

The Department of Philosophy's Standards and Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion
Humboldt State University

AREAS TO BE EVALUATED

Teaching will be evaluated in accordance with Appendix J and the policies below. Scholarship includes activities such as those listed in Standards for Scholarship below, which are in accordance with the American Philosophical Association's "Statement on Research" (<http://www.apaonline.org/?research>). Service includes activities undertaken for the department, university, community, or profession, such as those listed in the Standards for Service below. The primary evidence for the quality of a faculty member's work in all areas will consist of collegial letters that both explain and evaluate the activity.

STANDARDS FOR TEACHING

Appendix J requires teaching excellence. The Department of Philosophy also requires teaching excellence to be well documented for each period of evaluation by:

Required:

1. Collegial letters based on direct observations that evaluate teaching performance in the classroom;
2. Anonymous student evaluations that the Department of Philosophy requires for every graded course every semester;

May be included but not required:

3. Student letters based on direct observation that evaluate teaching performance in the classroom and other relevant venues.
4. Documented evidence of engaging in professional development activities in teaching such as participating in an Institute for Student Success, attending conferences and/or seminars related to teaching, and the like.
5. Anonymous student evaluations administered in 1 unit CR/NC courses taught as overloads.
6. Student letters that discuss the candidate's role as Academic Advisor.

Item 1 is the highest consideration when it comes to evaluating a faculty member's teaching. Although student letters (item 3) are not required, they may be included in the WPAF and will be evaluated along with anonymous student evaluations (item 2).

Criteria for Evaluation

1. The Department of Philosophy considers collegial letters discussing what is observed in

the classroom, and that provide a qualitative assessment of that performance, to be the most important evidence for teaching excellence. Although they may be included in the WPAF, our faculty members are not required to solicit collegial letters from outside of the Department of Philosophy.

2. In general, the Department of Philosophy regards scores on the anonymous student evaluations to reflect teaching excellence if:
 - a. Average scores for all questions are generally in the 4 to 5 range;
 - b. Average scores below 4 for any given question are exceptions;
 - c. Student comments are generally favorable, that is, there is no pattern of comments suggesting a problem with the instructor's teaching.
3. In cases where there is a pattern of student evaluations that fall below HSU's standard of excellence, faculty are expected to reflect upon and explain in their PDS the circumstances they think caused this as well as to state a strategy for remedying it.
4. Descriptions and reflections on the subject matter and methods of instruction for all 3 unit courses taught by a faculty member should be placed in their PDS along with the document explaining their Teaching Philosophy.

STANDARDS FOR SCHOLARSHIP

The Department of Philosophy includes the following types of activities below to count toward scholarship. Publications in reputable online journals also count as scholarship.

1. Publishing a book in philosophy by a non-vanity publisher;*
 2. Publishing an article in a peer-reviewed academic journal, including conference proceedings;
 3. Publishing an article or chapter in an anthology or textbook by a non-vanity publisher;
 4. Editing a book or journal in philosophy by a non-vanity publisher;
 5. Publishing a book review in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal;
 6. Giving a presentation or commentary at a philosophy conference, with acceptance based on peer-review.
 7. Securing (internal and external) grants.
- “Vanity publisher” refers to self-published or pay to publish venues.

Criteria for Evaluation

Scholarship must be documented in the PDS for each period of evaluation. Evidence for the quality of scholarship will primarily consist of letters in the WPAF from reputable scholars that address how the faculty member's scholarship has or will contribute to the field.

Below are the Department of Philosophy's ranking criteria for the area of Scholarship for the relevant period of evaluation:

For promotion to Full Professor:

Excellent: The faculty member's WPAF must include evidence of at least four activities from 1---7 above, with at least two being from 1---4.

Good: The faculty member's WPAF must include evidence of at least four activities from 1---7 above, with at least one being from 1---4.

Minimum Essential: The faculty member's WPAF must include evidence of at least three activities from 1---7 above, with at least one being from 1---4.

For Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

Excellent: The faculty member's WPAF must include evidence of at least three activities from 1---7 above, with at least two being from 1---4.

Good: The faculty member's WPAF must include evidence of at least two activities from 1---7 above, with at least one being from 1---4.

Minimum Essential: The faculty member's WPAF must include evidence of at least one activity from 1---4 above.

STANDARDS FOR SERVICE

The Department of Philosophy recognizes four categories of service: to the department, university, community, and profession. Service must be documented in the PDS and evaluated in the WPAF by collegial letters that explain the scope and importance of the service. Types of service that would fall in the four respective categories are given below. The number of hours spent on each activity is to be listed in the faculty member's PDS.

