

**PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY  
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY**

**[Revised and approved by Peer Committee on December 3, 2019; additional revisions  
approved by Department on June 12, 2020]**

Approved by Provost on 8/6/2020

**A. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE**

The Department of Philosophy sees two functions to be served by the evaluation of faculty: 1) to provide an ongoing record to facilitate reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions and post-tenure reviews; 2) to encourage self-evaluation by individual faculty members and constructive evaluation of the faculty, by the department, in order to sustain the effectiveness of department offerings and contributions to scholarship.

In using evaluations to meet these objectives, the department articulates its mission in terms of teaching, research, and service. Each faculty member is expected to show a strong commitment to teaching, offering a diverse set of courses that are taught according to standards of excellence. Each faculty member is also expected to be a productive scholar showing their research commitment both through the quality of their teaching and through publications and other productive scholarly activities. Finally, the department also affirms a commitment to service to the department, the university, and, when appropriate, beyond the university community.

Faculty members are expected to promote departmental goodwill through active participation in departmental affairs, sharing departmental responsibilities, and acting in ways consistent with promoting the welfare of students and other members of the university community.

**B. PROCEDURE**

All procedures will be consistent with articles of evaluation and promotion in the Agreement between the University of Maine System and Associated Faculties of the University of Maine (AFUM); see Articles 7, 9 and 10. Procedures will be brought in line with changes in the AFUM Agreement.

The department will conduct annual evaluations of faculty members during their pre-tenure, probationary period.

Unless credit towards tenure has been negotiated at the time of hire or a “stop the clock” request is in place, an Assistant Professor on tenure-track will submit an application for tenure in the Fall semester of their sixth year, following current AFUM-negotiated guidelines and schedules.

Tenured Associate Professors and Professors are subject to post-tenure review every four years following tenure. Ongoing Lecturers with over six years of service in the department are also subject to review every four years.

Each member of the department to be evaluated will provide the department peer committee with a detailed report of professional activities during the period of review,

together with an evaluation of their own performance using a format agreed on with the chair and the dean of the college. The purpose of this report and self-evaluation is to assess strengths and weaknesses so as to encourage the highest standards in the faculty member's activities and in the department as a whole.

The peer committee, consisting of all tenured faculty (other than the chair) and full-time ongoing lecturers who have achieved just cause status, will examine relevant reports and self-evaluations and may request supporting documents or other material from faculty members being evaluated. The peer committee will carefully discuss the submitted material and any other factors relevant to the faculty evaluation. The peer committee may also consult the personnel files of faculty members being evaluated.

The peer committee will prepare a written evaluation of each faculty member being evaluated. The evaluation will be guided by the criteria provided in this document, focusing on a faculty member's performance in relation to the department's mission of teaching, research and service. The evaluation is primarily intended to facilitate excellence in the individual's and the department's performance and to provide constructive feedback to probationary faculty members on their progress towards tenure.

Faculty members being evaluated have one week to submit a written response or correction to the peer committee evaluation—if they choose to write one—before the evaluation is placed in the faculty member's personnel file. Their response will be attached to the peer committee's evaluation.

The chair will add an independent evaluation that will be appended to the peer committee's report and forwarded to the dean.

All correspondence and essential documents associated with faculty evaluations will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

### **C. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSORS AND LECTURERS**

A person having the rank of **Assistant Professor** will have normally attained a Ph.D. in philosophy; placed a high priority on teaching, developing a repertoire of courses that address both areas of specialization and the overall needs of the department; shown evidence of high quality in teaching or clear progress toward such quality; shown evidence of high quality in fulfilling their advising responsibilities; undertaken their share of department responsibilities, and shown evidence of a commitment to service activities; developed areas of research specialization demonstrating promise of scholarly achievement; and begun to become a productive contributor to their own research fields through publications and other scholarly activities.

As probationary faculty, assistant professors undergo yearly evaluation. These yearly evaluations examine the relevant faculty member's progress in the areas of teaching, research, and service. While there is no numeric requirement for publications during these probationary years, the department does expect clear evidence of substantial involvement in research activity leading toward the standards required for promotion and tenure. Examples

of substantial involvement in research activity include but are not limited to presentations at professional meetings, publications in and submissions to refereed journals or book publishers, and ongoing preparation of working manuscripts. The department also expects quality teaching and advising as well as involvement in service at the minimum required levels. Criteria used for this evaluation are parallel to those found in Section D below—i.e., the probationary candidate should show graduated progress toward fulfilling those criteria as befits the years of progress toward the tenure application.

