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Note bene

This document was produced through 1) the development of a draft based on discussion of the departmental Steering Committee (selected, in part, because it includes elected representation from the different faculty ranks; meeting 2020-09-09); 2) a period for the full faculty to review the draft document (2020-09-15 to 2020-09-23); and 3) a meeting of the full faculty to discuss the document (2020-09-23), which culminated in the adoption of a submission version of the document by majority vote (i.e., the document submitted here); and 4) revisions by the Head in consultation with the departmental Steering Committee (2020-11-16) per recommendations from the College of Liberal Arts.
Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Philosophy is to produce significant research in the discipline of philosophy and related areas, to provide high quality undergraduate and graduate teaching, advising, and mentoring, and to contribute service to the College of Liberal Arts, Texas A&M University, the discipline of philosophy (or other areas of the academic profession), and the state of Texas. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Philosophy for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. (UR 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.2.2) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general Unit guidelines for faculty, annual review, tenure and promotion, promotion and post-tenure review, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure</td>
<td><a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</td>
<td><a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual &amp; Mid-Term Review</td>
<td><a href="https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines">https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)</td>
<td><a href="https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure">https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the event of inadvertent discrepancies between this document and Texas A&M University or Texas A&M University System policies, rules, and procedures, the University or System statements take precedence.
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M1 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles. Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M1) associated with each title within their unit. Faculty ranks and tracks within the Department of Philosophy are as listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. Typical faculty ranks and tracks within the department are:

2.1 Tenure-Track and Tenured Titles: Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members. All faculty members in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service, with exceptions made for termed appointments to focus on fewer of these areas (such as administrative appointments or development leave appointments). Instructor is a tenure-track appointment which is used for a person who was recruited to be an Assistant Professor on tenure-track, but who has not finished all requirements for the appropriate terminal degree on the date predicted. Upon evidence of completion of the expected degree, the appointment title will be changed to Assistant Professor. (The unit and appointed faculty member may also consider the option of a non-tenure track title such as Visiting Assistant Professor, which would not start the tenure clock). Instructors are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service.

2.2 Academic Professional Track Titles: Faculty with the title of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer will normally hold a master’s or terminal degree in the teaching field and primarily be engaged in instruction. They may be expected to engage in such service and administrative activities as is required to carry out their instructional duties (e.g. coordinating multiple sections of a large core curriculum course, or running placement exams for language instruction). The standard teaching load per semester for a full-time Lecturer or Senior Lecturer is four courses. If necessary and with approval from the College, a department may determine the teaching load, but it should not exceed 12 semester credit hours per semester catalog (or up to 16 for faculty teaching 4-credit hour language courses). Only regular course offerings (major or general academic) will count for the purpose of calculating teaching loads for faculty on this track. Supervision of undergraduate reading and research courses (285, 291, 485, and 491) or internships (484) normally will not count as one of the four courses in the standard load except in unusual circumstances approved by the Department Head. Faculty in lecturer titles should not be assigned to graduate courses. Course loads in excess of four 3-to-4 credit hour courses per semester require the approval of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are not expected to engage in research or service, but either may be taken into account in annual performance evaluations or for promotion in the category of Enhancing Instructional Effectiveness.

Faculty with the title of Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor normally hold a terminal degree in their teaching fields and will be engaged in both instruction and significant service. The category of service is understood broadly to include student advising and pedagogically–related activities outside the classroom. The standard load each semester for a full-time faculty member with instructional in their title is 9 semester credit hours as defined by the course catalog (or up to 12 for faculty teaching 4-credit hour language courses). Additional weights for large classes cannot be added to bring the credit hours to 9. Normally, this is three courses. Only regular course offerings (major or general academic) will count for the purpose of calculating teaching loads for instructional faculty. Supervision of undergraduate reading and research courses (285, 291, 485, and 491) or internships (484) normally will not count as one of the four courses in the standard load except in unusual circumstances approved by the Department Head. This course load may be reduced in instances of a substantial service assignment (e.g., College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation Page 4 of 31 serving as director of undergraduate studies, serving as coordinator of large, multi-section courses). Both deviations from the standard course load and the assignment of instructional faculty to specific graduate courses will require the approval of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. Once the Dean has authorized an instructional faculty member to teach a specific graduate course that authorization
remains in effect for subsequent semesters. Faculty in the Instructional titles are not expected to engage in research, but it may be taken into account in annual performance evaluations or for promotion in the category of Enhancing Instructional Effectiveness.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.1)

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member’s performance in the assigned categories of performance (teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; and service). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the Department, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and diversify the development of the College’s instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance include:

- Successful delivery of assigned courses
- Successful delivery of other courses (directed studies, internships, and supervision of undergraduate honors theses)
- Service on graduate committees
- Special activities performed in support of graduate program
- Curriculum (and pedagogical) development
- Involvement in undergraduate research experiences
- Published curricular materials.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity and/or creative work

Research is central to the mission of the Department, and effectiveness in research is required of all tenure-track faculty. All tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute to knowledge in the discipline of philosophy or related areas through the production of significant publications, as well as through other research outcomes. Effectiveness and excellence in research affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of research does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating research performance include:

- Coherent, continuous scholarly program of research
- Demonstrate scholarly productivity (as evidenced by the volume of publications or creative work, and grant and other related scholarly activities
• Influential research or creative work that is highly regarded in sub/specialized fields and/or disciplines

3.3 Service

Service is central to the mission of the Department, and effectiveness in service is required of all faculty. All faculty are expected to contribute service to the Department, including through departmental committee assignments, as well as to the College of Liberal Arts, Texas A&M University, the discipline of Philosophy (or other areas of the academic profession), and the State of Texas. Typically, service to the profession will not replace service obligations to the department, college, or university. Effectiveness and excellence in service affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of service does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating service performance include:

• Active participation in the operation of the department.
• Productive contributions to College and University initiatives and activities.
• Contributions to student development outside assigned teaching responsibilities.
• Demonstrable contributions to the mission and activities of professional organizations and scholarly communities, as is appropriate for track and rank.
• Demonstrable contributions to non-scholarly local and regional communities

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations.

