



College of Liberal Arts
Department Of Philosophy
Bylaws And Policies

Approved by the Office of the Provost March 25, 2024

Table of Contents

I. Bylaws 1

II. Policies..... 7

 A. Tenure and Promotion Policy7

 B. Annual Review Policy17

 C. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation Policy.....23

 D. 3 Year Lecturer Review and Promotion Policy28

 E. Peer Review of Teaching Guidelines.....31

 F. Faculty Workload Policy34

III. Appendices

 A. Appendix A - Department Evaluation Guidelines

 B. Appendix B - Evaluation Categories and Standards

 C. Appendix C - Definition of Performance Ratings

 D. Appendix D - Dossier Requirements

 E. Appendix E - Review Committee Composition and Requirements Regarding the Review

I. Bylaws

Introduction

This document is a collection of policies and procedures that govern The Department of Philosophy and the program in Religious Studies at UTRGV. This document is to supplement the policies and procedures set out in UTRGV’s Handbook of Operating Procedures and UT System’s Regents Rules and is in no way intended to contradict them: where there is a contradiction, HOP and UT System Policy supersede departmental policy. Amendments to this document will be by a majority vote of the full-time regular faculty.

Mission

The Philosophy Department at UTRGV seeks to develop a philosophically engaged life in our students, our colleagues, the Rio Grande Valley, and the world. We aim to help students, faculty, and our various communities make better sense of the world and decide how to better live in it.

As professional teacher-scholars, our faculty provides the core of a liberal arts education by teaching students to read carefully, think critically, write clearly, reason systematically, and

wrestle with some of the most difficult and important questions of human existence. Philosophy contributes to UTRGV's core curriculum by offering courses that develop critical thinking, communication, teamwork, and social and personal responsibility. We do this by introducing students to the ethical, political, epistemic, and religious philosophies that have shaped history; by training students in logical, critical, and evaluative methods of reflection; and by applying these methods to discuss and practice personal growth, the betterment of our communities, and the transformation of the world. The Philosophy Department also provides an indispensable service to other programs and majors, including Biology, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Engineering, UTeach, the Math and Science Academy, Social Work, Food Studies, Environmental Studies, Legal Studies, Mexican American Studies, Asian Studies, and Computer Science. Advanced courses in philosophy systematically and critically address questions about the human condition, aesthetics, ethics, society, politics, and the foundations of history, law, medicine, science, and mathematics.

Expected student learning outcomes include improved abilities to critically evaluate basic assumptions, evaluate theories and worldviews, see the world from the perspectives of other individuals and cultures, construct philosophical arguments, analyze and solve problems, communicate complex thoughts clearly, and write effectively about timeless questions and current problems. By developing a clearer sense of their personal values and social responsibilities, students will also become better prepared to assume positions of leadership. In fact, completion of the BA program in Philosophy prepares students for any job or profession that requires critical thinking and responsible decision making, helping students to succeed in any venture, enterprise, field, or course of further study that they choose. Philosophy majors and double majors from UTRGV have gone on to enjoy successful careers in medicine, engineering, entrepreneurship, criminal justice, business, law, ministry, scientific research, art, publishing, sales, management, and public service. As a department located on the U.S.-Mexico border, we seek to promote more diversity within the profession of philosophy itself, where the underrepresentation of Latinos and Latinas is a serious problem.

Our department is pluralistic in terms of philosophical approach, with faculty representing Analytic, Continental, American, Latin American, Asian, and Feminist traditions. We have particular strengths in Latin American philosophy, the philosophy of science, and applied ethics.

Membership and Voting

The "department" shall consist of all tenure-line faculty and full-time non-tenure track faculty with four or more continuous semester (Fall/Spring) appointments in philosophy or religious studies. All tenure-line faculty may vote on all issues, except as specified below. Emeritus/a faculty are not considered full-time faculty and hence do not vote. As a general rule, all full-time faculty hold the right to vote unless specified otherwise in the handbook, the vote is over an issue that would result in a conflict of interest, or in the case that a majority of tenure-line faculty vote to reserve the vote to tenure line faculty. The quorum for a regular department meeting is fifty percent plus one. No votes may be taken without a quorum. Electronic voting is allowed so long as the procedure is agreed to in a departmental meeting. A single request to the chair to make a particular vote anonymous, either in person or by email, is sufficient to establish an anonymous vote.

Chairperson

The chairperson is the chief administrator of the department, as well as its budget officer. The chair shall, in a collegial manner, administer and coordinate the activities of department faculty and any ad hoc or regular committees and perform all other duties specified in UTRGV HOP ADM 06-303 and UTS 182. The chairperson is responsible for convening department meetings at convenient hours but not during class times for full-time faculty except on an emergency basis. Any time a third of the full-time faculty request a special meeting on any issue the chair must schedule the meeting. The chair will not vote on matters before the department at any regular or special meeting except in the event of a tie or as specified below.

Selection and Review of Department Chairs

This policy is a supplement to those policies spelled out in the HOP ADM 06-303. When a faculty position that will include the administrative appointment as chair is authorized for recruitment, the department will form an *ad hoc* search committee. The structure and membership of the committee will be determined by discussion, nomination, and vote of the tenure line faculty. The current departmental chair may not be a search committee member. Only tenure line faculty may serve on the committee. Ideally, the committee should be diverse in terms race, gender, and academic rank. The committee will elect its chair. The committee will report its findings and recommendation to the faculty of the department as a whole who, as a whole, will hold the final and deciding vote on the recommendation of a new chair. Every attempt should be made to come to consensus on the recommendation of a chair but barring consensus, a majority vote is sufficient to make the recommendation. The recommendation will then be passed to the dean and upper administration who will make the selection in consultation with department faculty.

Every three years after the selection of a chair, the Philosophy faculty will hold a review of the chair that is supplemental of whatever review process the dean puts in place. This review shall minimally consist of an up or down vote of confidence and the department chair being reviewed shall be placed in one of the following categories:

- i. exceeds expectations;
- ii. meets expectations;
- iii. does not meet expectations;
- iv. unsatisfactory

This process can be supplemented by whatever other instruments the faculty and chair find useful to give the chair feedback, increase communication, and improve the functioning of the department. It is understood that the chair serves at the pleasure of the dean and the concurrence of the provost and the final decision about a chair's appointment must come from the dean and the concurrence of the provost.

Committee Structure

At the end of the academic year, the department shall form the following standing committees for the following academic year: policy committee, curriculum committee, assessment committee, outreach committee, tenure and promotion committee, tenured faculty comprehensive evaluation committee, NTT faculty renewal and promotion committee, and

annual review committee. The structure and membership of faculty review committees shall be determined by faculty vote and in accordance with ADM 06-503 Appendix E. The curriculum committee shall review and recommend regarding any curricular issues including but not limited to the addition and deletion of courses, changes to the degree plans of the BA in Philosophy and the MS in Bioethics, changes to the philosophy and religious studies minors, and changes to the undergraduate general education core. The departmental faculty as a whole must approve all curriculum changes. The assessment committee shall coordinate assessment of the department, graduating seniors, and core curriculum courses. The outreach committee shall coordinate outreach with students, within the university, and in the community. Sample activities include promotion of the major in the university, arranging internships, introducing measures for postgraduate success and counseling, outreach to high schools, and coordinating the department's contributions to NEXUS, HESTECH, FESTIBA, and comparable events. Though initial work will be done in subcommittee, any issue that is controversial shall be subject to a vote of the full-time faculty. Subcommittees will be formed on an *ad hoc* basis as needed.

Travel Funds

The system of allocation of any travel funds distributed to the department will be determined by tenure-line faculty vote at the first departmental meeting of the academic year.

