

Revised May 2009
Standards and Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion
Humboldt State University
Department of Philosophy

The members of the Department of Philosophy approved the following criteria for assessing scholarly, service, and teaching activities as applicable to the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process pursuant to Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook (effective 2008-2009).

Activities to be appraised. Teaching shall be appraised in accordance with Appendix J and the policies below. Scholarly activities are those listed in the standards for scholarship and are in accordance with the American Philosophical Association's Statement on the Profession regarding Research (referenced below via an online url). Service activities to be appraised are those listed below in the standards for service. We note that the new categories of scholarship in Appendix J incorporating the recommendations of the Carnegie report, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, are such that some service activities and some teaching activities now overlap into categories of scholarship.

TEACHING

The Department requires not just good teaching but excellent teaching. The Department also requires that teaching excellence be exhaustively documented. In accordance with Appendix J, IX.B.1.a.1-8, the primary evidence of teaching effectiveness will be peer reports of classroom observations testifying to excellence in teaching effectiveness. Each candidate will arrange to have more than half the faculty members in the Department observe the candidate's teaching and report on their observations for the file.

Student course evaluations are a crucial source of corroborating evidence for the judgments of peers, and faculty in the Department will have student course evaluations administered in every course which is part of the faculty member's teaching load. Faculty are urged also to have student course evaluation surveys administered in courses taught as overloads.

In general the Department regards scores on the student course evaluations as reflecting excellence if

1. averages for classes for the question on overall teaching excellence (Question 2.10 on the current form) are above 4.0 and
2. if average scores below 4.0 are exceptions or are absent.

Some allowance may be made for courses in which scores fall below this standard if the faculty member can provide an explanation with a plan for bringing scores up in the future.

SCHOLARSHIP

We define three levels of scholarship:

Minimal Essential

Completion of a paper in Philosophy ready to be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal in the field;

Completion of a paper regarding issues of teaching scholarship ready for submission to a peer-reviewed journal;

Presentation of a prepared commentary on another person's paper at a Philosophy conference;

Creation of a new course which incorporates research in Philosophy, including a 485-level course if the content of the course differs significantly from the content of the course the last time the professor taught it.

Good

Acceptance of a paper by a peer-reviewed journal in Philosophy;

Acceptance of a paper or chapter in a book in the area of teaching Philosophy scholarship;

Acceptance of a chapter in a book on Philosophy;

Presentation of a paper at a Philosophy Conference, where the paper is peer-reviewed;

Acceptance of a book review for publication in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal;

Excellent

Publication of a book in Philosophy via a non-vanity publisher;

Invitation to publish a paper in a peer-reviewed Philosophy journal;

Invitation to publish a chapter in a book on Philosophy

For one-year reappointment: at least one (1) from Minimal Essential is necessary and sufficient (if none from Good or Excellent); one (1) from Good is sufficient; one (1) from Excellent is sufficient.

For two-year reappointment: at least two (2) from Minimal Essential is necessary and sufficient (if none from Good or Excellent); one (1) from Good is sufficient; one (1) from Excellent is sufficient.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor: the department expects an average of two elements from Minimal Essential or one element from the Good or Excellent categories for each two year period. Specifically, this means that any of the following combinations of elements is sufficient for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor: (6) items from Minimal Essential, or three (3) items from Good, or four (4) from Minimal Essential and one (1) from Good; two (2) from Minimal Essential and two (2) from Good, or five (5) from Minimal Essential and one (1)

from Good. One item from the Excellent category is sufficient for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

For promotion to Professor: at least three (3) items from Good or Excellent. A particular work which is appraised as exceptionally valuable to the discipline because of its crucial insights or exceptionally high quality is considered *excellent* scholarship. Excellent scholarship is sufficient for promotion to any level.

Appraisals of Quality and Contribution to the Discipline. Publications in peer-reviewed venues, invited papers, invited reviews, and acceptances of papers by program committees for national or international conferences such as the APA divisional meetings, will be taken as positive professional appraisals of the quality and contribution to the discipline of the candidate's scholarly work. If the candidate's file does not include those kinds of scholarship, the department will solicit, in addition to letters from colleagues on campus, letters from disinterested external referees asking for their professional appraisal of the quality and contribution to the discipline of the candidate's scholarly work.

Note:

The department plans to revisit these criteria regularly for the following reasons:

HSU has recently changed the RTP process substantially and may change it more in the near future. Working out criteria is a complex process which may put some candidates at an unfair disadvantage, especially if their substantial strengths are not easily evaluated by these criteria. For example, a move to make scholarship of teaching more prominent in the area of research, which is part of our recent changes in Appendix J, must not lead to unfairness to candidates whose strengths are better measured by older models, or vice versa.

The department will continue in the near and mid-term future to experience personnel changes from retirements and new appointments. We will be faced with choices about whether we wish to change the major or change emphases in the program or change the basic character of the program (though we have a commitment to maintaining the current requirement that excellence in teaching remains primary). Any of those changes may affect our criteria for RTP.

The standards for how to evaluate e.g. scholarship of teaching remain a source of controversy in many disciplines, including philosophy. The American Philosophical Association has issued Statements on the Profession relevant to these issues. Those which bear directly on criteria for evaluation of personnel files are the statements on Research in Philosophy, on Research Expectations and Support, on The Teaching of Philosophy, on Service, and on Outcomes Assessment. These statements are online, linked from <http://www.apa.udel.edu/apa/governance/statements/index.html>. It has taken seventeen years (since the publication of Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered*) for new and wider concepts of scholarship to make their way into HSU's RTP process, partly because of resistance at a national level. As something closer to consensus is achieved on these matters the Department may reassess its positions.

Approved by ad hoc University Review Committee, September 21, 2009

Our main concern is that changes in RTP processes and criteria not lead to injustice to candidates. We are against any ratcheting upward of criteria which penalizes candidates because their hires or early careers were guided by expectations which have been revised toward more stringent requirements.

SERVICE

We define three levels of service:

Minimal Essential

Service on department committees (curriculum, budget, assessment, personnel, etc.); community service not discipline-related; student advising; writing letters of recommendation for students and colleagues; visiting colleagues' classes for the purpose of collegial evaluations.

Good

Either 1) Service as Department Chair, or 2) Service on committee(s) for another department/unit (e.g., IUPC for Journalism), or 3) Service on College or University-wide committees that meet less than twice a month, or 4) Service on the HSU local CFA Executive Board, or 5) Service as Chair of a university-wide committee that meets less than once per month or 6) Discipline-related community service

Excellent

Either 1) writing a program review, or 2) Service on college or university-wide committees that meet more than twice per month, or 3) Service as Chair of a college or university-wide committee that meets at least once per month or 4) Service as President of a Philosophy organization.

The following count as service, but for any particular case the of whether it belongs in the Minimal Essential, Good, or Excellent category will generally depend on an evaluation of collegial letters from persons outside the University: 1) Service on the editorial board of a Philosophy journal or 2) Service as the guest editor for a Philosophy journal or 3) Service as an officer in a Philosophy organization.

For promotion at any level: *good* service is necessary and sufficient. Good service means either two items from Minimal Essential *plus* one item from Good or Excellent, or two or more items from Good or one from Excellent.