

Criteria for Evaluation of the CLAS-Honors Preceptor of Philosophy

I. Procedural Guidelines

The CLAS-Honors Preceptor of Philosophy will be evaluated on the basis of teaching, research and professional development, and service commensurate with assigned responsibilities. An emphasis will be placed on teaching, but it is understood that teaching, research and service are often integrated and some activities may overlap across multiple categories. For the purposes of this document, teaching includes teaching in the classroom and other pedagogical activities outside the classroom, such as leading reading study groups, leading student field trips, and mentoring undergraduate research activities.

The Department of Philosophy and the Honors College endorse the following procedural guidelines regarding the evaluation of the CLAS-Honors Preceptor of Philosophy:

(1) The Peer Committee evaluates teaching based on evidence, including student evaluations, course materials, and classroom performance of all faculty members under consideration for reappointment or promotion, as well as their research and service activities.

(2) The Preceptor will provide the peer committee with a detailed report of professional activities during the review period together with an evaluation of his or her own performance. This report should also include copies of syllabi, summaries of teaching evaluations, and copies of published work. The purpose of such a report and self-evaluation is to facilitate the peer committee's assessment of strengths and weaknesses to enable evaluation of the quality of the faculty member's activities, and to assist him or her to meet all expectations.

(3) Annually during the probationary period, and less often thereafter, every faculty member must submit student evaluations of all courses taught each semester. The Peer Committee will also coordinate with the preceptor to arrange classroom observation in both units by a faculty colleague and their feedback will inform the committee's assessment of teaching.

(4) The Peer Committee will prepare a written evaluation of each faculty member being evaluated. The evaluation will be guided by concern for how a Preceptor's performance relates to the missions of teaching, research, and service pursued by the Department of Philosophy and the Honors College. For one week after the evaluation is placed in the faculty member's personnel file, he or she will have the opportunity to supply written responses that will be attached to the Peer Committee's report.

(5) The Peer Committee's evaluation is forwarded to the Chair of the Department of Philosophy who will add his or her evaluation.

(6) Unsolicited letters from students, alumni, community members, or other faculty members, along with any special recognition such as an award for good teaching, should be added to the faculty member's personnel record.

Signed commendations or complaints submitted in writing to the Department of Philosophy or to the Honors College become part of the faculty member's personnel file. The Honors College Dean, or the Philosophy Department Chair must supply the faculty member with a copy of such documents. The faculty member may respond in writing to any such document, and the written response also becomes part of the personnel file. All materials placed in the personnel file fall under the provisions of Article 6 of the current AFUM contract.

(7) During the evaluation process, the peer committee representatives from both Honors and Philosophy will take into consideration that this is a joint position – half-time Honors, half-time Philosophy – and adjust expectations regarding workload in each unit accordingly.

II. Evaluation Criteria

Teaching and Pedagogy

Evaluation of teaching will be based on performance in both the Honors College and in the Department of Philosophy. In making evaluations of both tenure-track and tenured faculty members, the Peer Committee will consider factors such as the following:

- (1) The individual's self-evaluations
- (2) Previous evaluations by the Peer Committee, Chair, and Dean
- (3) Student evaluations from all courses taught each semester
- (4) Written reports based on observation of teaching by faculty colleagues
- (5) Unsolicited letters from students, other faculty, and others
- (6) Written evaluations that may be solicited by the Department or College from selected students and others
- (7) Content, structure, and enrollment of courses
- (8) Advising and serving on student Honors Thesis Committees
- (9) Other evidence of effective teaching: teaching awards or other recognition of outstanding teaching; extent and effectiveness of student contact outside the classroom; how courses relate to other courses within the Honors College or Department of Philosophy in enhancing curriculum objectives
- (10) Evidence of effective advising and mentoring of students in the Honors College and Department of Philosophy. Criteria for evaluating advisors will include whether advisors are knowledgeable or willing to find information about academic requirements or other information needed by advisees; whether advisors are reasonably available during office hours and other mutually agreed upon times for appointments; and whether advisors maintain caring attitudes and open channels of communication with advisees. Advisors are encouraged to attend

- advising workshops, especially when there is a need for greater knowledge and for different approaches to advising in order to improve their advising activities.
- (11) Evidence of innovative curricular and pedagogical practices
 - (12) Grant applications in support of curricular and pedagogical development
 - (13) Organization of and/or participation in workshops or seminars on teaching
 - (14) Coordination of student reading groups
 - (15) Guest lectures in the Honors Civilizations sequence, or third year Honors tutorials

Research, Scholarship, and Professional Development

For the purposes of this document, *research* will be distinguished from *scholarship* or *professional development* more broadly construed. The CLAS-Honors Preceptor in Philosophy is expected to engage in activities in both categories.

Research will be used to refer to peer-reviewed or refereed publications. *Scholarship* and *professional development* will refer to a broader range of activities as specified below.

The Peer Committee expects publication of a minimum of three (3) refereed articles, or their equivalent, within the discipline of Philosophy before tenure. Fewer than three articles may be accepted if the candidate has published a book or philosophical translations or other philosophical work of such quality - as determined by the Peer Committee - that the committee agrees to lower the number of requisite publications required for tenure.

The Peer Committee expects a comparable commitment to research and/or scholarship within the Honors program. This commitment may be fulfilled by research, scholarly and professional development activities such as those specified below.

