

- 56 6.2. Development of new academic programs of study, new courses, and significant revisions
57 to existing courses.
58 6.3. Oversight of independent studies, directed readings, and internships.
59 6.4. Teaching of Honors courses, capstone courses, graduate courses or participation on
60 graduate thesis or dissertation committees.
61 6.5. The development and successful implementation of innovative pedagogical techniques.
62 6.6. Scholarly activity related to teaching.
63 6.7. Service related to teaching.
64 6.8. Presentation of guest lectures in classes taught by other instructors.
65

66 The activities outlined above are not rank-ordered. However, it is expected that meritorious performance as
67 teachers will be evidenced by several indicators of pedagogical success, as well as effort. Faculty members may
68 demonstrate their effectiveness as teachers by multiple means, including measures of student satisfaction,
69 measures of student success, and/or peer review or recognition. Ratings for individual categories will be based
70 upon quality and quantity of performance. For a rating of "Outstanding" student evaluations should be
71 appreciably above Department and College averages.
72

73
74 ***Additional Considerations in Evaluating Teaching:***
75

76 *Faculty member meets classes as scheduled including the scheduled final exam period, and gives in-*
77 *class finals during that period.*
78

79 *Faculty member provides and follows a syllabus that follows the current university guidelines*
80 *regarding syllabi and provides a copy of the syllabus to the department office for each class taught.*
81

82 *Interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary teaching.* Department expectations are that faculty teaching
83 humanities, religious studies, and the cognitive sciences must teach across disciplinary boundaries,
84 integrating scholarship from various humanistic and/or scientific fields. In addition, Humanities and
85 Religious Studies Faculty are expected to integrate knowledge of non-western cultures. Teaching
86 interdisciplinary courses may present special demands and challenges. Many interdisciplinary courses,
87 for example, are not only in newly emerging areas of study, but may require preparation across two or
88 more distinct disciplines. Faculty should document any such special demands and challenges.
89

90 **Research and Other Creative Activity**
91

92 The following activities will be considered in assessing the merit of faculty research and creative activity. All
93 research and creative activities should be related to the faculty member's disciplinary or interdisciplinary
94 expertise.

- 95 1. Publication of authored or co-authored books, articles, book reviews, and commentaries.
96 2. Translation of scholarly books and articles.
97 3. Editing of scholarly books and collections of articles (e.g., in journals or anthologies).
98 4. Production of scholarly or other creative materials in alternative media.
99 5. Scholarly presentations at professional conferences.
100 6. Funded grant activity.
101 7. Submission of grant applications, book proposals, essays or other relevant work for professional
102 review and consideration.
103

104 The activities outlined above are not rank-ordered. However, the following general principles will apply in
105 assessing the merit of scholarly and creative activities:

- 106
107 ○ Books rank above articles, articles rank above reviews and commentaries.
108 ○ Authored books rank above edited books or textbooks.
109 ○ Peer-reviewed activities rank above non peer-reviewed activities; however invited publications or
110 presentations that carry prestige will be duly weighted.

- 111 ○ In general, work published in internationally recognized journals ranks above work published in
- 112 national journals; work published in national journals ranks above that published in regional journals.
- 113 Similar considerations apply to conference presentations.
- 114 ○ Publications rank above presentations.
- 115 ○ Funded grant proposals rank above grant submissions.
- 116 ○ Work published or presented ranks above work accepted for publication or presentation, and work
- 117 accepted ranks above work submitted; work submitted ranks above work-in-progress that has not been
- 118 submitted for presentation or publication.
- 119 ○ Electronic publications will be evaluated according to the same principles as print publications, namely
- 120 those listed above.
- 121 ○ Creative work taking forms other than scholarly publication will be evaluated according to standards
- 122 relevant to the form of that work.

124 Scholarly work should be published/presented during the period covered by the annual evaluation. For a rank of
 125 "Outstanding" in the case of tenure and tenure-track faculty, such work should consist of at least one book or
 126 several articles/translations and/or several professional papers published or presented during the period covered
 127 by the annual evaluation. Instructors and visiting faculty should demonstrate sustained scholarly development,
 128 and keep current in their field. For a rank of "Outstanding" in the case of instructors and visiting faculty a single
 129 scholarly publication and/or 2 conference presentations during the period covered by the annual evaluation may
 130 be considered sufficient.