Summer Teaching Rotation

The chair shall schedule appropriate courses according to student needs and faculty expertise in accordance with departmental and college policy and procedure. If sufficient summer courses are not scheduled so that all tenure-line and three-year faculty members who wish to may teach two classes, each faculty member requesting summer teaching will be assigned one course. A second course shall be assigned according to a summer teaching rotation system initially prioritizing faculty with the longest length of service in the department. A list of department faculty in order of their rotation shall be maintained and updated every fall semester, adding any new members of the department. The rotation list shall be circulated among all department faculty members. Individuals declining to teach, persons ineligible for assignment for any reason, or those whose summer courses were cancelled hold their numerical position in the rotation order.

Department Recruitment Efforts

All faculty searches will be guided by the UTRGV Faculty Recruitment Manual.

Tenure Line Searches

Prior to formation of any search committee, the department shall discuss the need for additional tenure line faculty positions and general areas of specialization for any possible position or position request. A vote shall be called amongst the tenure and tenure track faculty before the search is authorized. A majority vote at the departmental level is required to authorize the search and determine the general area(s) of specialization. When a tenure line position is authorized for recruitment, the department will form an *ad hoc* search committee. The structure and membership of the committee will be determined by discussion, nomination, and vote of the tenure line faculty and as approved by the chair and dean. The departmental chair may not be a search committee member. Only tenure line faculty may serve on the committee. Ideally, the

committee should be diverse in terms race, gender, and academic rank. The committee will elect its chair. The committee will report its findings and recommendation to the faculty of the department as a whole who will hold the final and deciding vote on the recommendation of a candidate for a new position. Every attempt should be made to come to consensus on the recommendation but barring consensus, a majority vote is sufficient to make the recommendation. The recommendation will then be passed to the chair, dean, and upper administration who will make the selection in consultation with department faculty.

1. Search committees will draft job descriptions and ads with input from tenure line faculty. The ad should be circulated for feedback prior to submission.
2. Search committees will review applications based on job related criteria and will determine a short list of the best qualified applicants. Ideally, the list shall include at least two candidates. After review and approval by the Chair, Dean and the Provost, the short-listed candidates will be invited for an on-campus interview.
3. During the campus interviews, all members of the department will have an opportunity to meet/evaluate the candidates. The campus interview shall consist of at least a presentation of research/research agenda and teaching demonstration.
4. In a timely manner after completion of the on-campus interviews, the chair of the search committee shall schedule a meeting of all tenure line faculty so that they may offer their opinions/assessments of the candidates to the committee.
5. After the meeting, the tenure-line faculty will be provided the opportunity to anonymously vote on whether or not to recommend the candidates for hire and will be polled about candidate ranking in the case more than one candidate is acceptable. This vote will serve as the recommendation for hire.
6. The search committee chair will forward a document with this result along with a list of candidate strengths and weaknesses to the department chair, who shall forward this document and use it to make a recommendation to the dean, who will make the final selection. At this time, request(s) for dual career support can be made (see “Dual Academic Career Hiring Program Process and Guidelines”).

Non-Tenure Track Searches

Prior to formation of any search committee, the department shall discuss the need for additional Three-Year Lecturer faculty positions and general areas of specialization for any possible position or position request. A vote shall be called before the search is authorized. A majority vote of tenured, tenure track, and three-year lecturer faculty at the departmental level is required to authorize the search and determine the general area(s) of specialization. When a Three-Year Lecturer position is authorized for recruitment, the department will form an *ad hoc* search committee. The structure and membership of the committee will be determined by discussion, nomination, and vote of the faculty. Only tenure line and lecturer faculty with four or more semesters of continuous appointments may serve on the committee and vote on the candidates (‘voting faculty’). The departmental chair may not be a search committee member. Ideally, the committee should be diverse in terms race, gender, and academic rank. The committee will elect its chair. The chair of the search committee must be a tenure-line faculty member.

1. Search committees will draft job descriptions and ads with input from voting faculty. The ad should be circulated for feedback prior to submission.

2. The search committees will review applications based on job related criteria. The short listed candidates will be interviewed. All faculty in the department should have the opportunity to participate in the candidate interviews.
3. In a timely manner after completion of the interviews, the chair of the search committee shall schedule a meeting of all the voting faculty so that they may offer their opinions/assessments of the candidates to the committee.
4. After the meeting, the voting faculty will be provided the opportunity to provide anonymous input about strengths and weaknesses of candidates and also polled about candidate ranking in the case more than one candidate is acceptable. Any vote will serve as a non-binding recommendation to the search committee.
5. The search committee will review the comments/votes of their colleagues not on the committee as well as their own assessments. They will then vote on whether to recommend the candidates for hire and will be polled about candidate ranking in the case that more than one candidate is acceptable. The search committee chair will forward a document with this result along with a list of candidate strengths and weaknesses to the department chair, who shall forward this document and use it to make a recommendation to the dean, who will make the final selection.

One-Year Lecturer and Part-time Lecturer (Adjunct) Hiring Policy

From time to time it is necessary and desirable to recruit one-year and adjunct faculty to teach courses. The following rules are designed to ensure that the hiring process is democratic and open but also workable.

1. Applications for one-year lecturers should be solicited from as wide a pool as possible to ensure the best quality candidates. Where time permits, faculty should be solicited to aid in increasing the pool of applications. In a general faculty meeting during the spring semester the faculty will discuss the staffing needs of the department and form a One Year Faculty Search Committee. The search committee will write an ad based on the needs of the department for the following year. The committee will then review applications including possibly scheduling phone interviews. For each candidate in the pool, the committee will indicate whether they are qualified and acceptable for hire. In addition, the committee is encouraged to supply a ranked list of the most qualified candidates. The chair must consult with the committee if they make recommendations for hire that deviate from the ranked list. The chair may not recommend a candidate for hire unless the committee has deemed them qualified and acceptable for hire.
2. Experienced adjuncts will be hired and scheduled by the chair as needed, with the understanding that he or she will discuss the matter as appropriate and inform all department members of the proposed course(s) when drafts of the schedule are distributed

Emeritus Faculty

All retiring tenured faculty holding the rank of either full or associate professor are eligible for emeritus status (see HOP 06-402). During the final year of an eligible colleague's regular employment, the department chairperson will convene a meeting of the department to decide whether the colleague should or should not be recommended for emeritus status. Following deliberations, full time faculty, the chairperson included, will cast a written vote for or against the colleague's candidacy. The chair will then report the results to the college dean. If the vote is positive the chair will also prepare and deliver to the dean for his/her approval a formal

nomination of the colleague for emeritus status. The dean will in turn submit the nomination, together with his/her own assessment, to the Provost for final approval and action.

These Bylaws are supplemented by the following policies:

- A. Tenure and Promotion
- B. Annual Review
- C. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation
- D. Lecturer Review and Promotion Policy
- E. Peer Review of Teaching
- F. Workload Review Policy

II. Policies

A. Tenure and Promotion Policy

In keeping with University policy, the Department of Philosophy has developed the following guidelines in order to clarify performance requirements for tenure and promotion. For additional information, see the Handbook of Operating Procedures (ADM 06-505).

a. Procedures

1. A tenure evaluation dossier, shall be submitted by the candidate during each year of their probationary period to faculty portfolio system. It shall conform to the “Institutional Format for Faculty Review Dossier” (ADM 06-503, Appendix D) . Note that supporting documents must include the evaluations from all levels from the tenure reviews in all previous years.
2. Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty shall determine by vote the membership of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee(s). In the event that the department does not establish a Committee of the Whole, the membership will be determined by secret ballot. The following restrictions apply:
 - a. The department chair and associate deans are disqualified from service on department’s T&P committees.
 - b. Assistant professors are to be reviewed by one committee consisting exclusively of tenured faculty; associate professors are to be reviewed by one committee consisting exclusively of full professors.

