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 09:17 CST)
College Dean

_____
Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs

Guidelines for The Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (FES)
Philosophy Program

In accordance to APS 820317 the Faculty Evaluation System (FES) recognizes three categories for purposes of evaluation: scholarly and/or creative accomplishments, teaching effectiveness and service. A description of rating scale and definitions of terms used in the scale can be found under each category

I.   Scholarly and/or creative accomplishments

Rating Scale

Score	Descriptor
0	*No work*
1	*Less than Minimum Standards* Attaining this level means you have *not* done what is required to perform your job
2	*Minimum Standards* Attaining this level means you have done what is *required* to perform your job, but not to warrant meritorious recognition or progress in advancement to tenure and/or promotion
3	*Meets Expectations* Attaining this level means you have performed your job well, warranting meritorious recognition and, if relevant, progress in advancement to tenure and/or promotion
4	*Exceeds Expectations* Attaining this level means you have performed your job exceptionally well, warranting a significant meritorious recognition and, if relevant, significant progress in advancement to tenure and/or promotion
5	*Extraordinary Performance* Attaining this level means you have performed your job extraordinarily well, warranting an exceptional level of meritorious recognition and, if relevant, exceptional progress in advancement to tenure and/or promotion

Definition of Scholarly Work That Contributes to the Discipline

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

    a. Peer reviewed journal articles
    b. Peer reviewed book chapters
    c. Peer reviewed monographs

d. Peer reviewed textbooks
e. Peer reviewed articles in reference works
f. Peer reviewed academic presentations as presenter
g. Funded grants

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

a. Peer reviewed edited books
b. Peer reviewed critical book reviews
c. Edited journals
d. Peer reviewed bibliographies
e. Peer reviewed academic presentations as commentator
f. Works under review
g. Works in progress
h. Scholarly work presented at conferences, in workshops, and other professional venues
i. Peer reviewed blog entries
j. Peer reviewed public philosophy

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

a. Publication with high-quality presses and in high-quality general or specialized journals
b. Invitations to contribute to workshops, conferences, books, journals, and other outlets of scholarship
c. Journal rankings, acceptance rates, etc.
d. Funded research grants from prestigious institutions or in large amounts
e. Contracts with publishers
f. Inclusion of previous publications in anthologies
g. Citations in the published literature
h. Published discussion of publications, e.g., articles, book reviews, etc.
i. Publishing awards or prizes
j. Translations of their work into other languages
k. Author-meets-critics sessions in print or at conferences
l. Keynote speaker at a conference

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 publications over the review period.

Instrument Formatting

Minimum Standards: Philosophy Faculty Meet Minimum Standards (score of 2) if they present evidence of achieving one of the items from the "Secondary Scholarship" category with the exception of items **f.** "*Works Under Review*" and g. "*Works in progress*" (and present no evidence of achieving one of the items in the "Primary Scholarship" category).

Faculty who only present evidence of item f. "Works under review" or g. "Works in progress" will receive a 1, "Does Not Meet Minimum Standards."

Faculty who do not present any evidence of work from the "Secondary Scholarship Category" will receive a 0, "No work."

Meets Expectations: Philosophy Faculty Meet Expectations (score of 3) if:

- They present evidence of achieving <u>one</u> of the items from the "Primary Scholarship Category" (with the exception of item c. Peer reviewed monographs since a single such monograph counts the same as three other items of primary scholarship)
- <u>Or faculty present evidence of two</u> items from the "Secondary Scholarship Category". For published work, these may be *forthcoming* or *complete* (as defined above) following the guidelines described earlier.

Exceeds Expectations: Philosophy Faculty Exceed Expectations (score of 4) if they:

- Present evidence of achieving <u>two</u> of the items from the "Primary Scholarship Category" (with the exception of item c. Peer reviewed monographs since a single such monograph counts the same as three other items of primary scholarship)

- Or present evidence of achieving <u>one</u> of the items from the "Primary Scholarship Category" (with the exception of item c. Peer reviewed monographs since a single a monograph counts the same as three other items of primary scholarship) and <u>one</u> of the items from "Possible indicators of the quality of the candidate's scholarship"
- Or present evidence of achieving <u>one</u> of the items from the "Primary Scholarship Category" (with the exception of item c. Peer reviewed monographs) and <u>two</u> items from the "Secondary Scholarship Category" with the exception of item "f. Works in progress." For published work, these may be *forthcoming* or *complete* (as defined above) following the guidelines described earlier.

