

College of Liberal Arts
Department of Philosophy
Bylaws and Policies

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 supersedes 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, Mathematics, Social Work, Physics, Mexican American 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 lecturer 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, full-time lecturer faculty with voting rights 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 chair 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. 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 EVPAA and the final decision about a chair's appointment must come from the dean and the concurrence of the EVPAA.

Committee Structure

At the beginning of the academic year, the department shall form the following standing committees: curriculum committee, assessment committee, outreach committee, tenure and promotion committee, and annual review committee. 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, changes to the philosophy minor, 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 FESTIBA 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

If summer teaching is available and needed, tenure-line and faculty with 3 Year Appointments will be assigned courses according to the criteria set out in UTRGV's Guidelines and General Practices for Course Offerings During the Summer Sessions. If sufficient summer courses are not scheduled so that all tenure-line and three-year faculty members who wish to may teach two classes, summer teaching assignments shall then occur in accordance with a rotation system initially based on 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. In

order of priority each person shall be offered two sections. 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. 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 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 Vice Provost for faculty affairs, 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. If more than one candidate is recommended, an order of preference should be indicated, including the strengths and weaknesses of all recommended candidates. The search committee chair will submit the

recommendation to the departmental chair. The departmental chair will forward the recommendation to the Dean. The departmental chair may add his or her personal recommendation but does not have veto over the search committee's recommendation.

Three-Year Lecturer 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. 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 and hold a vote to make a recommendation for hire. If more than one candidate is recommended, an order of preference should be indicated, including the strengths and weaknesses of all recommended candidates. The search committee chair will submit the recommendation to the departmental chair. The departmental chair will forward the recommendation to the Dean. The departmental chair may add his or her personal recommendation but does not have veto over the search committee's recommendation.

One-Year and Adjunct Lecturer 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 insure 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 insure 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. However, any full-time faculty member at any time prior to the signing of the contract may challenge any proposed adjunct and the chair's offer may be overturned by a majority vote of the department.

Emeritus Faculty

All retiring tenured faculty holding the rank of either full or associate professor are eligible for emeritus status. 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 EVPAA for final approval and action.

These Bylaws are supplemented by the following policies

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

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 folder, or dossier, shall be submitted by the candidate during each year of their probationary period to the department chair. It shall conform to the “Institutional Format for Faculty Review Dossier” (HOP 6-505). 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 secret ballot the membership of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee(s). 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.
 - c. 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, will appoint faculty from another department in the college.
 - 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. Committee members who cannot make a decision based solely upon the evidence or for any other reason shall also recuse themselves.
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 weighted as follows:
 - a. Teaching, 40%
 - b. Scholarship, 40%
 - c. Professional Service, 20%
7. As noted in HOP 6-505.D.1.e, “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 required to consult with their department chair and dean before reaching this decision.
9. According to HOP 06-505 E. c ii the minimum 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 HOP 06-505 E c. vi.
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 Handbook of Operating Procedures (6-505, sections E3 and E4).
11. Future revisions of the department’s tenure and promotion requirements 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. The original version of 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.
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.
4. Accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and professional service completed prior to appointment at UTB/UTPA/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 in each of the three areas of review, noting the strengths and areas for improvement in each area. 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:

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 during the probationary period. In particular, to be eligible for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and be granted tenure, the candidate must demonstrate an average of at least “meets expectations” on 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 demonstrate an average of at least “meets expectations” on 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. 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. 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.

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.

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.

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, Pan American Collaboration for 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, 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 demonstrate an average of at least “meets expectations” on 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 during their last three years as associate professor.

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 will then meet to discuss any alternative external 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.). 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 appeal as specified in HOP ADM 06-505 E. 3 and 4. Faculty may request reconsideration of their T&P evaluation at any level of review up to the President. Faculty must file a written request for reconsideration directly to the level of review within 10 business days of being notified of the review. The written request must state grounds for the request and include supporting evidence; it will be included in the faculty member's dossier. The committee or evaluator with whom a request is filed shall submit a written response to the faculty member within ten business days of receipt of the request. The faculty member may write a reply to the evaluator's/committee's response within five business days of the faculty member's receipt of the evaluator's response. Faculty not recommended for renewal during his/her probationary period may present a grievance on an issue or subject related to the non-renewal decision to the EVPAA.

H. Request for Extension of Probationary Period

Faculty may request an 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 according to the guidelines determined by the EVPAA and stated on the Faculty Resources tab on Provost's Website. <http://www.utrgv.edu/provost/faculty-resources/index.htm> Faculty members may also submit any other materials they deem to be appropriate.

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 highest annual review rating achieved by the candidate in the intervening years since the last available merit increase, in consultation with the relevant institutional guidelines.