Each committee shall be comprised of (i) at least three faculty members or (ii) at least one-third of the department’s tenured faculty members, whichever is greater. In the event that the department does not have the requisite number of eligible personnel, the college dean, in consultation with the department chair and departmental faculty, will appoint faculty from another department in the college. Faculty being reviewed may recommend faculty members to serve on this committee, (Appendix E, section 1.c.iv).

c.

- d. The Department T&P Committee shall elect its own chair.
 - e. Committee members with a conflict of interest shall recuse themselves from all relevant committee deliberations and voting. A conflict of interest includes having an intimate relationship (e.g., spouse or domestic partner) with the candidate. For other close relationships (e.g., close friendship or extensive scholarly collaboration), the committee member should consult with the dean concerning participation. It is the committee member's responsibility to disclose potential conflicts/recuse themselves if they cannot make a decision based solely upon the evidence.
- 3. Tenured members of the department shall vote on whether to recommend the promotion of tenure-track faculty. To this end, they shall have access to the dossiers of candidates who are applying for tenure and to the T&P Committee's report. The recommendations of both the T&P Committee and the Department will be included in the candidate's dossier when it goes to the department chair.
 - 4. Each year, in accordance with the Pathways for Review Deadlines, the Department T&P Committee and department chair will independently and successively evaluate a candidate's performance and provide the candidate with the following:
 - a. written evaluation of noted strengths and/or areas for improvement in performance, including substantive justifications as to any recommendations, whether positive or negative;
 - b. recommendation to reappoint on tenure-track or remove from tenure-track;
 - c. recommendation for consideration for tenure when appropriate.
 - 5. Tenure-track candidates are expected to demonstrate consistent progress toward the achievement of tenure. To facilitate this progress, the candidate will have a conference with the department chair **each year** at the conclusion of the tenure evaluation process to discuss perceived strengths/weakness, possible means of improvement, and prospects for reappointment and continuation to final tenure review.
 - 6. Faculty responsibilities are teaching, scholarship, and professional service. In the Department of Philosophy these performances are standardly weighted as follows during performance reviews:
 - a. Teaching, 40%
 - b. Scholarship, 40%
 - c. Professional Service, 20%

When applying this policy, reviewers will consider the faculty member's workload distribution and adjust expectations for teaching, scholarship, service and, when applicable, administration, so that their expectations and assessment reflect the faculty member's stated commitments for each area and overall.

- 7. As noted in ADM 06-505.D.1.d, "The granting of tenure is not solely a reward for performance during the probationary period; rather, it is a deliberate act taken after

considered evaluation of the appointee's past performance and potential for future performance.”

8. Tenure-track candidates who believe they have exceeded the Department's performance criteria for tenure and promotion in an abbreviated period of time may apply for early tenure and promotion. Candidates are recommended to consult with their department chair and dean before reaching this decision.
9. According to ADM 06-504 Ddi the standard time in associate professor rank for promotion to professor is six years. However, in an effort to retain and promote the highest quality faculty, promotion to full professor is to be based on achievement in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service rather than time in rank, consistent with ADM 06-504 Ddii 10. The candidate may appeal his or her evaluation for tenure or promotion at any level of the process. Candidates wishing to appeal will follow the “Request for Reconsideration” procedures under the ADM 06-503 Appendix E and ADM 06-504 Appendix E.
11. Future revisions of the department's tenure and promotion evaluation standards will not be applicable for two full academic years after official adoption unless the affected candidate chooses to be evaluated by a new revised policy. This policy takes effect immediately upon approval by the university administration.

b. General Performance Standards

1. To be eligible for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a tenure-track candidate must demonstrate success in teaching, service, and scholarship, and meet the minimum publication requirements as established in this policy.
2. To be eligible for promotion to Professor, an Associate Professor candidate on a (3-3 or 9 credit per term teaching load) must demonstrate success in teaching, service, and scholarship, and meet the minimum publication requirements as established in this policy. These publications must have occurred since the candidate's promotion to associate professor.
3. To be eligible for promotion to Professor, faculty on the “teaching track” for a minimum of 50% of their time under review (4-4 or 12 credits per term teaching load) shall exceed the standards established in this policy in the areas of Teaching & Service. In the area of Research/Scholarship the candidate must produce one peer-reviewed scholarly journal article OR peer-reviewed monograph/book published by a reputable scholarly or university press plus two additional substantial scholarly publications or equivalent. These publications must have occurred since the candidate's promotion to associate professor.
4. Accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and professional service completed prior to appointment at UTRGV may be considered as evidence of a candidate's potential for future performance but will not be used as the sole criteria for awarding tenure. A tenure-track candidate must meet teaching, publication, and service requirements as established in this policy during the probationary period.
5. The Department T&P Committee and the department chair, in their respective reviews, will evaluate a tenure-track candidate's performance for the previous year and cumulatively in each of the three areas of review, noting the strengths and areas for improvement in each area and noting the candidate's progress toward achieving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.. Note that the first-year review will be based on only one semester's performance, not an entire year's. In the final probationary year, tenure-track faculty will receive a review

based on the faculty's member's performance during the entire probationary period.

c. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness

The Department T&P Committee will consider the following when assessing teaching effectiveness. These activities are evaluated and weighted as specified in the annual review policy

1. Student evaluations of teaching
2. Peer evaluations of teaching
3. Contributions to curriculum and course development, such as designing and implementing writing assessments and learning outcomes assessments.
4. Creation of web-based Distance Learning course(s)
5. Teaching of Learning Communities course and other involvement in student retention initiatives or programs
6. Awards and Honors for teaching excellence
7. Mentoring of students, e.g.,
 - a. Mentoring of teaching assistants
 - b. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate student research, including presentations at state/regional/national conferences
 - c. Member or chair of thesis committee
8. Evidence of professional development in the area of teaching (e.g., attending professional teaching development seminars and integrating new material into courses)
9. Evidence of innovative responsibilities in teaching (e.g., service learning, field trips, studies abroad, performances, and travel with students for academic or cultural purposes)

The above list is not exhaustive and the items are not listed in any order or preference. To be eligible for tenure, a tenure-track candidate must submit a portfolio of items that documents successful teaching as determined by the criteria specified in the annual review policy during the probationary period. In particular, to be eligible for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and be granted tenure, the candidate must achieve "meets expectations" on a majority of their Annual Evaluations in the area of teaching during the probationary period. To be eligible for promotion from associate professor to full professor, the candidate must achieve "meets expectations" on a majority of their Annual Evaluations in the area of teaching during their last five years as associate professor.

Candidates for promotion from assistant to associate professor are required to include at least one peer observation report per year in their dossier. Candidates for promotion from associate to full professor are required to include at least one peer observation report every three years in their dossier; it is expected that under normal circumstances a candidate will include at least two peer observation reports in their dossier.

d. Criteria for Evaluating Research/Scholarship

The Department of Philosophy particularly values quality and peer-reviewed scholarship, which may appear in either print or electronic media. Co-authored publications are acceptable but the candidate must also show evidence of sole and/or first-authored research. Encyclopedia entries, adding up to a total of 3,000 words or more may count as only one journal article for any one promotion. Substantial external grant proposals, even if they are not funded, may also count as only one journal article for any one promotion. Substantial public philosophy contributions may also count as only one journal article for promotion to Associate and up to two journal articles for promotion to Full. Candidates are required to include external reviews of their research, as described below in section F, and the significant core of their case for promotion must be published in peer-reviewed scholarly journals or academic books published by reputable presses (no vanity press publications will be counted). Other types of academic work may enhance the case for scholarship, but no amount of such work can replace the need for quality reviewed scholarship, and candidates should indicate reviewed or non-reviewed status next to each article or publication.

