or university-level committee
9. Serving on Faculty Senate
10. Editing a journal or book series
11. Serving as a presiding or non-presiding officer of a professional organization
12. Organizing an academic conference

Any of the above will be taken as evidence, as well, of leadership in being a contributing member of the Department, College, University, and Profession. However, it should be noted that the above list is not exhaustive; other service activities of similar scope may be considered as examples of leadership.

Note that in the case of post-tenure review, we take into account fluctuations in the relative emphasis on teaching, scholarship, and service across the career of the candidate. Changes in

these areas or additional relevant factors must be included in the qualitative section of the evaluation.

III. Documentation Required

A. **Assistant Professors and Associate Professors not Pursuing Rank of Professor:** Faculty are encouraged to submit the following documents for an evaluation of service:

1. A narrative that explains the general nature of service activities undertaken during the period examined. This narrative should be written for a wider and interdisciplinary audience and should, if applicable, comment on the trajectory of the candidate's service activities; how do the activities chosen serve the broader aims of the Program, Department, College, University, and/or profession? In addition, the narrative should include a brief description of any areas of their service work they would like to emphasize and a brief explanation of the particular significance of these accomplishments, a discussion of any extenuating circumstances the candidate faced during the evaluated period (if applicable), and, finally, a brief description of the candidate's plans for future service work. In order to ensure a successful comprehensive narrative, the Philosophy program shall make available sample narratives and, where desired by the candidate, faculty mentorship in revising and refining the narrative.
2. (Optional) A document containing evidence of the candidate's service work during the review period, including but not limited to active or archived copies of organization webpages or rosters, new coverage of events, testimonials, etc.
3. An updated copy of the candidate's C.V.
4. Submitted copies for each year of the review period of the fillable CHSS FES document and all supporting documentation appended thereto. Because the DPTAC evaluation is independent of the chair's FES evaluation, the final FES scores are not binding on DPTAC; the candidate is therefore encouraged to address in the narrative any areas in which they believe the FES scores they have received are lower than merited by the candidate's contributions.

B. **Professors and Associate Professors Pursuing Rank of Professor:** Faculty are encouraged to submit the following documents for an evaluation of service:

1. A narrative that explains the general nature of service activities undertaken during the period examined. This narrative should be written for a wider and interdisciplinary audience and should, if applicable, comment on the trajectory of the candidate's service activities; how do the activities chosen serve the broader aims of the Program, Department, College, University, and/or profession? In addition, the narrative should include a brief description of any areas of their service work they would like to emphasize and a brief explanation of the particular significance of these accomplishments, a discussion of any extenuating circumstances the candidate faced during the evaluated period (if applicable), and, finally, a brief description of the candidate's plans for future service work. In order to ensure a successful comprehensive narrative, the Philosophy program shall make available sample

narratives and, where desired by the candidate, faculty mentorship in revising and refining the narrative.

2. (Optional) A document containing evidence of the candidate's service work during the review period, including but not limited to active or archived copies of organization webpages or rosters, new coverage of events, testimonials, etc.

3. An updated copy of the candidate's C.V.

4. Submitted copies for each year of the review period of the fillable CHSS FES document and all supporting documentation appended thereto. Because the DPTAC evaluation is independent of the chair's FES evaluation, the final FES scores are not binding on DPTAC; the candidate is therefore encouraged to address in the narrative any areas in which they believe the FES scores they have received are lower than merited by the candidate's contributions.