Committee

The Annual Review Committee will be formed yearly by election, and will consist of a minimum of three faculty members. The Department Chair may not serve as a voting member of the committee. The committee chair will ensure that proceedings on each and every case will be fully recorded and deposited with the Department Chair, who in turn will provide for secure storage for a period of five years. 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 each all three areas: teaching, research, service.

Departmental Expectations

The expectations for all philosophy lecturers, assistant-, associate-, and full-professors are the same: to conduct research, to teach, and to serve the department, community, profession, or University. The expectations differ in quantity, not in quality, depending on one's teaching load and research support. 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.

In the event that a faculty member on a 4/4 load (or higher) meets or exceeds expectations in teaching and one other category, they shall be considered to meet or exceed expectations overall.

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
- Having good scores on student evaluations (The total number of Agree and Strongly Agree responses for each semester shall constitute the numerator, while the total number of Agree, Strongly Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree responses shall constitute the denominator when calculating a percentage figure).
- 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 observations 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 observations 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.

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, MBA, or Ph.D.,) 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. As tenured faculty, 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

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. Faculty with a Three-Year Appointments **meet expectations** in the area of research if they document any **one** activity 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. Faculty with a Three-Year Appointments exceed expectations in the area of research if they submit a publication for review or have published a peer reviewed journal article (or its equivalent) within the last three years.

The above summarizes expectation for research/scholarship, however, reviews should be holistic in nature, taking into account the member's overall 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 is 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 FESTIBA or HESTEC

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

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

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).
- 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.

Procedure and Appeals

1. The Department Chair will relay all evaluation materials the Committee chair within five days after the deadline specified in the UTRGV Pathways. The Annual Review Committee may request supporting documents from a faculty member, but should do so equitably in similar instances for all faculty members. The Committee will independently review evaluations according to the Pathways time schedule. The Annual Review Committee shall also rank the faculty member in one of the following four (4) categories: “4” – Exceeds expectations; “3” – Meets expectations; “2” – Does not meet expectations; or “1” – Unsatisfactory according to the criteria specified in this policy.
2. The Committee will then send a copy of their evaluation to each faculty member.
3. Faculty who are not in agreement with the Departmental Committee’s evaluation may request reconsideration. This request must be submitted to the Committee chair in writing within ten business days after receipt of the evaluation. The Committee will then review the original evaluation in light of the reconsideration request.
4. The Committee will then make a final evaluation and send it to the candidate and the Department Chair.
5. The Department Chair will conduct an independent review of each faculty member and shall also rank the faculty member in one of the following four (4) categories: “4” – Exceeds expectations; “3” – Meets expectations; “2” – Does not meet expectations; or “1” – Unsatisfactory according to the criteria specified in this policy.
6. Faculty who are not in agreement with the Department Chair’s evaluation may request reconsideration. This request must be submitted to the Department Chair in writing within ten business days after receipt of the evaluation. The Chair will then review the original evaluation in light of the request for reconsideration.
7. The Chair will then make a final evaluation and send it to the candidate.
8. These final evaluations from the Departmental Committee and the Departmental Chair will be forwarded to the Dean of the College.

As stated in HOP 06-502 E. 2. E. faculty can appeal at each department level. Before the file is forwarded to the dean, if the faculty is not satisfied with the department level outcome, they may request a review by a College Annual Review Committee, who will make a recommendation to the dean. The dean's decision is final.

C. Post-Tenure Review 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 Post-Tenure Review 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 Post-Tenure 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 PTR. 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 the guidelines determined by the EVPAA and stated on the Faculty Resources tab on Provost’s Website. <http://www.utrgv.edu/provost/faculty-resources/index.htm> Faculty members may also submit any other materials they deem to be appropriate.
3. The department shall elect an annual departmental committee consisting of tenured professors who shall conduct the initial PTR 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 Meeting Expectations in Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty peer summative 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 an average of meet expectations or better over the period under review in the teaching section of the Annual Review.

B. Criteria for unsatisfactory performance in Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty have unsatisfactory performance in Teaching effectiveness if and only if they do not have on file a summary of a formative peer review during the period under review and have an average of unsatisfactory in the teaching section of the Annual Review over the period under review.

2. Criteria for Research/scholarship

A. Criteria for Meeting Expectations in 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 at least ONE of the following professional activities:

- a. presenting at meetings of professional organizations which may be local, state, regional, national or international
- b. attending professional meetings, panels, or workshops which continue their development in their discipline
- c. publication of articles, book reviews, encyclopedia entries, or any other scholarly work.