The Department T&P Committee will consider the following activities when assessing scholarship. The venues for scholarship include, but are not limited to:

1. Peer-reviewed academic journal articles published in recognized scholarly journals at the state, regional, national, or international level. Further proof of outlet quality can be indicated in the submitted dossier (for instance, by noting which major databases the journal is indexed in).
2. Book chapters in scholarly anthologies published by presses with a national or international reputation for quality publications or small presses with a well-established reputation for high quality publications.
3. Scholarly monographs published by reputable academic presses.
4. Textbooks published by academic or commercial presses with national or international reputation for quality publications, if the textbook requires substantial original contributions by the tenure-track candidate (viz., the work is not merely a collection of classic readings, etc.).
5. Edited collections of scholarly essays. Candidates will also receive credit for serving as primary editor of a scholarly journal.
6. Peer-reviewed conference papers based on original research presented at state, regional, national, or international academic conferences.
7. Book reviews published in recognized scholarly journals at the state, regional, national, or international level.
8. Encyclopedia and reference book entries.
9. Translations related to their philosophical research.
10. Grant proposals (note whether the application was successful or unsuccessful).
11. Public philosophy contributions, requiring scholarly expertise, that advance the public standing and relevance of philosophy.

By the date of review for a candidate, the majority of work must be either in print or in press. Work that is accepted and forthcoming is subject to review and verification.

The philosophy department actively supports UTRGV's goals of becoming an emerging research institution, which employs "the highest quality faculty members...who pursue global excellence in teaching, research, and service." Our pursuit of global excellence in research requires travel to international, national, and regional conferences, as well as teaching loads commensurate with emerging research expectations. We understand adequate travel funds to mean, at minimum, a departmental travel budget that covers all expenses for at least one national conference for each Tenure-Track and Tenured faculty member.

Third-Year Review:

Tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated in a third-year review. Third-year review follows the same review criteria as annual review, except that the third-year review should provide a holistic assessment of the candidate's progress toward tenure made over the first two complete years on the tenure track. Departmental and Chair level reviews provide feedback on how the faculty member is progressing towards tenure and promotion in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The review will focus explicitly on evaluating progress toward tenure and promotion by considering the quantity and quality of professional activities completed to date. As general guidelines, at this point the faculty member should have:

- published or made substantial progress toward publishing at least two projects;
- documented at least two examples of teaching effectiveness or improvement; and
- contributed time and effort in at least two professional service activities that had positive and reportable impact.

A candidate satisfies the minimum requirements for promotion by any of the following possible combinations specified below:

FOR PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:

- a scholarly monograph published by a reputable university or academic press, OR
- a minimum of four scholarly articles published in peer-reviewed journals, OR
- one substantial external grant application supplemented by three scholarly articles published in peer-reviewed journals, OR
- one textbook supplemented by two scholarly articles published in peer-reviewed journals, OR
- major translation (book) project along with two scholarly articles published in peer-reviewed journals, OR
- one co-authored scholarly book along with two scholarly articles published in peer-reviewed journals, OR
- one co-edited scholarly book or textbook along with two scholarly articles published in peer-reviewed journals.
- Substantial contribution(s) in public philosophy along with three scholarly articles

published in peer-reviewed journals

FOR PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE TO FULL PROFESSOR:

- a scholarly monograph published by a reputable university or academic press, OR
- five scholarly journal articles or scholarly book chapters published by a reputable university or academic press, OR
- an edited collection of scholarly essays, supplemented by four scholarly articles published in peer-reviewed journals, one of which may be a contribution to the collection, OR
- a major translation (book) project supplemented by three scholarly articles published in peer-reviewed journals, OR
- one textbook published by a reputable university or academic press, supplemented by three scholarly articles published in peer-reviewed journals, OR
- one co-authored scholarly book supplemented by three scholarly articles published in peer-reviewed journals, OR
- one co-edited scholarly book or textbook supplemented by three scholarly articles published in peer-reviewed journals.
- Substantial contribution(s) to public philosophy along with four (or three) scholarly articles published in peer-reviewed journals

The above lists are not exhaustive and the items are not listed in any order of preference. In particular, it should be noted that a peer-reviewed book chapter is equivalent to a peer-reviewed journal article.

e. Criteria for Evaluating Professional Service

The Department T&P Committee will consider the areas listed below when assessing a candidate's service activities. It is the responsibility of the candidate to list and describe professional service activities in a manner that enables the Committee to determine the scope and intensity of the activities, including details of the work contributed to each committee:

1. Service to the Department

- a. Standing department committees
- b. Ad hoc committee member
- c. Search committee member
- d. Chair of committee for any activity listed above
- e. Advisor, student organization
- f. Mentoring new faculty
- g. Administrative duties

2. Service to the College or University

- a. University Task Force
- b. Faculty Senate
- c. Standing university committees or councils
- d. Standing college committees
- e. Ad hoc committee member
- f. Chair of committee for any activity listed above
- g. Advisor, student organization
- h. Facilitator
- i. Contributions to Interdisciplinary Programs (e.g., Mexican American Studies, Religious Studies, Gender and Women's Studies, Center for Collaboration and Ethics)

3. Community Service

- a. Active participation in discipline-related community organizations
- b. Participation in local boards and committees in the area of disciplinary expertise
- c. Work activity related to public schools and educational organizations
- d. Professional consulting in the community
- e. Presentations, workshops, conferences or seminars within the community
- f. Providing free expertise to non-profit organizations
- g. Community oriented programs and festivals (e.g. FESTIBA, HESTEC, NEXUS, International Week)

4. Service to Professional Organizations and the Academic Community

- a. Editing or reviewing articles or manuscripts for publication by a scholarly journal or press
- b. Organizing, chairing, or service as commentator or respondent on a panel at an academic conference
- c. Serving as an officer of a professional organization
- d. Active membership in professional and educational associations
- e. Participation at professional meetings
- f. Participation on boards and committees of professional organizations
- g. Assistance to professional groups, organizing seminars, workshops
- h. Reviewing grant applications for a recognized grant organization

The above lists are not exhaustive nor are the items listed in any order of preference. In addition, the candidate must substantially contribute to professional service in two of the four major areas listed above. In addition, to be eligible for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and be granted tenure, the candidate must achieve "meets expectations" on a majority of their Annual Evaluations in the area of service during the probationary period. To be eligible

for promotion from associate professor to full professor, the candidate must have occupied leadership roles in professional service during their career and demonstrate an average of at least “meets expectations” on their Annual Evaluations in the area of service.

f. External Reviews

1. Purpose. External reviews are intended to provide internal reviewers with supplementary information about a candidate’s scholarly record. They are not to be viewed as displacing internal reviews or judgments, especially those at the department level where faculty have both disciplinary expertise and a rich perspective of the candidate’s overall performance in terms of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
2. Selection of reviewers. The candidate will submit a ranked list of at least six potential external reviewers to the department chair. When compiling this list, the candidate is strongly encouraged to consult mentors, department colleagues, and the department chair. With the list of potential reviewers the candidate must include their CVs, a brief explanation of why they are appropriate reviewers, and a description of the candidate’s previous interactions (if any) with the recommended reviewers, to avoid conflicts of interest. In the context of this policy, conflict of interest is defined as having a close personal relationship or a collaborative professional relationship, such as having been one’s advisor, having jointly authored a publication, or having been colleagues in an academic department at another institution. This list and supporting documentation should be submitted to the department chair no later than February 1st of the academic year prior to the candidate’s application for tenure or promotion. The chair will then consult with the department’s current year tenure and promotion committee for approval of the list. If the ranked list is not approved, the committee will inform the candidate of the reasons why, in writing, in a timely manner. The department chair or the committee may suggest qualified alternates in writing, complete with an explanation of why they are appropriate reviewers. The committee, department chair, and candidate must deem acceptable all six potential external reviewers.
3. Solicitation of reviewers. The department chair will contact the nominated reviewers until either four agree to conduct the external review or all names on the list have been contacted. The department chair should send the initial letters to potential reviewers no later than March 1st. The department chair will provide the external reviewers with a copy of the relevant Tenure and Promotion policy, all evidence of scholarly achievement as provided by the candidate including copies of relevant publications, and a copy of the candidate’s CV. The costs associated with all review materials including hardback monographs will be borne by the university. In the solicitation letter the chair will provide (a) a summary of the candidate’s workload in terms of teaching (class sizes, number of course preparations, etc.) and service, and (b) information about the level of the University’s support for the candidate’s research (travel funds, course releases, etc.). The candidate shall be provided the opportunity to review the letter of solicitation before it is sent to reviewers. External reviewers should be asked to address the candidate’s record of scholarly contribution, in at least one or two paragraphs. Reviewers will send their reports to the department chair.