4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching include, but are not limited to:

• Excellent teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
• Significant excellent graduate advising as evidenced by number of roles as Chair of doctoral and MA committees, student success, time to degree, and placement
• Significantly contributing to the academic or professional development of students (e.g. working with the University Honors program)
• Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
• Hosting visiting graduate students, particularly if funded by Fulbright awards or equivalent national awards
• Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
• Demonstrated innovation in course design and delivery
• Publishing textbooks with presses or comparable of the highest quality

4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:

• Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
• Effective graduate advising as evidenced by number of roles as Member of doctoral and MA committees, student success, time to degree, and placement.
• Some participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
• Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award
• Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:

• Publications in leading general or specialty refereed journals, or refereed book chapters in especially distinguished volumes
• Publication of scholarly books by university presses or comparable of the highest quality.
• Receiving major, nationally competitive fellowship or research grants (particularly emphasizing federal grants and fellowships on the AAU indicators list)
• Presentation of keynote (or comparable) and invited papers at major international and national meetings
• Evidence of high impact of publications as indicated by publication metrics (for example, outstanding publication metrics, such as citations, or comparable metrics, such as book reviews in significant venues)
• Visiting professorships at significant research universities
• Demonstrated impactfulness in interdisciplinary research

4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:

• Publications in refereed journals, or publication of a chapter in a book with a university press or comparable of high quality.
• Publication of edited volume (as editor or co-editor) with a university press or comparable of high quality
• Presentation of papers at national or international meetings
• Receiving internal research fellowship or award
• Contributions to interdisciplinary research on campus (for example, through interdisciplinary research collaborations through university-sponsored grant programs, research collaborations supported by the Glasscock Center for Humanities Research, or other units).
• Evidence of impact of publications as indicated by publication metrics (for example, citations or other metrics)

4.5 Indicators of Excellence in Service includes, but is not limited to:

• Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board
• Being an officer in a national or international professional organization
• Serving as program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting
• Demonstrated excellence in service to the department, college or university (involving some singular achievement over and above simply holding a particular appointment or membership on a committee, for example, contributing to a major report, such as an Academic Program Review self-study, or developing a new initiative, such as a new program for recruitment).
• Undertaking major initiatives in curriculum or research on behalf of the department

4.6 Indicators of Effectiveness in Service includes, but is not limited to:
• Being an executive committee member or committee chair in a national or international professional organization
• Serving on University, college, and department committees and task forces
• Being an advisor to student organizations
• Serving in leadership roles within the department
• Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations. This activity per se is considered service; however, being asked to serve as reviewer can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service), with primary emphasis on the quality, significance, and impact of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for the Department are as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor:

Assistant professors should have a Ph.D., in Philosophy or in an appropriate discipline. They should be well qualified to teach at the undergraduate and graduate levels and possess qualifications for research in a special field. Over time an assistant professor should show progress toward meeting the expectations for the rank of associate professor and the awarding of tenure.

5.1.2 Associate Professor:

Associate professors with tenure should demonstrate meritorious performance in teaching, research or creative work, and service.

Teaching. Teaching must be shown to be consistently competent, and the evidence presented should be both substantial and sufficiently thorough to make a strong case. The Department’s expectation is that the evidence in successful tenure cases will show a genuine commitment to undergraduate and, where appropriate, graduate teaching. Moreover, the Department also expects that the record will indicate that the courses taught by the successful applicant will be characterized by diligent preparation, careful organization, clarity of presentation, intellectual rigor appropriate to the level of the students being taught, and fair and appropriate evaluation of students' tests and assignments. Finally, it is expected that any master's theses and dissertations that an applicant supervises will be of high quality.

Research and/or creative work. Research and creative work must show evidence of both accomplishment and promise, and must be consonant with the aims of a major research university. A first book or series of articles based on the dissertation should be published as early as is consistent with practices in nationally visible departments. Third year reviews will evaluate a candidate’s plans for completing work derived from the dissertation and development of a research program beyond the dissertation. In all cases for tenure and promotion to associate professor, there must be evidence of a significant and sustainable research program that is beyond any book or
series of articles derived from the dissertation and that is demonstrated in thematically or theoretically related externally refereed articles, book chapters, research grants or fellowships, or other evidence of research activity. While judgments of quality, impact, and productivity over time cannot be reduced to quantitative measures, it would be unusual for successful candidates to have published or have accepted for publication fewer than either (a) 1 book with a leading university press or equivalent (for which the manuscript has been published or has passed the final stages of review and been accepted by the press for publication) and a short series of refereed articles and book chapters (4-6) that evidence initial stages of a further project; or (b) a significant series of refereed articles and book chapters (11-14) in reputable refereed journals that evidence one project and the initial stages of a further project. Successful candidates will typically be expected to be able to show that their work is achieving increasing recognition and visibility in their subfield.