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 documenting substantial progress on longer term publication projects such as a book manuscript. Faculty **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, editing a scholarly journal, encyclopedia entries, OR by publishing at least **two** peer reviewed items (or its equivalent) supplemented documenting substantial progress on longer term publication projects.

B. Criteria for Unsatisfactory Performance in Research/scholarship

A faculty member is unsatisfactory in their Research/scholarship if and only if they have not participated in any professional activities during the period under review. Professional activities include attending academic conferences and workshops, writing grant proposals, editing books or journals, or publishing book reviews, encyclopedia entries, conference proceedings, book chapters, journal articles, translations, textbooks, monographs, or any other scholarly work.

3. Criteria for Service

A. Criteria for Meeting Expectation in Service

Faculty member **meets expectations** if they regularly served on average at least one department, college, or university committee (standing, search or *ad hoc*) per year or served as a peer observer for teaching effectiveness or directed a program or served as an academic advisor or advised a student organization or served as a new faculty mentor.

AND/OR

Faculty member has served the community as an organizer, consultant, or presenter and/or served as an organizer or presenter at university venues such as FESTIBA, HESTEC, reading/discussion groups, speaker series, student organizations, etc. a minimum of three times during the review period.

AND/OR

Faculty member has served the profession by organizing roundtables, panels, served as a commentator/judge for meetings of professional organizations or served as an editor or referee for a professional journal a minimum of three times during the review period.

B. Criteria for Unsatisfactory Performance in Professional Service

Faculty has unsatisfactory performance if they have an average of 1 or below in the service section of the Annual Review over the period under review.

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)..
- 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).

- 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.

D. Appeal

A faculty member may appeal a Post-Tenure Review decision, following the procedures outlined in ADM 06-504 E 5 g:

D. 3 Year Lecturer Review 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 and Clinical Faculty as delineated in

<http://www.utrgv.edu/files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/guidelines-for-review-reappointment-promotion-full-time-lecturers.pdf>

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 folder shall be submitted to the Department Chair by the faculty member during the fall semester.

II. The review evaluation folder will include the following items. Further information about these items can be found in

<http://www.utrgv.edu/files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/utrgv-format-for-faculty-review-dossier.pdf>

1. an applicant statement and self-evaluation (a narrative summary outlining how one has met or exceeded his or her expectations in the areas of teaching, research, and service in the past academic year, and in the case of promotion, in the other years since promotion)
2. departmental criteria for annual review
3. a current Curriculum Vita
4. a faculty professional growth plan explaining one's expectations for the coming year in the areas of teaching, research, and service (this plan should be crafted to meet departmental standards for annual review)
5. a teaching summary, including teaching evaluation data and at least one peer review
6. a research/scholarship summary
7. a professional service summary
8. representative samples documenting 5-7, including syllabi

III. Three-year lecturer faculty in a department will elect the annual Philosophy Lecturer Evaluation 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, 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;

b.) 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.

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 research goals, and to serve the department, community, profession, or University. Because lecturers teach more classes and receive less research support than professors, reviews of lecturers will place more emphasis on excellence in teaching than on the other two categories. Reviewers will take this 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, research, and service 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 the 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 involves adjudicated professional misconduct or dereliction of duty.

REAPPOINTMENT

A *strong* candidate for reappointment will meet or exceed expectations in teaching and at least one other area.

A *viable* candidate for reappointment will meet or exceed expectations in teaching.

A “does not meet expectations” rating in teaching, or in both research and service, raises serious concerns about a lecturer’s suitability for reappointment.

An “unsatisfactory” rating in teaching is sufficient ground for non-reappointment. An “unsatisfactory” rating in research or service raises serious concerns about a lecturer’s suitability for reappointment.

PROMOTION

A *strong* candidate for promotion will exceed expectations in all three areas.

A *viable* candidate for promotion will exceed expectations in teaching area and meet expectations in the remaining areas.

A “does not meet expectations” rating in research or service, or a failure to exceed expectations in any area, raises serious concerns about a lecturer’s suitability for promotion.

A “does not meet expectations” rating in teaching, or an “unsatisfactory” rating in any area, disqualifies a lecturer for promotion.

E. Peer Review 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. It is designed to serve as a tool for instructor mentoring and for Annual Reviews, Post Tenure Reviews, 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

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 EVPAA.

This POLICY applies only to Tenured Faculty. All Tenure-Track faculty are expected to maintain an active research/scholarship program and produce published works on a regular basis in line with department/program standards leading to tenure. Lecturer faculty are hired to provide important capacity to meet teaching needs and this policy does not apply to them.

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.

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 (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.) one (1) of which **must** be a peer reviewed publication in print or in press (not forthcoming), or its equivalent¹, during the three year review period may continue on the research workload. 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.

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/program 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.