4. Addition of external reviews to dossier. The names of the external reviewers will be removed from the external reviews before they are shown to the candidate or added to the candidate's dossier. All external reviews must be included, but candidates have the right to respond to any review they wish to comment on. The candidate's response will be included in their dossier. If fewer than two reviews are received in a timely fashion, such fact can in no way be held against the candidate, so long as the candidate met his or her responsibility in meeting the deadline to nominate reviewers acceptable to the chair and tenure and promotion committee.

g. Appeals

Faculty retain all rights of reconsideration and appeal as specified in HOP ADM 06-503 sections 9 g. 11, 12, and Appendix E, "Appeal of Promotion and Tenure Decisions" and "Request for Reconsideration of Non-Renewal Decisions."

f. Request for Extension of Probationary Period

Faculty may request and extension of their probationary period as specified in HOP ADM 06-505 E. 5. . A tenure-track faculty member requesting an extension of the probationary period shall submit a written request to the department chair.

B. Annual Review Policy

Introduction

Each fall semester the philosophy department will evaluate all current faculty employed during the preceding year, in the areas of: teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship and service. The faculty member being evaluated shall submit a dossier using the faculty portfolio tool system in accordance to the deadlines set forth in the UTRGV Pathways document.

The objectives of the annual evaluation are to provide faculty with an appraisal of their job performance and to provide a basis for possible merit salary increases. Merit is defined as an annual salary increase based on performance awarded to tenured, probationary and lecturer faculty, but not to teaching assistants or part-time faculty. Whenever merit salary increases are available, they will be awarded based on the average review rating achieved by the candidate in the intervening years since the last available merit increase, in consultation with the relevant institutional guidelines. If the average falls exactly between two rankings, the faculty will be awarded the higher ranking.

Committee

The Annual Review Committee will be formed yearly by election of the full time Philosophy faculty, and will consist of a minimum of three faculty members. The committee shall elect its chair. from among the tenured faculty. The Department Chair may not serve as a voting member of the committee. The committee chair will ensure that the committee fairly reviews, deliberates, and votes on the case of every faculty member and the final reviews are submitted through the faculty portfolio tool system. Each individual will be granted full access to his or her own records and proceedings upon request to the Department Chair, and will have a chance to meet with the committee to discuss the review. Based on the definitions described below, the committee will evaluate the faculty member in all three areas: teaching, research, service.

Departmental Expectations

A standard 3/3 workload for Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty understood in terms of time devoted to each category is 60% Teaching, 20% Service, and 20% Research.

A standard 4/4 workload for Lecturer faculty on Three-Year Appointments is 80% Teaching, 20% Service, and 0% Research. While research is not necessary for a successful Lecturer review or promotion Department Evaluation Guidelines for Lecturer faculty do not require a standard Lecturer research allocation of 0%. In consultation with and as approved by the Department Chair and College Dean (see ADM 06-501 and “Faculty Workload Procedures”), Three-Year Lecturer faculty may include 10% Research as part of their workload allocation, subject to the further conditions provided in “Departmental Expectations in Research/scholarship” below. When applying this policy, reviewers will consider the faculty member’s workload distribution and adjust expectations for teaching, scholarship, service and, when applicable, administration, so that their expectations and assessment reflect the faculty member’s stated commitments for each area and overall.

Upon review of the materials, the Annual Review committee will determine whether the faculty member's teaching, research/scholarship, and professional service counts as 1) unsatisfactory, 2) does not meet expectations, 3) meets expectations, or 4) exceeds expectations. Evaluations for merit consideration shall be independent of tenure and promotion evaluations, although the results for merit evaluation may be a factor in making such decisions.

Departmental Expectations in Teaching

The philosophy department expects its faculty to teach their assigned courses well. Evidence includes but is not limited to:

- Getting a peer review of teaching and writing a narrative describing what the faculty member has learned from the peer observation process and any plans for improvement or development
- Obtaining student evaluations where more than 80% of students agree or strongly agree that the instructor clearly defines and explains course objectives and expectations, is prepared to teach each instructional activity, communicates effectively, encourages them to take an active role in their learning, and is readily available to them.
- Developing a new course for review by the UCC
- Preparing a course one has not taught before
- Improving on one's existing courses
- Attending a workshop about teaching
- Attendance at conferences, workshops or related activities bearing on teaching
- Incorporating Service Learning into one's courses
- Incorporating effective technology into one's courses
- Incorporating student research into one's courses
- Development of class aids materials
- Awards and honors for teaching excellence
- Evidence of joint faculty and student participation in independent studies (research papers, honor projects, theses, exhibitions, performances and presentations).
- Advising or mentoring students

Submitting peer reviews of teaching with reflective narratives as required and student evaluation scores of 80% or higher suggest that faculty **meet expectations** in the area of teaching, but all documented evidence of teaching performance should be considered. It is possible for a faculty member to meet expectations in the area of teaching with student's evaluation scores lower than 80% but lower scores should be directly addressed and contextualized in the faculty narrative and the committee and chair reviews.

Submitting peer reviews of teaching with reflective narratives as required and student evaluation scores of 90% or higher suggest that faculty **exceed expectations** in the area of teaching, but all documented evidence of teaching performance should be considered. It is possible for a faculty member to exceed expectations in the area of teaching with student's evaluation scores lower

than 90% but lower scores should be directly addressed and contextualized in the faculty narrative and the committee and chair reviews.

Note: The percentages cited above refer to performance on the Likert scale for the five mandated questions on student evaluations. There is substantial evidence that a number of factors can influence these ratings such as class size, course type (lower undergraduate, upper undergraduate, M.A., or Ph.D.), delivery method (online vs. face-to-face), and grade distributions. There is also substantial evidence to show that students systematically rate the instruction of women and minorities lower than that of white males. Consequently, there is not a “magic number” to the overall ratings on course evaluations as they may vary across the noted criteria. The Departmental Review Committee and Department Chair have the academic qualifications and experience to assess these student ratings in a broader context. Faculty undergoing reviews should discuss any questions with members of the Departmental Review Committee (particularly the Chair) and/or the Department Chair.

Departmental Expectations in Research/scholarship

To meet the Research/scholarship expectations of the philosophy department in any given academic year means to make progress toward completing one’s research goals. Evidence of this include but are not limited to:

- Publishing an article
- Publishing a book
- Editing a book
- Obtaining a book contract
- Writing or editing an article
- Co-authoring an article or book
- Submit an article or book for peer review
- Presenting papers at professional academic meetings, at the local, state, national, and international levels
- Participating in a panel at professional academic meetings, at the local, state, national, and international levels
- Participating in workshops about research
- Researching one’s topic in a way that informs their teaching
- Participating in a writing group
- Ongoing research (candidate should specify)
- Writing a critical review
- Writing an encyclopedia entry
- Publishing a translation
- Presenting one’s research on one of UTRGV’s campuses
- Public philosophy contributions, requiring scholarly expertise, that advance the public standing and relevance of philosophy.