**Service.** Service must show signs of developing citizenship in the University and scholarly communities. Over time an associate professor should show progress toward meeting the expectations for the rank of professor.

### 5.1.3 Professor:

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor should demonstrate continued and outstanding accomplishment in research and teaching, and valuable contributions to leadership and professional service (See Appendix I of Texas A&M University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion University Rule 12.01.99.M1).

**Research.** Rather than simply evaluating the total productivity of a faculty member since tenure (e.g., completion of a second book, series of articles, or a specific number of grant awards), the Department will assess as grounds for promotion the quality, trajectory, and impact on the field of a candidate’s entire body of scholarship, as well as the candidate’s national (or international) visibility. More particularly, successful candidates for promotion to professor are expected to be well established and highly respected figures in their fields, and should demonstrate achievements sufficient to merit such a promotion in any AAU institution aspiring to be a consensus top 10 public university. The candidate’s standing in the field and the impact of the research record should be documented by in the candidate’s dossier through multiple indicators. A prospective promotion candidate is encouraged to pursue productive “exploratory” discussions with her/his department head, professors in the department, and mentors to weigh her/his scholarly and professional stature as substantiated with specific accomplishments. If publications in the pipeline are indicative of scholarly impact and national or/and international recognition, a prospective candidate is encouraged to consider critically the stages of development of such works, assessing whether they are already effective in demonstrating scholarly impact and visibility at the level required for promotion to professor.

**Teaching.** Outstanding teaching is demonstrated by evidence of a strong motivation to engage students in the learning process, by the rigor and scope of the courses taught, by student achievements, and by leadership in programmatic and curricular development. A strong record of undergraduate teaching is essential, as is a commitment to graduate education and the mentoring of graduate students in departments with graduate programs.

**Service.** Outstanding service and leadership are demonstrated by engagement in departmental, College, University and professional activities that further the intellectual and pedagogical profile of
the institution.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected. Promotion reviews for APT faculty in the Department of Philosophy will be conducted according to the criteria listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.

5.3 Process for tenure-track promotions

5.3.1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

- In the Spring of the academic year prior to mandatory review, the Head will appoint a T&P Subcommittee Chair and Member responsible for the review of research in consultation with the candidate. In accord with university and colleague guidelines, the candidate will submit research materials for review by external evaluators and the department will facilitate the solicitation of external evaluation letters.

- In the beginning of the Fall semester, the Head will finalize the T&P subcommittee in consultation with the candidate, appointing members responsible for the review of teaching and service. In accord with CLLA guidelines and deadlines, as well as in consultation with the Head, the Chair of the T&P Subcommittee will set a timetable (a) for the T&P to produce subcommittee reports for review by the T&P Committee and (b) for a meeting of the T&P Committee to assess and vote on the case.

- The Department will submit all required T&P materials to the College of Liberal Arts in accord with college deadlines.

5.3.2. Promotion to Full Professor

- Faculty members who wish to be considered for promotion to full professor are responsible to notify the Head of this intention by the end of the Fall semester prior to the year in which the faculty person wishes to undergo the review process. At this time, the faculty person is entitled to request a meeting of the full professors in the department to provide advisement regarding the faculty person’s intention to undergo review for promotion. If requested, this meeting will be scheduled for the Spring semester prior to the formation of a T&P Subcommittee.

- In the Spring of the academic year prior to mandatory review, the Head will appoint a T&P Subcommittee Chair and Member responsible for the review of research in consultation with the candidate. In accord with university and colleague guidelines, the candidate will submit research materials for review by external evaluators and the department will facilitate the solicitation of external evaluation letters.

- In the beginning of the Fall semester of the year of the review process, the Head will finalize the T&P subcommittee in consultation with the candidate, appointing members responsible for the review of teaching and service. In accord with CLLA guidelines and deadlines, as well as in
consultation with the Head, the Chair of the T&P Subcommittee will set a timetable (a) for the T&P to produce subcommittee reports for review by the T&P Committee and (b) for a meeting of the T&P Committee to assess and vote on the case.

- The Department will submit all required T&P materials to the College of Liberal Arts in accord with college deadlines.

5.4. Process for Academic Professional track promotions

The review process for Academic Professional track faculty (such as Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, or “Adjective” Assistant Professor to “Adjective” Associate Professor) is very similar to that for tenured and tenure-track faculty. It is on the same timeline as T/TT promotions, and performance expectations in each area are similar, even though the weighting of the components may vary significantly. The process also differs in the following ways:

- In general, for appointments without a research component, no outside letters are required, as faculty in some academic professional track appointments do not have external visibility (see College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for specific details about letters for APT promotion reviews).

- Expectations for Teaching, Research and Creative Activities, and Service may be changed to reflect the individual’s responsibilities as they are determined by the department head.

- The Department does not require internal letters of support for academic professional track faculty.

Academic professional track faculty seeking promotion will submit a dossier for review, organized according to the Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure. Academic professional track promotion dossiers will be evaluated by department committee, department head, college committee and dean. Academic professional track promotion dossiers will then be forwarded to the dean of faculties, for approval by the provost and president.

6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

In the case of budgeted joint appointments, it is recommended that heads, directors and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.