First Category: Service to the Department

Service on department committees (curriculum, assessment, personnel, etc.) can count as department service even though also a part of our collateral duties, since its documentation shows how active the faculty member is in the department. Being Department Chair counts as department service as well, even though partially compensated by release time, and constitutes a leadership role within the department. Student advising, writing letters of recommendation for students, and visiting colleagues' classes for the purpose of writing collegial evaluations are all part of our collateral duties that are equally binding for all tenure track department members and so *will not count* as department service.

Second Category: Service to the University

This category includes activities that serve the university such as: guest lecturing for other HSU faculty; serving on a committee for departments/units other than Philosophy; serving on a College or University---wide committee (chairing such committees constitutes a leadership role); reporting for a standing committee of the HSU Senate or campus wide task force; serving on the HSU local CFA Executive Board; creating and/or participating in programs and forums for the university. Serving on a university committee that compensates faculty with release time also counts as university service.

Third Category: Service to the Community

This category includes discipline related community service such as: serving as a member of an ethics committee; giving guest lectures in local schools other than HSU; giving presentations in the community that have philosophical content and significance; participating in or creating social justice activities for the community.

Fourth Category: Service to the Profession

This category includes discipline related professional service such as: serving on the editorial board of a philosophy journal; serving on the board of a philosophical society (executive board membership constitutes a leadership role); developing conference programs; reviewing potential publications for philosophy journals or texts; chairing panels at philosophical society conferences.

Criteria for Evaluation

Service must be documented in the PDS for each period of evaluation. Evidence for the quality of service will primarily consist of collegial letters in the WPAF that explain the scope and importance of the service. The Department of Philosophy defines a 'service activity' in terms of the following three criteria: (1) the type of activity served in a certain category (e.g., fulfilling a Community Service requirement by serving on Ethics Committee X); (2) the role served in doing the activity (e.g., being a committee member, or a board member, or the Chair/President of Ethics Committee X); and if relevant, (3) the number of terms served in doing the activity. For service activities that include term limits, repeating terms will constitute the fulfillment of distinct activities, even if the type and/or role of the activity is the same (e.g., serving two terms as a committee member for Ethics Committee X will constitute two distinct activities).

Below are the Department of Philosophy's ranking criteria for the area of Service for Promotion to Full Professor for the relevant period of evaluation (over the full six-years of evaluation):

Excellent: The faculty member's WPAF must include evidence of serving in at least one of the

two following ways: (1) completing at least five service activities for those listed above, with at least one serving in a leadership role and one serving outside of the department; or (2) completing at least four service activities from those listed above, with two serving in a leadership role and one serving outside of the department.

Good: The faculty member's WPAF must include evidence of at least four service activities from those listed above, with at least one serving in a leadership role and one serving outside of the department.

Minimum Essential: The faculty member's WPAF must include evidence of at least three service activities, with at least one serving in a leadership role.

Below are the Department of Philosophy's ranking criteria for the area of Service for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor for the relevant period of evaluation:

Excellent: The faculty member's WPAF must include evidence of completing at least three activities for those listed above, with at least one serving in a leadership role and one serving outside of the department.

Good: The faculty member's WPAF must include evidence of completing at least three activities for those listed above, with at least one serving in a leadership role or one serving outside of the department.

Minimum Essential: The faculty member's WPAF must include evidence of completing at least three activities for those listed above.

CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION
From Appendix J of the HSU Faculty Handbook

Scholarship/Creative Activities	Service	Outcome
Good	Good	Acceptable
Excellent	Minimum Essential	Acceptable
Minimum Essential	Excellent	Acceptable
Good	Minimum Essential	Unacceptable
Minimum Essential	Good	Unacceptable

Addendum to RTP Criteria
Dept. of Philosophy
Submitted 8-24-16

The Department of Philosophy adds the following amendment to its RTP Criteria:

Faculty who have reduced WTU's (below the standard 3) for collateral duties will have a corresponding reduction in workload expectation regarding collateral duties (scholarship and service) for the purposes of RTP during the period their WTU's are lower than 3.

For example, if a faculty member's WTU's for collateral duties are reduced from 3 to 2 for a period, then the expectation of the quantity of collateral duties performed during said period (as outlined in Department RTP Criteria) will correspondingly be reduced by one-third.

For RTP purposes, verification of collateral duties reductions for chairs is accomplished via notation of such in the WPAF along with inclusion of the annual Chairs' contract(s) which stipulate adjusted WTU's.

Rationale - CAHSS reduces collateral duties WTU's for Chairs from 3.0 to 2.1. Without an amendment such as this, Faculty in CAHSS who serve as Department Chairs who have not yet progressed to Full Professor will be held accountable for doing the same quantity of collateral duties (scholarship and service) as faculty who are provided more WTU's for the same expected quantity. **That is an inequity.** If a faculty member has WTU's reduced for X then their expectation for X must be correspondingly reduced. That is how it is done for teaching WTU's. Collateral WTU's should be no different.