Tenured and Tenure Track faculty **meet expectations** in the area of research if they submit a publication for review or document any **two** activities on the above list. Tenured and Tenure

Track faculty **exceed expectations** in the area of research if they have published in the period under review or if they have published **two** peer reviewed journal articles (or its equivalent as **described in Section d of the above Tenure and Promotion Policy**) over the previous **three** years.

NTT Lecturer faculty on the standard 80% Teaching / 20% Service / 0% Research workload **exceed expectations** in Research by performing any one activity on the above list; otherwise, they **meet expectations** in Research.

Lecturers with formally approved workloads including 10% Research **exceed expectations** in research if they submit a new (or significantly revised) manuscript for review, have published a peer-reviewed journal article (or its equivalent) within the last three years, or document any **two** activities on the above list. They **meet expectations** in research if they document any **one** activity on the above list.

A Lecturer may request a 10% research workload if it is their desire AND they have a substantial article published in a reputable peer-reviewed journal in the last 3 years. Any Lecturer faculty who does not have such a peer-reviewed article (or equivalent) in the last three years cannot apply for a 10% research load and, if already on a 10% research load, will have it removed at the time of the next MOA.

The above summarizes expectation for research/scholarship; however, reviews should be holistic in nature, taking into account the member's overall workload and record of performance. The faculty member's research statement should contextualize his/her scholarship record with evidence of the publisher's ranking (e.g. acceptance rate), impact on the field, and/or other evidence related to the quality of the scholarship as well as any other information that may help reviewers better understand the work and the context in which it was generated.

Departmental Expectations in Professional Service and Administration

To meet the professional service and administration expectations of the philosophy department in any given academic year means to give one's time and/or resources to the department, university, or community. Evidence of this includes but are not limited to:

- Service to the university
- Standing university committees or councils
- Standing college committees
- Standing department committee
- Conducting a Peer Review of Teaching
- Ad hoc committee member
- Faculty Senate
- Advisor for a student organization
- Chair or executive committee for any activity listed above
- Community Service
- Active participation in professionally-related community group
- Service in professional capacity to boards or committees
- Professional service to public schools and agencies without remuneration

- Professional consulting without remuneration
- Presentations at workshops, meetings, etc. in community
- Service to Professional Organizations
- Moderator for professional on-line 'zine
- Membership in professional and educational groups
- Participation at professional meeting as assigned moderator or panelist
- Participation on boards and committees
- Assistance to professional group organizing meetings, administrative. etc.
- Serving as executive officer of professional organization
- Awards and honors for service
- Participation or leadership role in NEXUS, FESTIBA or HESTEC

Faculty with standard allocations of service workload **meet expectations** in the area of service if they document any **two** activities on the above list.

Faculty with standard allocations of service workload **exceed expectations** in the area of service if they document any **three** activities on the above list.

These ratings shall be revised upwards or downwards for faculty on altered teaching loads as they give increased or decreased time to the pursuit of research.

Summary Ratings

Faculty members will receive an evaluative rating of **Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory** for each one of the three categories of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service. Based upon these three separate ratings, one Summary Rating for each faculty member is determined according to the following:

- A faculty member shall receive a **summary rating of exceeds expectations** if they exceed expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation one of which must be teaching (for faculty on a 4/4 teaching load) or scholarship/research (for faculty on a 3/3 teaching load) or service (for the department chair) and at least meet expectations in the remaining category of evaluation.
- A faculty member shall receive a **summary rating of meets expectations** if they at least meet expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation one of which is teaching (for faculty on a 4/4 teaching load) or scholarship/research (for faculty on a 3/3 teaching load).
- A faculty member shall receive a **summary rating of does not meet expectations** if they do not meet expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation, one of which is teaching (for faculty on a 4/4 teaching load) or scholarship/research (for faculty on a 3/3 teaching load).
- A faculty member shall receive a **summary rating of unsatisfactory** if they do not meet expectations in all three categories of the evaluation.

Faculty with One-Year Appointments

The teaching workload of faculty with one-year appointments necessitates that their required duties be limited to teaching their classes well. While accomplishments in research and service are to be noted on their annual review, one-year lecturers are to be judged almost exclusively on

their record of instruction which should include at least student evaluations and a peer review of their teaching. Annual reviews require two independent review levels, department review committee and chair. Reviews are forwarded to deans for review and approval, and to address any discrepancies between the two levels of review (if they exist).

Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty are to be reviewed by the department chair or whomsoever the department chair designates. The review should include at least student evaluations and a peer review of their teaching.

Request for Reconsideration and Appeals

Faculty retain all rights of reconsideration and appeal as specified in HOP.

C. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation Policy

a. Purpose

The Department of Philosophy acknowledges tenure as an important protection for academic freedom, especially since the foundation of our academic culture and democratic society rests on the principles of free inquiry, open debate, and unfettered criticism of knowledge and institutional practices. The University of Texas-Rio Grande Valley also supports a periodic review of tenured faculty to enhance and protect, not diminish, the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom. To this end, the purpose of Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation is to provide guidance for meaningful faculty development, to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals, to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate, and to assure that faculty are meeting their obligations to UTRGV and the State of Texas. At no time shall this Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation policy infringe on the tenure system, academic freedom, due process, or other protected rights; nor shall it establish a term-tenure system or require faculty to re-establish their credentials for tenure.

b. Procedures

1. All tenured faculty members are to be evaluated annually, with a comprehensive evaluation performed every six years after the last successful comprehensive review for tenure, promotion, or Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation. The six-year evaluation is to include evaluation of all three areas of professional responsibility (research/scholarship, teaching, and professional service) taken as a whole. The Department of Philosophy recognizes that different faculty may contribute to the university, profession, and community in different but equally valuable ways.
2. The faculty member being evaluated shall submit a dossier according to ADM 06-504 Appendix D -Dossier Requirements
3. The department shall elect an annual departmental committee consisting of tenured professors who shall conduct the initial Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation. Only tenured faculty shall vote to elect the members and composition of the committee(s). The committee shall have at least three members. The faculty member under review shall have the opportunity to meet with the committee, if desired. The results of the evaluation shall be communicated in writing to the faculty member being reviewed and the chair. The chair shall conduct an independent review. The results of both the committee and chair evaluations shall be communicated in writing to both the faculty member being reviewed and the dean.

c. Criteria

The Department of Philosophy has set the following expectations for tenured faculty. The final evaluation of: a. exceeds expectations; b. meets expectations; c. does not meet expectations; or d. unsatisfactory must be based on all three areas of evaluation (research/scholarship, teaching, and professional service) taken as a whole. The Department

Philosophy recognizes and values the fact that different faculty may choose to dedicate more time and effort to any of the three areas of review and that the differential availability of resources may create differential patterns of performance.

1. Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

A. Criteria for Exceeding Expectations in Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty **exceed expectations** in teaching if they have both obtained a minimum of one positive peer review of teaching every three years for the period under review and the faculty has obtained a majority of exceeds expectations in the teaching section of the Annual Review over the period under review.

B. Criteria for Meeting Expectations in Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty peer evaluations of teaching indicating that the faculty member is meeting expectations regarding in-class performance, curriculum design, and assessment. Faculty **meet expectations** if they have on file a Peer observation report within the last 3 years and a majority of meet expectations or better over the period under review in the teaching section of the Annual Review.

C. Criteria for Does Not Meet performance in Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty have Does Not Meet performance if one of the following three conditions are met: 1) they do not have a peer review of teaching during the period under review or 2) the peer review indicates “does not meet” performance in the classroom or 3) the faculty has a majority of “does not meet” in the teaching section of the Annual Review over the period under review.

D. Criteria for unsatisfactory performance in Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty have **unsatisfactory** performance if two out of the following three conditions are met: 1) they do not have a peer review of teaching during the period under review or 2) the peer review indicates unsatisfactory performance in the classroom or 3) the faculty has a majority of “unsatisfactory” in the teaching section of the Annual Review over the period under review.