In terms of annual reviews for faculty whose area of responsibility is administrative (e.g., associate deans, department heads, or directors), annual reviews will be conducted by their immediate supervisor. For a faculty
member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities such as teaching and/or research, the immediate supervisor is required to solicit feedback from the department head, director, or supervisor regarding the faculty member’s performance in those areas. Faculty with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head, director, or supervisor with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

6.1 Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
  - See University Rule 12.01.99.M1. For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member’s progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

6.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual’s career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.3 Time Period of Review and Review Process

- Annual reviews will focus on the three-year performance period comprising the most recent three calendar years.
- The review process is:
  - Every year on or about December 1, the Head will distribute a “Faculty Annual Report” to each faculty member. Faculty members will be required to submit the completed report by January 20 of the subsequent year. Each faculty member’s completed “Faculty Annual Report” will detail that faculty person’s performance for the three calendar years prior to that of the deadline and will serve as the basis for the evaluation of that faculty person’s performance. It is incumbent upon each faculty person to present his or her accomplishments.
• Annual Faculty Performance Reviews (FPRs) will be completed by the Head in consultation with the Faculty Annual Evaluation Advisory Committee (FAEAC) in accord with Department of Philosophy Bylaws, Article XI. In accord with these bylaws:

• Section One. The Faculty Annual Evaluation Advisory Committee shall have three regular members and one alternate member. All members will be tenured faculty of the Department. Regular members will serve rotating three year terms in accord with an established faculty rotation schedule. The alternate member will serve a one year term.

• Section Two. Duties of the Faculty Annual Evaluation Advisory Committee:

  (A) The Faculty Annual Evaluation Advisory Committee shall receive from the Department Head a draft annual evaluation of each faculty member and copies of the relevant materials upon which the evaluation was based.

  (B) The Committee shall review each annual evaluation in a timely manner and prepare a response to each evaluation. Minority reports from the Committee are permitted.

  (C) Reports from the Committee may

    1. Report that the Committee concurs with the Department Head's evaluation.
    2. Report that the Committee does not concur with the Department Head's evaluation. In this case, the Committee must indicate precisely what part or parts of the evaluation it disagrees with and present an alternate evaluation. In both types of reports the committee as a whole or individual members of the committee may prepare statements.

  (D) The Department Head shall consider the Committee's report(s) as advisory in determining the final evaluation report of each faculty member, with one exception. If the Head awards a faculty member a rating of "unsatisfactory" that faculty member may, before the evaluation is finalized, ask the tenured faculty of the Department to evaluate the faculty member. The written report by the tenured faculty is advisory, but must be considered by the Head before a final decision is made.

  (E) Members of the Committee will recuse themselves when their own evaluation is being considered by the Committee. (This clause is also applicable where potential or actual conflicts of interest could be at issue, for instance if the person being evaluated is a present or former spouse of at least one member of the Committee.) At that time the alternate will be seated as a full member of the Committee.

Section Three. Regular and Alternate Members of the Committee will serve on a rotational basis. An initial list of all tenured faculty members, except the Department Head, will be prepared with order arranged by lot. The first three slots become the first three regular members. The fourth slot will become the first alternate member. The next year the fourth slot will become a regular member. The fifth slot will become the alternate member and so on. After serving on the committee as a regular member, the
Section Four. Procedural Issues:

1. The Committee shall vote to select a chair during the fall semester and inform the Department Head of the result.

2. As far as circumstances permit, the Committee and Department Head should strive to observe the following schedule:
   
   (i) The Committee meets with the Head to discuss any general issues pertaining to the year’s evaluations.
   (ii) The Head delivers preliminary evaluations and all supporting information to the Committee.
   (iii) The Committee meets to discuss the evaluations. The Committee may call a further meeting with the Head to discuss specific issues.
   (iv) The Committee delivers its report to the Head. This report should be included with the Department Head’s salary recommendations to the Dean.
   (v) Simultaneous with sending his or her salary recommendations to the Dean, the Head reports to the Committee his or her response to any suggestions made in their report.

- Upon completion, the Head will provide each faculty member with a written copy of his or her respective FPR. Faculty members will indicate receipt by signing the copy of the FPR they have received. Each faculty member has the opportunity to make an appointment with the Head to discuss the FPR.

- FPRs will serve not only as documentation of job performance but also as the principal basis for merit raise recommendations from the Head to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4) will be rated on five-point scale: “Unsatisfactory” (1.00), “Needs Improvement” (2.00), “Meets Expectations” (3.00), “Above Expectations” (4.00), “Excellent” (5.00). Faculty performance may receive scores between whole number designations. Overall faculty performance will be a calculation of scores in performance areas relative to assigned efforts in the areas.

Characteristically, tenured faculty’s assignment is 40% effort in teaching, 40% effort in research, and in 20% service; and, tenure-track assistant faculty’s assignment is 45% effort in teaching, 45% in research, and 10% in service. The annual review process acknowledges that teaching, research, and service assignments may vary among faculty members and may evolve over the course of a faculty person’s career. The characteristic teaching assignment includes a teaching load of two courses per semester. The Department Officers of Associate Head, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Director of Graduate Studies, and Associate Director of Graduate Studies typically receive appropriate course reductions in conjunction with their leadership roles.

6.4.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching are:
**Unsatisfactory.** The absence of a faculty person’s demonstrated competence as instructor of record for assigned courses over a three-year period as evidenced by failure to meet basic expectations as described below as “Meets Expectations.”

**Needs Improvement.** Faculty person’s demonstrated competence as instructor of record for assigned courses over a three-year period is compromised by partial failure to meet basic expectations as described below as “Meets Expectations.”