131
 132 ***Additional Considerations in Evaluating Research:***

133
 134 1. Availability of Scholarly Venues

135 For interdisciplinary and newly-emerging areas of research scholarly, peer-reviewed publication venues
 136 may be limited. Examples of interdisciplinary combinations of studies or sub-disciplines of expertise in
 137 the Philosophy Department in which venues for peer-reviewed publication are limited, either because of
 138 the newness of the sub-disciplines or because of the particular nature of the combination include, but
 139 are not limited to: Native American studies, Asian studies, African studies, feminist theory, queer
 140 theory, critical theory, cultural studies, dance theory, environmental studies, neurophilosophy,
 141 neurophenomenology, neurolinguistics, and others. Faculty may need to be creative in finding suitable
 142 venues for dissemination of their work. For example, a faculty member's work may be published not
 143 only within scholarly journals within the discipline of her or his particular training, but also in journals
 144 representing other intersecting disciplinary and interdisciplinary interests and competencies. It is also
 145 anticipated that faculty working in newly developing subdisciplines and interdisciplinary fields may
 146 publish some of their work in scholarly anthologies devoted to these developing areas. Evaluations
 147 give due weight to invited contributions where invitations are prestigious and to work published in
 148 anthologies where a rigorous peer-review process can be demonstrate. In this regard, the following
 149 should be considered.

- 150
- 151 a. Documentation of the limited nature of peer-reviewed publications for that combination of
- 152 studies.
- 153 b. Documentation of review procedures and level of prestige for the chosen alternate
- 154 publication venues.
- 155 c. Independent support of research by outstanding scholars in the combination of studies of the
- 156 submitted publications.

157
 158 2. Acceptance Rates

159 When available, acceptance rates of journals should be documented in the faculty member's report on
 160 research. The publication records of faculty will be judged relative to acceptance rates in their field.

161
 162 3. Timeliness of Editorial Notification and Publication

163 Note that in philosophy, humanities and religious studies, the review time for work may be lengthy
 164 (ranging from several months to over a year), as may the time between acceptance of work and its
 165 actual publication (ranging from several months to several years). In cases where particular publication

166 venues have an unusually long time-delay for notification and/or publication, the faculty member is
167 advised to do the following:

- 168
- 169 a. Indicate and document the length of the review process.
 - 170 b. Provide documentation from the editor explaining the unusually long time-delay

171

172 4. Citations

173 Citations, while a good indicator of the quality of one's work, are not the only or necessarily the primary
174 indicator. In addition, the ISI Web of Science is not the only or necessarily standard source of citation
175 information in Humanities, Philosophy, Religious Studies, or even the cognitive sciences. If some of
176 the journals and other publication venues for faculty are not covered in the ISI Web of Science, the
177 faculty member is advised to do the following:

- 178
- 179 a. Document that the publication venues are not covered in the Web of Science Citation index.
 - 180 b. Provide alternate documentation of references to or other signs of awareness of the faculty
181 member's publications.

182

183 5. Joint vs. Single Authorship

184

185 Joint or multi- authored publications are common in the Cognitive Sciences and many of its combining
186 disciplines. In cases of joint authorship, the faculty member is advised to provide explanation of the
187 role of the authors -- who is primary, what it means to be primary, and the role of other authors. Credit
188 will be assigned in proportion to the primacy of authorship or amount of work involved.

189

190 6. Grant Support.

191

192 Faculty will be evaluated on their grant-related activities according to the availability and importance of
193 grants in their area of research. The importance, availability, and funding levels of grants in
194 Humanities, Religious Studies, and Philosophy are not high. Grant activity in the cognitive sciences
195 however, is more important.

196

197 **Service and Professional Development**

198

199 The following activities will be considered in assessing the merit of faculty service to the profession, university
200 and community.

201

202 A. University Service

- 203
- 204 o Membership on Department, College or University committees; Faculty Senate.
 - 205 o Organizing, or participating in, workshops or seminars related to the mission of the Department,
206 College or University.
 - 207 o Coordination of special academic programs.
 - 208 o Advisor to campus organizations.

209

B. Professional Service

- 210
- 211 o Offices or special responsibilities in professional organizations related to academic discipline.
 - 212 o Membership in professional organizations related to academic discipline.
 - 213 o Service to one's discipline or other institutions (e.g., external evaluator, program review).

214

C. Public Service

- 215
- 216 o To public schools or to other community or state organizations.
 - 217 o As consultant due to professional expertise related to one's academic discipline.
 - 218 o As moderator, guest or commentator on public media, such as television radio or print media on
219 topics related to one's scholarly expertise.

220

D. Professional Development

- o Participation in, organization of, or attendance at conferences, courses, workshops and seminars
designed to enhance competence and understanding in academic or scholarly contexts.