2. Criteria for Research/scholarship

Faculty who are on a Teaching Load are primarily teaching faculty yet are expected to keep abreast of developments in their field; these faculty are expected to document research/scholarship activities as evidenced by the following professional activities:

1. presenting at meetings of professional organizations which may be local, state, regional, national or international
2. attending professional meetings, panels, or workshops which continue their development in their discipline
3. publishing articles, book reviews, encyclopedia entries, or any other scholarly work, including public philosophy.

4. producing substantial, concrete, and documentable progress towards the achievement of a long-term project (such as a book manuscript).

Definitions for Exceeds, Meet, Does Not Meet, and Unsatisfactory Achievement in Research/Scholarship:

A. Criteria for “Exceeds Expectations in Research/Scholarship”:

Faculty on a teaching load of 3/3 **exceed expectations** if they publish at least **two** peer reviewed items (or its equivalent) supplemented with other scholarly works that may also include book reviews, encyclopedia entries, the editing of a scholarly journal; OR if they publish at least **two** peer reviewed items (or its equivalent) supplemented by documenting substantial, concrete, and verifiable progress on longer term publication projects.

B. Criteria for “Meets Expectations in Research/Scholarship”:

Faculty on a teaching load of 3/3 **meet expectations** if during the period under review they publish of at least **one** peer reviewed item (or its equivalent) supplemented with other scholarly works that may also include book reviews, encyclopedia entries; OR by publishing at least **one** peer reviewed item (or its equivalent) supplemented by documenting substantial progress on longer term publication projects such as a book manuscript.

C. Criteria for Does Not Meet in Research/Scholarship:

Faculty on a teaching load of 3/3 **do not meet expectations** in their research/scholarship if and only if they do not satisfy the criteria for ‘meets expectations’ but otherwise demonstrate that they are keeping abreast of scholarship in their field by participating in professional workshops and conferences The review should recognize that not all ‘unsatisfactory’ ratings are equal and evaluate what was accomplished and its proximity to ‘meets expectations.’

D. Criteria for Unsatisfactory in Research/Scholarship:

Faculty on a teaching load of 3/3 do not meet expectations in their research/scholarship if and only if they do not satisfy the criteria for ‘does not meet expectations.’ The review should recognize that not all ‘unsatisfactory’ ratings are equal and evaluate what was accomplished and its proximity to ‘meets expectations.’

Altered Teaching Load:

These ratings shall be revised upwards or downwards for faculty on altered teaching loads as they give increased or decreased time to the pursuit of research.

3. Criteria for Service

A. Criteria for Exceeding Expectations in Service

A faculty member **exceeds expectations** in service if they obtain a majority of annual evaluation scores which exceed expectations and the faculty member has no unsatisfactory ratings in service on their annual reviews in the period under review.

B. Criteria for Meeting Expectation in Service

A faculty member **meets expectations** in service if they obtain a majority of annual evaluation scores of meets expectations or higher and does not have two unsatisfactory ratings on their annual reviews in the period under review.

C. Criteria for Does Not Meet in Professional Service

A faculty member **does not meet expectations** in service if they obtain a majority of at least does not meets expectations and does not have three unsatisfactory ratings on their annual reviews in the period under review.

D. Criteria for Unsatisfactory in Service

A faculty member is **unsatisfactory** in service if they obtain three or more unsatisfactory ratings in service on annual reviews during the period under review.

d. **Summary Ratings**

Faculty members will receive an evaluative rating of **Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory** for each one of the three categories of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service. Based upon these three separate ratings, one Summary Rating for each faculty member is determined according to the following:

- A faculty member shall receive a **summary rating of exceeds expectations** if they exceed expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation and at least meet expectations in the remaining category of evaluation, one of which must be teaching (for faculty on a 4/4 teaching load) or scholarship/research (for faculty on a 3/3 teaching load) or service (for the department chair).
- A faculty member shall receive a **summary rating of meets expectations** if they at least meet expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation, one of which must be teaching (for faculty on a 4/4 teaching load) or scholarship/research (for faculty on a 3/3 teaching load) or service (for the department chair).
- A faculty member shall receive a **summary rating of does not meet expectations** if they do not meet expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation, one of which is teaching (for faculty on a 4/4 teaching load) or scholarship/research (for faculty on a 3/3 teaching load) or service (for the department chair).
- A faculty member shall receive a **summary rating of unsatisfactory** if they do not meet expectations in all three categories of the evaluation.

e. **Appeal**

A faculty member may appeal a Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation decision, following the general procedures outlined in ADM 06-504 E.

D. 3 Year Lecturer Review for Reappointment and Promotion Policy

The Department of Philosophy has established the following policy to supplement the University Guidelines for Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-time Lecturers, Professors of Practice, and Clinical Faculty as delineated in <https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/guidelines-for-review-reappointment-promotion-2021-2022.pdf>

The purpose of reappointment is to reaffirm lecturers' professional qualifications to continue their service in our Department; this reaffirmation is based on the assessment of candidates' achievements during their previous/immediately prior term of appointment, according to the standards outlined here.

The purpose of promotion is to recognize lecturers' continuous professional growth and achievements, and a demonstrated commitment to the success of the department. This recognition is based on the assessment of the candidates' work starting from their first appointment or last promotion, whichever is most recent, and according to the standards outlined here.

The promotion and/or reappointment evaluation is normally a review of the candidate's performance in the past three years; however, the holistic contributions of the candidate to UTRGV and the legacy institutions will be considered. To earn promotion and/or reappointment, a lecturer must have a demonstrated, consistent record of achievement in the areas under review. Evaluations should take into account the interconnectedness of these activities and the fact that the nature of the emphasis of a faculty member's contribution to the mission of UTRGV may shift at appropriate times during the individual's career, and that each of these areas is essential for the success of the institution and for the success of its students.

POLICY SCOPE

Items regarding review and reappointment apply to all full-time lecturers. Items regarding promotion apply only to three-year lecturers of ranks I, II, and III in their appointment expiration year.

PROCEDURES

I. A review evaluation dossier shall be submitted to the faculty portfolio system by the faculty member during the fall semester.

II. The review evaluation dossier will be constructed according to Appendix D Appendix D.

III. Three-year lecturer faculty in a department will elect the NTT Faculty Renewal and Promotion Committee from lecturers at rank II or above, tenured, and tenure-track faculty. Lecturers applying for promotion are ineligible to serve on the committee that year. The committee will elect its own chair.

IV. Each year, in accordance with HOP ADM 6-502, 7 the Lecturer Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair will independently and successively evaluate the performance of the faculty member under review providing:

a.) written evaluation of noted strengths and/or weakness in performance. NOTE: If a Three-Year Lecturer has an approved 10% Research workload, this evaluation shall include a review of the faculty member's 10% research election and related outcomes for the applicable year(s) under review.

c.) recommendation to reappoint as continuing lecturer at the same rank, reappoint as continuing lecturer and Promote in rank, or remove from lecturer positions with appropriate notification for termination of employment.

V. The candidate undergoing evaluation, whether for review, reappointment, or promotion, may appeal his or her evaluation at any level of the process. See "Request for Reconsideration" procedures under the Handbook of Operating Procedures (ADM 06-505, sections E3 and E4),

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR *REVIEW, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION*:

The standards for review, reappointment, and promotion are based on departmental criteria for annual review and the candidate's narrative statement and supporting materials. The narrative statement and supporting materials should demonstrate the candidate's success in meeting departmental expectations as specified in the department's annual review criteria, and, in the case of promotion, should show that the candidate has exceeded departmental expectations in teaching and at least one other area. All full-time faculty members are expected to teach courses well, to make progress toward their professional goals, and to serve the department, community, profession, or University. Because lecturers teach more classes and receive less research support than tenure-track and tenured professors, reviews of lecturers will place more emphasis on excellence in teaching than on the other two categories. Reviewers will also take any approved 10% research elections into account when applying the department's annual review criteria to a lecturer's narrative statement and supporting materials.