**Meets Expectations.** Faculty person demonstrates competence as instructor of record for assigned courses over a three-year period as evidenced by a faculty person’s ability to meet basic expectations, to include: consistently employing sufficient pedagogical techniques to instruct students; holding classes at regularly scheduled times, complying with university policies concerned with special course assignments (such as W, I, CD or ICD courses), the posting of syllabuses and CVs online, and the submitting attendance verification, mid-term and final grades. The faculty person further regularly contributes to the teaching mission through participation in some teaching priorities, such as, the delivery of large courses, W, I CD or ICD courses, the delivery of graduate and undergraduate directed studies, and the delivery of graduate and undergraduate advising.

**Above Expectations.** Beyond satisfactory competence as instructor of record for assigned courses over a three-year period as evidenced by a faculty member’s ability to meet basic expectations (as described above), faculty person’s efforts are distinguished by achievements, such as: earning a minor grant or award; engaging in some formal efforts to enhance teaching; doing significant notable teaching and graduate advising; making further significant contributions to graduate and undergraduate education within the department; and engaging in some development of curriculum and pedagogy.

**Excellent.** Beyond satisfactory competence as instructor of record for assigned courses over a three-year period as evidenced by a faculty member’s ability to meet basic expectations (as described above), faculty person’s efforts are distinguished by achievements, such as: earning a significant teaching grant or award; doing significant notable teaching and graduate advising; making further distinguished contributions to graduate and undergraduate education within the department, college, or university; and regularly engaging in development of curriculum and pedagogy.

6.4.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** are:

**Unsatisfactory.** Faculty person’s efforts do not result in the presence of program of research as evidenced by criteria described below as “Meets Expectations.”

**Needs improvement.** Faculty person’s efforts do not result in the presence of a significant program of research as evidenced by criteria described below as “Meets Expectations” but include results that are indicative of ongoing research, such as, in the three-year reporting period: publishing at least one article in a suitable blind peer-reviewed journal, peer-reviewed edited volume with a university press, or comparable; earning a minor grant; or presenting two or more papers in significant external professional venues.

**Meets Expectations.** Faculty person’s efforts result in the presence of a significant program of research. While research output cannot be reduced solely to publications or to a specific number of
publications, it would be unusual for a faculty person to earn a score of ‘Meets Expectations’ with fewer than 3 refereed article or refereed book chapter publications or the equivalent in a three-year reporting period. The primary criterion for the evaluation of “Meets Expectations” is publications, though a faculty person with less than the indicated record of publications may be raised to an evaluation of “Meets Expectations” incrementally by significant scholarly editing roles, significant internal and external grants and awards, presentation of research in a substantial number of significant venues, or comparable accomplishments.

**Above Expectations.** Beyond satisfactory presence of a significant program of research, a faculty person’s efforts result in a level of achievement evidenced by a record of publications incrementally stronger than that typical of a rating of good but not as strong as that of excellent. While the primary criterion for the evaluation of “Above Expectations” is publications, a faculty person with less than the indicated record of publications may be raised to an evaluation of “Above Expectations” incrementally by significant scholarly editing roles, significant external grants and awards, presentation of research in a substantial number of significant venues, or comparable accomplishments.

**Excellent.** Beyond satisfactory presence of a significant program of research, a faculty person’s efforts result in a level of achievement that demonstrates high visibility and recognition within the field. The primary criterion for the evaluation of “Excellent” is publication quality, impact, and visibility, but other factors may be taken into account, such as significant scholarly editing roles, significant external grants and awards, or the presentation of research in significant venues, such as keynote addresses at major national or international conferences, or comparable accomplishments.

6.4.3 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Service** are:

**Unsatisfactory.** Faculty person fails to participate in departmental and other administrative processes and service duties as described below as “Meets Expectations.”

**Needs Improvement.** In the three-year reporting period, a faculty person’s participation in departmental administrative processes is limited or he or she does not adequately fulfill departmental service assignments; or, within the three-year window, a faculty person does not participate in any college- or university-level committee service or any professional service.

**Meets Expectations.** Faculty person participates in departmental administrative processes, such as attending faculty meetings and (as appropriate) tenure and promotion meetings (or, in any case, providing the Head with a suitable explanation for an absence from a departmental meeting, committee meeting, or a tenure and promotion meeting); fulfilling duties associated with departmental committee assignments; and, in the three year evaluation window, participating in some further service activities, such as a college- or university level committees, or professional service, such as a manuscript review for a blind peer-review journal.

**Above Expectations.** Beyond service that “Meets Expectations,” a faculty person engages in significant service initiatives or roles within the college or university (such as service on a significant college or university committee), and profession (such as leadership role in professional organization or in conference planning).

**Excellent.** Beyond service that “Meets Expectations,” a faculty person makes exceptional contribution to the university (such as Director of a major service initiative or Chair of a major
university-level committee) or profession (such as executive committee member of the APA or large professional organization).

6.5 **Required Components**

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of *University Rule 12.01.99.M1*, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.5.1 Faculty member's report of previous activities.

See PHIL Appendix I, departmental Faculty Annual Report

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of *University Rule 12.01.99.M1*, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

6.5.2 A written document stating the department head's, program director's, or supervisor's evaluation and expectations.

The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head, director, or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all required System and University training programs (*System Regulation 33.05.02 Required Employee Training*). In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the “ACKNOWLEDGEMENT” portion of the department head’s, director’s, or supervisor’s written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

- I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory Texas A&M University System training.