Extraordinary Performance: Philosophy Faculty exhibits Extraordinary Performance (score of 5) if they:

- Present evidence of achieving <u>three</u> of the items from the "Primary Scholarship Category"
- Or present evidence of achieving <u>two</u> of the items from the "Primary Scholarship Category" (with the exception of item c. Peer reviewed monographs) and at least <u>one</u> of the items from "Possible indicators of the quality of the candidate's scholarship"
- Or present evidence of item "c. Peer reviewed monographs" from the "Primary Scholarship" category." For published work, these may be *forthcoming* or *complete* (as defined above) following the guidelines described earlier.

II.   Teaching Effectiveness

Rating Scale

Score	Descriptor
0	*No work*
1	*Less than Minimum Standards* Attaining this level means you have *not* done what is required to perform your job
2	*Minimum Standards* Attaining this level means you have done what is *required* to perform your job, but not to warrant meritorious recognition or progress in advancement to tenure and/or promotion
3	*Meets Expectations* Attaining this level means you have performed your job well, warranting meritorious recognition and, if relevant, progress in advancement to tenure and/or promotion
4	*Exceeds Expectations*

	Attaining this level means you have performed your job exceptionally well, warranting significant meritorious recognition and, if relevant, significant progress in advancement to tenure and/or promotion
5	***Extraordinary Performance*** Attaining this level means you have performed your job extraordinarily well, warranting an exceptional level of meritorious recognition and, if relevant, exceptional progress in advancement to tenure and/or promotion

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.

Documentation

In addition to completing this form, Philosophy Faculty are required to complete the fillable CHSS FES document (location TBA), attaching all necessary supporting evidence (e.g., copies of student evaluations), as well as provide evidence of peer review of teaching (the Philosophy Program will make available different peer evaluation forms for faculty).

Minimum Standards

Philosophy Faculty of any rank meet Minimum Standards if fulfilling all of the categories below; any category that is not applicable may be marked with 'NA' (e.g., if the faculty member was willing and able to meet the standard but did not have the opportunity to do so):

Standard	Completion
Engaged in classroom instruction (FTF and/or ONLN)	
Met with classes as scheduled	
Held regular office hours	
Provided timely and appropriate feedback to students	
Completed attendance verification on time	
Submitted term grades on time	

Submitted textbook adoptions on time	
Posted syllabus to Blackboard on time	
Met course requirements (e.g., WE requirements, formatting syllabi according to college guidelines)	
Contributed to program course assessment (e.g., SACS pre-/post-tests)	
Worked with Service for Students with Disabilities	

Meets Expectations

Philosophy Faculty of any rank Meet Expectations if fulfilling all of the categories below; any category that is not applicable may be marked with 'NA' (e.g., if the faculty member was willing and able to meet the standard but did not have the opportunity to do so):

Standard	Completion
Contributes to fulfillment of the Program's curricular needs	
Participated in program curriculum discussions	
Engaged in peer evaluation of teaching (e.g., classroom observation, assignment evaluation, syllabus evaluation, etc.)	

III.   Service

Rating Scale

Score	Descriptor
0	*No work*
1	*Less than Minimum Standards* Attaining this level means you have *not* done what is required to perform your job
2	*Minimum Standards* Attaining this level means you have done what is *required* to perform your job, but not to warrant meritorious recognition or progress in advancement to tenure and/or promotion
3	*Meets Expectations*

	Attaining this level means you have performed your job well, warranting meritorious recognition and, if relevant, progress in advancement to tenure and/or promotion.	
4	***Exceeds Expectations*** Attaining this level means you have performed your job exceptionally well, warranting significant meritorious recognition and, if relevant, significant progress in advancement to tenure and/or promotion	
5	***Extraordinary Performance*** Attaining this level means you have performed your job extraordinarily well, warranting an exceptional level of meritorious recognition and, if relevant, exceptional progress in advancement to tenure and/or promotion	

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.