In evaluating *research*, the Peer Committee will look at factors such as the following:

- (1) Publications of refereed books, journal articles, and book chapters. *Refereed* means that such contributions have been evaluated positively and recommended for publication by one or more experts in the field
- (2) Published translations with accompanying philosophical commentary, notes, annotations or supportive essay
- (3) Published articles on philosophical pedagogy in a philosophical journal such as *Teaching Philosophy*
- (4) Published Honors articles in national refereed Honors journals, such as the *NCHC Journal* or *Honors in Practice*
- (5) The Peer Committee may include in its evaluations of research works under consideration by a publisher, works accepted for publication but not yet published, and/or grant proposals submitted but not funded.

In evaluating *scholarship* and *professional development*, the Peer Committee will also look at factors such as the following:

- (1) Published, refereed collections of professional papers
- (2) Published book reviews
- (3) Grant applications for undergraduate research experiences for students
- (4) External grants designed to elicit support for scholarly research
- (5) Formal scholarly papers delivered at professional Philosophy or Honors meetings
- (6) Serving as a respondent on scholarly panels
- (7) Joint presentation of research results with students at professional academic venues
- (8) Scholarly or teaching workshops or courses attended
- (9) Other evidence of scholarly growth and accomplishment that aligns with the missions of the Honors College and the Department of Philosophy

Service

The service activities of faculty members can be divided into (a) “applied scholarship” or “outreach” (such as using one’s philosophical training in giving talks, writing articles or opinion pieces, and providing consultation for a non-professional audience or community), (b) service to the profession (such as serving as an officer of a professional organization), and (c) other activities not involving specific philosophical training (such as serving on various university, college, departmental, and community committees and projects). All faculty members are expected to contribute to service needs in one or more of these areas.

The total service expectations of the CLAS-Honors Preceptor of Philosophy should be compatible with expectations for other full-time faculty members in Philosophy and Honors. While some service will be specific to the Honors College or the Department of Philosophy, many other forms of service should count as meeting the expectations of both units simultaneously, including service to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the University of Maine, the community, and professional scholarly organizations.

In making evaluations of both tenure-track and tenured faculty members, the Peer Committee will consider factors such as the following:

- (1) Participation in administrative duties
- (2) Participation in various committee assignments
- (3) Editorships
- (4) Editorial work for a scholarly journal or press
- (5) Previous evaluations by the Peer Committee, the Chair, and the Dean
- (6) Reports and evaluations by others participating in shared service activities
- (7) Contributions to Departmental, College, or University governance, planning, and programs through committee work and by taking on specific tasks

- (8) Service as faculty advisor for student groups, or participating in student or other university organizations
- (9) Community service related to one's academic interests. This may take local, regional, national, and international forms
- (10) Service to professional, scholarly organization
- (11) Exceptional service for which one does not receive released time from teaching may also be recognized

III. Peer Evaluation Committee Structure

The peer evaluation committee for the CLAS-Honors Preceptor of Philosophy will consist of representatives of both units. The Department of Philosophy will be represented by two members of the Department's peer committee to be elected by that Department's peer committee. The Honors College will be represented by two AFUM-eligible members of the Honors College faculty not affiliated with the Department of Philosophy. They will be chosen by the Honors College peer committee. The peer committee will forward its recommendations regarding reappointment to the Philosophy Department Chair. The committee and the Chair's recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean of the Honors College and to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The Deans will make recommendations to the Provost.

IV. Promotion and Post-Tenure Review

Promotion from the rank of Assistant to Associate Professor follows after successful completion of the expectations of Assistant Professors outlined in this document. The candidate's record will be presented according to the University's template for applications for promotion and reviewed according to the faculty contract.

Faculty members wishing to apply for *early tenure and promotion* must meet all stated criteria for teaching, research and scholarship, and service. In addition, they must demonstrate exceptionally broad national and/or international recognition of their work as substantiated by measures that may include significant national awards for teaching and/or research, invitations to speak at prestigious conferences or institutions, frequent citation of their work, well-placed favorable reviews, or a publishing and/or teaching record beyond that required of a typical applicant.

Promotion to Professor from the rank of Associate Professor presupposes a continuing record of accomplishment in all areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and service comparable to expectations for tenure. Through their work candidates should have established a national and international reputation, as validated by experts in the field. Their record of service should demonstrate a sustained commitment to activities that align with and enrich the missions of the Honors College and the Department of Philosophy.

Tenured Associate and Full Professors are subject to Peer Reviews at four-year intervals. CLAS-Honors Preceptors who receive a peer committee evaluation of satisfactory or better will be recommended to receive an adjustment consistent with the contract to their base pay effective at the start of the subsequent fall semester. The standard for successful post-tenure review is satisfactory performance. This is not the same standard as that applied in peer review for tenure and promotion.

Performance shall be deemed “satisfactory” in the area of teaching when the Preceptor’s quantitative evaluations do not score significantly below the CLAS and Honors College averages, and there are no serious complaints filed by students against the Preceptor. In the area of research, “satisfactory” performance means that the Preceptor has given evidence of ongoing scholarly activity including, but not limited to, publications or conference presentations. Service activity is “satisfactory” when the Preceptor serves on committees or otherwise contributes to the profession, the Philosophy Department, CLAS or the Honors College, the University, state, local or national government, non-profit organizations, or the general public as an outgrowth of his or her academic position and expertise.

V. External Evaluation

For promotion to Associate Professor and to Professor, the UM System policy stipulates that external letters of evaluation from experts in the candidate’s discipline be provided. Letters will be solicited by the Chair of the Department of Philosophy and the Honors College Dean in accordance with University of Maine procedures.

Approved by the joint Honors/Philosophy Peer Evaluation Committee (January 2019)

Approved by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
February 5, 2019.