6.5.3 Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.

The department head, director, or supervisor may meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

6.5.4 Performance Assessment

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service shall be consistent across faculty members. The standard weights for tenured faculty are
40% teaching, 40% research and 20% service; the standard weights for tenure-track assistant professors is 45% teaching, 45% research and 10% service; while the weights for academic professional track faculty are determined in accord with individual appointment letters, weights will be consistent relative to specific faculty assignments. Out of a commitment to fairness and comparability in faculty evaluation, the department expects that these will vary only in the most exceptional circumstances (e.g. a substantial change in professional duties following post-tenure review or related discussions).

6.6 Assessment outcomes that require action

As per University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:

6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being “Unsatisfactory” in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care...), or a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the Department established criteria (see Section 7.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see Section 9.2.) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of “Unsatisfactory” for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an “Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review (see section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 9), they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity/creative work), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”. The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Satisfactory” when pre-determined milestones are met.

6.7 Time-Line

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year.”
6.8 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of University SAP 12.01.99.M1.

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of University SAP 12.01.99.M1.

7. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of University SAP 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

7.1 Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the Department rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the Department’s P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

7.2 Process
The mid-term review should be conducted between March of the academic year prior to the target academic year, and December of the target year. For example, if the mid-term review is due during the academic year, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2022 and December 2022. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hired</th>
<th>Probationary Period</th>
<th>Mid-Term Review will occur between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calendar Year 2019</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Mar – Dec 2022 (due before December 2022 of AY 2022-2023)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Feedback from midterm review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head (supervisor/Department director), and departmental faculty. The Department of Philosophy will conduct the mid-term review following the procedure described in the College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation.

8. Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).

2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 8.2.).

8.1 Purpose

- Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.
- Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives.
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

8.2 Peer Review Committee

The membership of the Peer Review Committee will be formed in accord with departmental bylaws, Article XII. In accord with this: The procedure for appointing members to the committee is the same as for the Faculty Annual Evaluation Advisory Committee (see Appendix A), with two exceptions: (i) The committee shall have five

---

1 Post-Tenure Review might not be applicable to your unit, especially if you do not have tenured faculty members, e.g., TAMUQ.
members instead of three (and no alternate member), and (ii) all members shall hold the same rank, or higher, as the faculty member being evaluated.

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

- Head’s Faculty Performance Reviews for the period under review
- Most recent Faculty Annual Report’s for the period under review
- Current CV
- Other materials as appropriate

8.3.2 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.

8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.

8.3.4 A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.5 A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.6 A rating of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.

8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units. If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

8.3.8 By no later than May 31st, each unit will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee’s

---

2 It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
8.3 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 8.2.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.7). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

8.4.1 The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.

8.4.2 The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

8.4.3 The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.

8.4.4 The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member’s academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.

8.4.5 The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:
8.4.5.1 No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near term improvement plan of Section 2.4, 4.1.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 5) acceptable to the dean.

8.4 The Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member’s performance (as measured against stated criteria in the unit guidelines under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, director, or supervisor and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the unit, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member’s obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. For more details on the Professional Development Plan see Section 9 of University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review)

8.5 Appeal

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of the Post-tenure review are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University SAP 12.99.99.M0.01 (Faculty Grievances Procedures not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final (section 6, University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee’s finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final (section 6, University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

If the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost (section 6, University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

8.6 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review
A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review, by making a request to the department head, director, or supervisor (section 6, University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

9. **Granting Faculty Emeritus Status**

   *University Rule 31.08.01.M2* states the following: Every individual who, at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least 10 years, must be considered for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered.

   For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see *Institutional Rule 31.08.01*, which indicates the process for this situation.

   See the Dean of Faculties website for *procedures and forms* for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

   The Department’s criteria for granting Emeritus status are a career-long, strong record of teaching, research, and service.

---

**Contact Office**

Department of Philosophy, e-mail jbosley@tamu.edu

---

*Approved Department of Philosophy, 9-30-2020*
*Approved College of Liberal Arts, 3-15-2021*
PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT – 2017

Reporting period: January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2019

The information you provide in this report is the primary basis for departmental review of your performance over the three year reporting period. The information you provide is also the primary source for the annual report to the Dean on the department’s performance on which merit pool allocations are based. So be as complete as possible when listing your activities. Prompts are provided to assure that faculty members do not overlook contributions that should be considered for their annual review and for the Department’s annual report to the Dean.

Please attach a current copy of your curriculum vitae and (as requested under “Service” below) a copy of your TrainTraq training transcript.

NAME: RANK: 

DATE APPOINTED TO THIS RANK: DATE APPOINTED AT TAMU: 

ACADEMIC UNIT(S) (Dept/Program): Philosophy 

PART ONE: RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Note: In this section, include books, articles, and chapters on the scholarship of teaching and learning, but list textbooks, teachers’ guides, and other pedagogical publications in the teaching section of this report. Group entries by the three calendar years in the reporting period. For each entry, include an indication of the quality of the press or journal.

BOOKS, JOURNAL ARTICLES AND BOOK CHAPTERS

A. Books published during the reporting period. (Give a complete citation that includes all coauthors, if any, and a page count. Indicate if the book is edited, translated, or a revised edition of previously published work, and specify whether or not the book was refereed.)

1. 