Minimum Standards: Tenure Track and Tenured Philosophy Faculty Meet Minimum Standards if Fulfilling All of the Categories Below:

Standard	Completion
Serves on a Program- or Department-Level Committee (Includes Searches)	
Regularly Attends Program Faculty Meetings	
Regularly Attends Department Faculty Meetings	

Faculty who meet some but not all of the above will receive a 1, "Does Not Meet Minimum Standards." Faculty who do not meet any of the above but do engage in other service work indicated on line items below will also receive a 1. Faculty who neither meet any of the above nor engage in other service work indicated below will receive a 0, "No work."

Meets Expectations: To meet expectations, in addition to meeting the minimum standards, Tenure Track and Tenured faculty must achieve one or more of the following, depending on rank:

- Assistant professors must check one item to meet expectations. Any additional items beyond the first should not be checked, since these can be employed below to provide additional incremental points.
- Associate professors must check two items (or the equivalent*) to meet expectations. Any additional items beyond the second should not be checked, since these can be employed below to provide additional incremental points.
- Professors must check three items (or the equivalent*) to meet expectations. Any additional items beyond the third should not be checked, since these can be employed below to provide additional incremental points.

Equivalents: the starred items below count for the equivalent of two items.

Note also that items marked with a + are items that would be best performed by a Program Coordinator compensated with release time. So long as no such position exists (as at present) it is only appropriate that such substantive responsibilities should warrant significant meritorious recognition and, when applicable, advancement toward tenure and promotion.

Standard	Completion
Serves on Additional Program- or Department-Level Committee (Includes Searches) Specify:	
Serves on Second Additional Program- or Department-Level Committee Specify:	
Serves on College- or University-Level Committee Specify:	
Serves on Additional College- or University-Level Committee Specify:	
Search Committee Chair	
SACS Facilitator*+ (counts as two items)	
Lead in charge of scheduling*+ (counts as two items)	

Drafting of Documents & Statements on Behalf of Program Specify:	
Diversity Work that Aligns with Program, Department, College, and/or University Standards Promoting Equity & Inclusion Specify:	
Mentorship of New/Junior Faculty	
Ethics Minor Coordinator	
Organizer of Recurring Events to Recruit Students to Philosophy	
Advisor for Philosophy Club or Phi Sigma Tau	
Attends Graduation and Graduation Reception	

Boxes to Check for Incremental Point Increases Across Categories of Service

Note: Faculty members may count a particular item for more than the suggested increment based on the intensity or duration of the activity warranting the adjustment. In this case, the faculty member is expected to include a written justification of any such adjustments in "Proposed Additions or Considerations."

Recall that items marked with a + are items that would be best performed by a Program Coordinator compensated with release time. So long as no such position exists (as at present) it is only appropriate that such substantive responsibilities should warrant significant meritorious recognition and, when applicable, advancement toward tenure and promotion.

Service to Program (P)	Point Increment	Cap	Running Total
Search Committee Member	.5	2	
Search Committee Chair (in addition to member)	.25	.25	
Philosophy Search Participation (such as attending candidate research presentations and providing feedback to committee) Specify:	.1	.2	
SACS Facilitator+	.5	.5	
Lead in charge of scheduling+	.5	.5	
Organizer of Regular, Recurring Activity aimed at recruitment of students to Philosophy (e.g. Meet a Philosopher" Table)	.25	.25	