221
222 In regard to committees, evaluation is based not simply on membership, but on degree of participation or
223 on how active the faculty member was on the committee. For a rank of "Outstanding" service activity
224 should be regular and significant and extend beyond the departmental level. Instructors and visiting faculty
225 are expected to participate in the collegial life of the department, including assigned departmental service
226 activities. However, due to ineligibility for many service assignments, it is not expected that instructors
227 and visiting faculty serve on college or university committees in order to receive an "outstanding" in the
228 service category.

229

230 **Other assigned duties**

231
232 Other assigned duties may include attending commencement ceremonies, advising, supervision of interns,
233 and academic administration, or duties described in a position description (e.g., a position such as Associate
234 Chair or Graduate Coordinator).

235
236 Evaluation is based on the consistent performance, timeliness of performance and/or completion of task.
237 Performing such assigned duties will be weighted the same as service. For a rank of "Outstanding" in this
238 regard activity should be regular and significant.

239

240

241 **Merit standards**

242

243 Merit standards will be utilized for the apportionment of any part of salary increases that may be designated
244 as merit raise. In this regard, merit raise money will be allocated to those receiving an overall annual
245 evaluation of either "Outstanding" or "Above Satisfactory."

246
247 In determining which evaluative ratings ("Outstanding", etc.) to assign on annual reports in individual
248 categories, as well as overall, the Department Chair will adhere to the following guidelines. Ratings for
249 individual categories will be based upon quality and quantity of performance (where quality under research
250 is strictly correlated with the relative rankings indicated for specific activities).

251

252 ***Tenure Earning & Tenured Faculty***

253

254 Research, teaching and service are weighted according to the ratio 3:2:1. For a given category, a
255 rating of "Outstanding" provides a multiplicative factor of 4, "Above Satisfactory" a factor of 3,
256 "Satisfactory" a factor of 2, "Conditional" a factor of 1, and "Unsatisfactory" a factor of 0. A total
257 score of 21, *together with* a ranking of "Outstanding" under research, is required for an overall
258 evaluation of "Outstanding;" 16 is required for "Above Satisfactory;" and 12 is required for
259 "Satisfactory." Below 12 a ranking of "Conditional" will depend on agreement to a performance
260 improvement plan, without which a ranking of "Unsatisfactory" will be assigned.

261

262 While it is not practicable to quantify the determination of ratings for individual categories, the
263 following considerations are taken into account, for example, as *necessary* conditions for a rating of
264 "Outstanding" for tenure-earning & tenured members of the faculty. Under teaching, student
265 evaluations should be appreciably above Department and College averages. Under research,
266 scholarly work should be published/presented during the period covered by the annual evaluation,
267 such work consisting of at least one book and/or several articles/translations and/or several
268 professional papers. Under service, activity should be regular and significant and extend beyond the
269 departmental level.

270

271 ***Instructors and Visiting Faculty***

272

273 For Instructors and Visiting Faculty, research, teaching, and service will be weighted according to the
274 ratio 2:3:1 or at a ratio mutually agreed upon by the Chair and the faculty member at the beginning of

275 the academic year. This reflects the fact that such positions carry heavier teaching expectations. As
276 with tenured and tenure-earning faculty, it is expected that student evaluations should be appreciably
277 above department and college averages in order to earn an evaluation of "outstanding" in the teaching
278 category. Under research, it is anticipated that instructors and visiting faculty will demonstrate
279 sustained scholarly development, as keeping current in their field is important for teaching efficacy.
280 This should be demonstrated by publication or presentations during the period under consideration;
281 however, a single scholarly publication and/or 1 conference presentation may be considered sufficient
282 for awarding of an "outstanding" in this category. Instructors and visiting faculty are expected to
283 participate in the collegial life of the department, including assigned departmental service activities.
284 However, due to ineligibility for many service assignments, it is not expected that instructors and
285 visiting faculty serve on college or university committees in order to receive an "outstanding" in the
286 service category.
287

288 The multiplicative factors that pertain to other faculty pertain here. For a given category, a rating of
289 "Outstanding" provides a multiplicative factor of 4, "Above Satisfactory" a factor of 3, "Satisfactory"
290 a factor of 2, "Conditional" a factor of 1 and "Unsatisfactory" a factor of 0. However, a total score of
291 21, *together with* a ranking of "Outstanding" under teaching is required for an overall evaluation of
292 "Outstanding;" 16 is required for "Above Satisfactory;" and 12 is required for "Satisfactory." Below
293 12 a ranking of "Conditional" will depend on agreement to a performance improvement plan, without
294 which a ranking of "Unsatisfactory" will be assigned.