B. **Refereed journal articles published during the report period.** (Give a complete citation, including page numbers and coauthors, if any.)

   1.

C. **Unrefereed journal articles published during the report period.** (Give a complete citation, including page numbers and coauthors, if any.)

   1.

D. **Refereed book chapters published during the report period.** (Give a complete citation, including page numbers and coauthors, if any. Note that an invited book chapter may nevertheless be refereed.)

   1.

E. **Unrefereed book chapters published during the report period.** (Give a complete citation, including page numbers and coauthors, if any.)

   1.

**OTHER PUBLICATIONS**

F. **Book reviews published during the report period.** (Give a complete citation, including page numbers and coauthors, if any.)

   1.

G. **Entries in reference works published during the reporting period.** (Give a complete citation, including citation including page numbers; indicate whether invited, refereed, or unrefereed; and indicate if coauthored.)

   1.

H. **Other publications during the reporting period.** (Include here popular articles, notes/comments, publications in conference proceedings, etc. Give a complete citation, including page numbers.)

   2.

**WRITINGS IN PROGRESS**
I. Works accepted for publication during this period but not yet published. (indicate title, length, and venue; invited, refereed, or unrefereed; coauthored, edited, translation, or revised edition).

1.

J. Works submitted and under review as of January 1 of the current year. (Provide title, target journal or press, anticipated submission dates; invited, refereed, or unrefereed; indicate if coauthored, edited, translated, or revised edition.)

2.

K. Manuscripts in progress as of January 1 of the current year. (Describe estimated overall length of work when completed and percentage of work completed as of January 1; provide title, target journal or press, and anticipated submission date; indicate if invited, refereed, or unrefereed and if coauthored.)

3.

SCHOLARLY EDITING

L. Scholarly editing activity during the reporting period. (Describe work here only if it involves responsibilities not covered in other sections—e.g., work as editor of scholarly journal or special issue, member of editorial board as listed on masthead, serving as editor of a book series, etc.)

1.

PRESENTATIONS

M. Scholarly presentations in domestic venues during the reporting period. (Include title, name of organization, place, date, invited or submitted, and note any keynote or plenary presentations.)

2.

N. Scholarly presentations in international venues during the reporting period. (Include title, name of organization, place, date, invited or submitted, and note any keynote or plenary presentations.)

3.

GRANTS

Note: Include submitted and funded fellowships, institutes, seminars, etc.

O. Research grants from which funds were received or spent during the reporting period. (Include titles of projects, funding agencies or sources, dates of submission and award, dollar amount; clearly indicate your role and role of
others involved.)

1.

P. Research grant proposals submitted during the reporting period. (Indicate status of proposals as of January 1 of the current year, and include titles of projects, funding agencies or sources, dates of submission and award, dollar amount; clearly indicate your role and role of others involved.)

2.

OTHER

Q. Other scholarly activities. Give complete descriptions of other scholarly activities during the reporting period that do not fit into the above categories.

3.

R. Check one of the following:

☐ After considering the research environments in which I am principal or lead investigator for the environment, I present the following safety concerns and attempts to mitigate them (list below); or

☐ After considering the research environments in which I am the principal or lead investigator for the environment, I believe that all safety concerns that I could mitigate would tend to be of low impact and low frequency.

S. Summary.

Tenured Faculty: Provide here a brief summary statement of your efforts in this category. Please include discussion of the significance of specific contributions to your field(s), and (as applicable) relationships to interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary, diversity, and/or internationalization. Also include any other information that may not be apparent from the above list.

Tenure-track Faculty: Include with this report a three page statement on research, teaching and service, as called for in the Dean of Faculties’ guidelines for promotion and tenure: http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/tenure_promotion/DOF_Tenure_Guidelines.pdf.

PART TWO: TEACHING

A. Formal courses taught at TAMU during the reporting period. Mark courses taught for the first time with an asterisk. If you did not carry the standard teaching load for your appointment, indicate the reason (e.g., administrative duties, teaching release, leave, etc.). Note if a course was team-taught. Be sure to designate W, I, or Honors courses, as well as any study abroad courses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term*</th>
<th>Course-Section Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Enrollment as of 12th class day</th>
<th>Mean Student Evaluation</th>
<th>Student Responses to Item 10</th>
<th>Student Responses to Item 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Terms: A = spring, B = summer, C = fall

B. **Other courses taught during the reporting period.** Include directed studies, internships, supervision of honors theses, etc. Include semester/year, course title, student’s name and (for honors theses) graduation date.

1.

C. Did you submit departmental assessment data for your undergraduate courses? (If not please provide the reason: for example, you are teaching PHIL 240, which does not have a writing component).

1.

D. **Service on graduate student committees.** Include student’s name, department, degree sought, in progress or date completed, and whether you chaired or were a member of the committee.

1.

E. **Progress of advisees in our graduate program.** Indicate milestones completed by students whose committees you chaired, such as thesis proposals or defenses, preliminary exams, research awards, publications, professional placement, etc.; include semester.

1.

F. **Notable accomplishments by former graduate students.** For students whose committees you chaired, indicate here accomplishments such as placement, promotion to associate professor, etc.

1.

G. **Special activities performed in support of our graduate program.** Include here conducting workshops, helping to recruit graduate students, helping students publish papers or write grant applications, involvement with
professionalization activities, efforts to secure funding for graduate students, etc. Provide outcomes if known.

1.