The Lecturer Evaluation Committee and Department Chair will rate the candidate's performance in teaching, service, and research, bearing in mind that there are no standard expectations in research for Three-Year-Lecturers (unless they have made the optional 10% research election with the chair's/dean's approval as described in the Annual Review Policy above). Ratings will be provided using four categories: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, and unsatisfactory. As defined in HOP ADM 6-502, these categories are to be interpreted as follows:

Exceeds expectations - Reflects a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.

Meets expectations - Reflects accomplishments commensurate with what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.

Does not meet expectations - Indicates a failure as defined by the unit beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to correction.

Unsatisfactory - Failing to meet expectations for the faculty member's unit, rank, or contractual obligations in a manner that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or, dereliction of duty, or incompetence. It also means failing to meet expectations based on findings of professional misconduct.

REAPPOINTMENT

A candidate is eligible for reappointment in the event that they achieve “meets expectations” or better on a majority of their Annual Evaluations or better during the period under review.

PROMOTION

A candidate is eligible for promotion if they have a mode of overall annual evaluations of “exceeds expectations” during the period under review. Reviewers will conduct a holistic review that considers lecturers' professional growth and contributions to the success of the department in terms of their achievements in teaching, and service. Fulfillment of research expectations will be aligned with how often their workload included the optional 10% research election during the period under review.

Three-Year Lecturer faculty on the standard 80% Teaching / 20% Service / 0% Research workload **exceed expectations** in Research by performing any **one** activity from the bulleted list under “Departmental Expectations in Research/scholarship” in the Annual Review Policy above; otherwise, they **meet expectations**.

Three-Year Lecturers with formally approved workloads including 10% Research **exceed expectations** in research if they publish at least one substantial peer-reviewed journal article (or its equivalent) within a three-year period. They **meet expectations** in research by documenting any **two** activities from the “Departmental Expectations in Research/scholarship” in the Annual Review Policy above.

For promotion, a Three-Year Lecturer on a 10% research load will need to have published a substantial peer-reviewed article in a reputable academic journal (or its equivalent) during the review period. A lecturer will be considered on a 10% research load if the majority of their time during the review period was spent on a 10% research load.

E. Peer Observation of Teaching Guidelines

Section 1. Purpose

The Department of Philosophy is committed to providing its students with the best quality education possible. To that end, Peer Review of Teaching is designed to improve instructor efficacy and promote the values of the discipline. It is designed to serve as a tool for instructor mentoring and collaboration, and for Annual Reviews, Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation, and the process of Promotion and Tenure.

Section 2. Scope and Frequency

Full-time tenure-track faculty and full-time Lecturers I/II/III are to be reviewed annually. Full-time tenured faculty and full-time Senior Lecturers are to be reviewed at least once every three years.

Any full-time faculty member in the Department may serve, with the approval of the reviewed, as peer observer; any full-time faculty member of UTRGV outside of the Department may serve, with the approval of the reviewed and the Department Chair, as peer observer. Peer observers are not required to be specially credentialed, although all faculty are encouraged to take advantage of opportunities for training in pedagogy and in mentoring.

Section 3. Peer Reports

The peer observer is to give the reviewed faculty member an oral or written report, as the observed faculty member chooses. This report should be based on course material such as syllabus and assignments, at least one visit to the reviewed faculty's class (with virtual visits for online courses), and pre-/post-observation meetings between reviewer and reviewed. The peer observer report is given to the reviewed faculty member only and is not included in the latter's report unless the reviewed faculty member chooses otherwise.

Peer observers are expected to consult with the reviewed faculty member to discuss the following (suggested) items:

- a. Learning objectives for the course
- b. Concept behind the design of the course (syllabus to be provided)
- c. Teaching philosophy and methods utilized
- d. Assessment methods (sample assessment can be provided)
- e. Classroom management style

In connection with these discussion points, the observer is encouraged to use the following questions to guide the review:

- a. What are the SLOs for the course and how are they reflected in the learning objectives of the syllabus and on a daily basis?
- b. How does the pedagogical method used in the classroom reflect the values of the discipline?

- c. What kinds of assessments and/or class activities allow the student to model the discipline's values?
- d. How does the instructor communicate and model these behaviors to the students?
- e. How does the instructor create opportunities for student discussion and engagement that are sensitive to the distinctive socio-economic and cultural features of the student population?

Suggested content for the peer report includes:

- a. How well the course material and classroom activities align with the learning objectives for the course.
- b. Discussion about classroom observation including strengths and/or weaknesses of presentation style, student-instructor and student-student interaction, classroom management, etc.
- c. Feedback on syllabus, assessment methods, and other teaching materials.
- d. Description of overall strengths and weaknesses as an instructor, and general suggestions for improvement.

Section 4. Reports by Reviewed Faculty

Responding to the peer report, the reviewed faculty member shall submit a report that includes the following:

- 1. Name and signature of reviewed faculty
- 2. Name and signature of peer observer
- 3. Name and course number of observed class
- 4. Date of any pre-observation meeting
- 5. Date of observation(s)
- 6. Date of any post-observation meeting
- 7. A narrative describing what the reviewed faculty member has learned from the peer observation process and any plans for improvement or development.

Section 4. Suggested Timeline

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>
No later than one week prior to first day of class	Provide faculty member with department guidelines	Department Chair
No later than the fourth week of the semester	Identify peer observer and provide name of observer to the department chair	Reviewed Faculty
No later than sixth week of the semester	Meet to discuss teaching materials and set date(s) for observation	Peer Observer and Reviewed Faculty

No later than twelfth week of the semester	Peer observation(s)	Peer Observer
Within one week of the observation	Post-observation meeting	Peer Observer and Reviewed Faculty
No later than the end of final exams week	Report by reviewed faculty provided to chair	Reviewed Faculty

F. Faculty Workload Policy

The Philosophy Department's workload policy is based on and in compliance with the UTRGV College of Liberal Arts Policy and the Policy set by the PROVOST/VPAA, which applies to all faculty appointed at UTRGV

Tenured faculty will be placed on a Research Track or Teaching Track as follows:

1. This POLICY is based on the annual reviews of the THREE previous academic years and thus will be updated annually as part of the review (i.e., Spring) for the next academic year.
2. A faculty member on the 18 hour annual Research Workload (teaching load of 9 credits per term) whose Annual Review recommendations in the area of Research/Scholarship EXCEED or MEET EXPECTATIONS over two of three consecutive years, **and** does **not** have any recommendations of "UNSATISFACTORY" over said three year period **and** who has produced at least three (3) scholarly products one (1) of which **must** be a peer reviewed publication in print or in press (not forthcoming), or its equivalent, during the three year review period may continue on the research workload. (NOTE: This might include demonstrated evidence of progress towards a major publication such as a book, a grant which received peer evaluation whether or not it was funded, etc. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to submit this evidence.)

A faculty member whose Annual Review recommendation does not meet these criteria will be placed on a 24 hour annual Teaching Track load (teaching load of 12 credits per term) for a period of at least one academic year.

Any tenured faculty member on the Research Track may elect to be on a Teaching Track workload. These assignments will be for one (1) academic year, at a minimum.

3. A faculty member on the Teaching Track may return to the Research Track workload by:
 - a. submitting a proposal detailing a research plan that will allow them to meet research track expectations in their annual reviews to their Chairperson and Dean. Upon approval by the Chair and Dean, the faculty member may return to the Research Track workload.
 - b. Showing that their scholarship MEETS or EXCEEDS expectations for their department Annual Review criteria for scholarship for the previous three years during the annual review process and that they have met the criteria in bullet 3 above.