	Point Increment	Cap	Running Total
Participant in Recruitment Activity	.1	.3	
Circulation of Promotional Materials for Scheduled Courses	.1	.3	
Drafting and/or Substantial Editing of Documents & Statements on Behalf of Program	.25	.5	
Program Committee Member Specify:	.25	1	
Program Committee Chair Specify:	.5	1	
Ethics Minor Coordinator	.5	.5	
Mentorship of New/Junior Faculty	.25	.5	
Peer Evaluator to a Colleague in Philosophy	.1	.5	
Invited Presentation to Philosophy Club	.1	.2	
Advisor to Philosophy Club	.25	.25	
Advisor to Phi Sigma Tau	.25	.25	
Attendance at Philosophy Events	.1	.5	
Coordinator/Organizer of Philosophy Event Series	.25	1	
Coordinator/Organizer of One-Time Philosophy Event (e.g. invited speaker event open to campus community)	.1	.5	
Presents on Philosophy Program for Saturday@Sam	.25	.25	

Proposed Additions or Considerations (with written justification):

Service to Department (D)	Point Increment	Cap	Running Total
Peer Evaluator to a Colleague in Psychology	.1	.5	
Department Committee Member	.25	1	
Department Committee Chair	.5	1	

Department Search Committee Member	.5	2	
Department Search Committee Chair (in addition to points for committee membership)	.25	.5	
Psychology Search Participation (such as attending candidate research presentations and providing feedback to committee) Specify:	.1	.5	
Drafting and/or Substantial Editing of Documents and Statements on Behalf of Department (D)	.25	.5	
Attendance of Department (Psychology or Joint Psychology & Philosophy) Events (e.g., Pizza with the Profs) Specify:	.1	.5	
Coordinator/Organizer of Joint (Psychology & Philosophy) Event Series or Large Event Specify:	.25	1	

Proposed Additions or Considerations (with written justification):

Service to College (Col)	Point Increment	Cap	Running Total
Participation in Graduation and Graduation Reception	.25	.25	
College Committee Member	.25	1	
College Committee Chair	.5	1	
College Search Participation (e.g., attending candidate talks and providing feedback to search committee) Specify:	.1	.5	
Attendance of CHSS Events not already specified (e.g., CHSS Kick Off, Preview@Sam) Specify:	.1	.5	
Coordinator/Organizer of CHSS Events Specify:	.25	1	

Proposed Additions or Considerations (with written justification):

Service to University (U)	Point Increment	Cap	Running Total
Faculty Senate Representative	.5	.5	
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Member (in addition to representative)	.5	.5	
University Committee Member	.25	1	
University Committee Chair	.5	1	
University Search Participation (e.g., attending candidate presentations and providing feedback to committee) Specify:	.1	.5	
Inquiry Journal editor	.5	.5	
Advisor of Student Organization (not applicable to Philosophy & Psychology orgs counted above) Specify:	.25	.5	
Faculty Moderator at Undergraduate Research Symposium	.1	.2	

Proposed Additions or Considerations (with written justification):

Service to Profession (Prof)	Point Increment	Cap	Running Total
Journal referee	.1	.5	
Journal special issue editor	.25	1	

Journal editorial board member	.1	.5	
Journal editor	.5	1	
Journal section editor (e.g., book reviews)	.25	.5	
Professional blog editor (e.g., APA or APA Newsletter)	.25	.5	
Active membership in professional organization	.1	.3	
Executive committee/board member of professional organization	.25	.5	
Presiding Officer of professional organization	.5	1	
Non-Presiding Officer of professional organization	.25	.5	
Moderator/panel chair of conference	.1	.5	
Organizer of conference panel/session	.25	.5	
Organizer (or co-organizer) of large (150+ participant) academic conference	1	1	
Organizer (or co-organizer) of mid-sized (50-149 participant) academic conference	.5	1	
Organizer (or co-organizer) of small (49 participants or fewer) academic conference or workshop	.25	.5	

Proposed Additions or Considerations (with written justification):

***Proposed Additions or Considerations of <u>Service to the Community</u> (with written justification):

<u>Category Point Totals</u>
Note that the total of the increments enumerated below cannot exceed 2.

Service to the Program (P) Category Point Total: _____
Service to the Department (D) Category Point Total: _____
Service to the College (Col) Category Point Total: _____
Service to the University (U) Category Point Total: _____
Service to the Profession (Prof) Category Point Total: _____
Service to the Community (Com) Category Point Total: _____
Final Considerations (with written justification):

OVERALL SERVICE POINT TOTAL (Not to Exceed 5): _____