H. **Curriculum development.** Include here courses that were new or significantly revised and other contributions to curriculum development (e.g., proposal of W, I, Honors or team-taught courses).

1.

I. **Involvement in undergraduate research experiences.** Include here involvement in the University Research Opportunities Program, papers published with undergraduates, etc.

1.

J. **Published curricular materials.** Include here textbooks, teachers’ guides, instructional videos, web-available teaching materials, etc. (i.e., materials intended for use by teachers and students in classroom or pedagogical settings) published during the review period that do not fall under “the scholarship of teaching and learning,” which is covered above under research. Provide full citations, including dates, URLs, etc.

1.

K. **Lectures given on pedagogical issues.** Provide title, date, and venue.

1.

L. **Teaching awards/honors received.** Include faculty exchanges, teaching Fulbrights, teaching grants, etc.

1.

M. **Other teaching activity not addressed above.** Include here coordination of multi-section courses, attendance at teaching workshops and subsequent incorporation of workshop material into your teaching, innovative teaching practices, work with undergraduates on graduate school applications, etc.

1.

N. **Check one of the following:**

☐ After considering the teaching environments in which I am instructor of record, I present the following safety concerns and my attempts to mitigate them (list below); or

☐ After considering the teaching environments in which I am instructor of record, I believe that all safety concerns that I could mitigate would tend to be of low impact and low frequency.

O. **Summary.**
Tenured Faculty: Please provide a brief summary statement of your efforts in this category. Please indicate (as applicable) contributions that your teaching made to interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary, diversity, collaborative work, and/or internationalization. Also include information that may not be apparent from a list format.

Tenure-track Faculty: Include with this report a three page statement on research, teaching and service, as called for in the Dean of Faculties’ guidelines for promotion and tenure: https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure

PART THREE: SERVICE

A. Compliance with University training programs. Please attach a copy of your Training Transcript (available from HRC Connect via https://sso.tamus.edu; click on Training, take any training required, click on View My Transcript, and print) showing that you had completed all required trainings as of January 1 of this year.

1.

B. Department, college, and university service. Indicate names of committees or assignments, dates of service, and roles (e.g., committee member, chair).

1. Department:

   i. Committee Assignments

      1. As Chair. Indicate the extent of committee efforts (e.g., frequency of meetings, assigned tasks) and committee accomplishments

         a.

      2. As Member

         a.

   ii. Other Departmental Service

      1.

2. College:

   i. Committee Assignments
1. As Chair. Indicate the extent of committee efforts (e.g., frequency of meetings, assigned tasks) and committee accomplishments.
   a.

2. As Member. Indicate the extent of committee efforts (e.g., frequency of meetings, assigned tasks) and committee accomplishments.
   a.

   ii. Other College Service

   1.

3. University:

   i. Committee Assignments

   1. As Chair. Indicate the extent of committee efforts (e.g., frequency of meetings, assigned tasks) and committee accomplishments.
      a.

   2. As Member. Indicate the extent of committee efforts (e.g., frequency of meetings, assigned tasks) and committee accomplishments.
      a.

   ii. Other University Service

   1.

C. Faculty mentoring.

   Associate and full professors: List the names of faculty members (including associate professors) for whom you served as either a formal or informal mentor; briefly describe.

   Assistant and associate professors: List the names of faculty members who have provided formal or informal mentoring to you over the past year; briefly describe.

D. Student advising. Note here work as advisor for student organizations, MENTORs, ALLYs, and other formal advising work with students.

   1.
E. **Extra-university service.** List here committees and administrative roles within community organizations, invited popular presentations, etc.

1.

F. **Professional service.** Indicate offices and roles in professional organizations, membership on federal grant review panels, etc. Indicate whether offices are elected or appointed.

1.

G. **Event planning.** List any conferences, mini-conferences, and symposia for which you served on the planning committee (indicate conference title, your role, date, and location).

1.

H. **Conference panels.** List conference panels for which you served as organizer, chair, or discussant; provide date, organization, and location.

1.

I. **List manuscript/grant reviewing activities.** Indicate academic journals, presses, and/or agencies for which you reviewed manuscripts, performances, and grants during the reporting period.

1.

J. **Service as outside reviewer for tenure and promotion cases.** Give institution and rank; do not list names of faculty members involved.

1.

K. **Other service activities not covered above.**

1.

L. **List any service awards/honors received.** Indicate whether from TAMU or external.

1.

M. **Check one of the following:**

☐ After considering the service environments in which I play a leading role (e.g., as faculty advisor to a student organization, leader on field trips, etc.), I present the following safety concerns and my attempts to mitigate them (list below).
☐ After considering the service environments in which I play a leading role (e.g., as faculty advisor to a student organization, leader on field trips, etc.), I believe that all safety concerns that I could mitigate would tend to be of low impact and low frequency.

N. Summary.

Tenured Faculty: Provide a brief summary statement of your efforts in this category. Indicate (as applicable) contributions that your service made to interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary, diversity, and/or internationalization; such contributions might include, for instance, special efforts to attract minority graduate students, work on study abroad programs, and work with a visiting international scholar. Also include information that may not be apparent from a list format.

Tenure-track Faculty: Include with this report a three page statement on research, teaching and service, as called for in the Dean of Faculties’ guidelines for promotion and tenure: https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure

PART FOUR: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON INTERNATIONALIZATION & DIVERSITY

Describe any accomplishments that have contributed to internationalization or diversity that are not covered in items above.

- End –