A person having the position of **Lecturer** must have satisfactory academic preparation in the subject area to be taught and evidence of successful experience in the classroom. The position of full-time lecturer is normally a full-time teaching position. Lecturers are not expected to do research and are not eligible for tenure, but, per the AFUM contract, they can achieve just cause status after working continuously in the department for six years.

Evaluations for reappointment at the lecturer level focus primarily on success in teaching and secondarily on the demonstration of some contribution to service at the departmental level (and, as desired and possible, levels beyond). Criteria used for this evaluation include the individual's annual reports; previous evaluations by the peer committee, chair, and dean; quantitative data and qualitative student evaluations; observation(s) of teaching; and course materials.

#### **D. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

**Associate Professor:** A person having the rank of Associate Professor will have normally achieved a repertoire of courses and demonstrated a dedication to and a high level of achievement in teaching; shown flexibility in developing new areas of teaching competence when appropriate to departmental needs; shown evidence of continuing high quality efforts in advising students; become a productive scholar in their chosen areas of research, both publishing and showing signs of ongoing growth as a scholar; and made important service contributions to the department, the University, and, when appropriate, the community and/or profession. The department does not require candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor to have published a book.

Under the terms of the Union contract, the peer committee is responsible for evaluating all faculty members and for recommending faculty members for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. In making evaluations of tenure-track faculty members for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the peer committee will consider the factors listed below. (Note: If the individual being assessed has been hired at the rank of Associate Professor and is applying for tenure and promotion to Professor, the criteria for teaching, research and service will be assessed at the higher level of expectations described in section E below. If the individual being assessed has been hired at the rank of Associate Professor without tenure and is now applying for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor, the criteria for teaching, research and service will be assessed at the level of expectations described in this section and according to any contractual agreements made at the time of hire.)

#### **Teaching**

The department places a high priority on teaching. It looks to its members to have developed a repertoire of courses that address both areas of specialization and the overall needs of the department. When probationary faculty members are applying for tenure, they should show evidence of high-quality teaching. The department also expects candidates for tenure to have served as effective advisors for students assigned to them. In making its evaluations, the peer committee will examine the following materials in tandem with the above criteria:

- a. The individual's self-evaluations and annual reports
- b. Previous evaluations by the peer committee, chair and dean
- c. Quantitative data and qualitative evaluations from student evaluations collected by the University
- d. Observations of teaching by a faculty colleague(s) (optional, but recommended)
- e. Unsolicited letters from students and others who have first-hand experience of the faculty member's teaching (optional)
- f. Content, structure, and enrollment of courses
- g. Flexibility in meeting the department's overall teaching needs
- h. Other evidence of effective teaching, such as awards or other recognition of outstanding teaching, the extent and effectiveness of student contact outside the classroom, mentoring of undergraduate research projects, how courses relate to other courses within the department to enhance the department's curriculum objectives, how courses relate to other courses within the University as a whole to enhance the department's presence on campus
- i. Evidence of effective advising, such as knowledge or willingness to find information about academic requirements or other information needed by advisees, availability during office hours and other mutually agreed upon times for appointments, effective channels of communication with advisees, use of relevant advising tools, and participation in advising workshops (especially when there is a need for greater knowledge and for different approaches to advising in order to improve their advising activities)

### **Research**

To be eligible for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the department expects that the candidate will have demonstrated a high-level research program. To do so, a candidate may take different approaches with respect to publication. For instance, a strong research program is indicated by the publication of an average of one single-authored, peer-reviewed scholarly article or book chapter per year, amounting to five published articles and/or book chapters in total prior to the application for tenure. A strong research program would also be indicated by the publication of a single-authored, peer-reviewed book manuscript at a reputable publishing press and demonstration of additional scholarly production (e.g., in the form of the publication of a scholarly article(s) and/or presenting new publication-quality

material at conferences, etc.); in other words, a book manuscript printed by a reputable press is deemed equivalent to roughly 4 to 5 articles, but a candidate who takes this approach to demonstrating a strong research program must also show evidence of additional research beyond the focus of the book manuscript. In all cases, there is an additional expectation that candidates for tenure will have been actively involved in scholarly engagement beyond publication principally in the mode of participating in conferences and workshops, and, secondarily, through some participation in the following types of activities: editorial work, grant submission and work, manuscript review, association work, non-peer reviewed philosophical writing for public audiences (such as a blog, commentary, or book review), and/or other justifiably comparable undertakings in the field of philosophy.

Candidates who are relying on a book for tenure and promotion must demonstrate that the book manuscript is either in print, published in advance online, or forthcoming. For the purposes of this document, a forthcoming text is one that is accepted and in need of no required changes other than final copy editing. Articles submitted as part of the review for tenure and promotion must be either published (in-print or online), forthcoming, or accepted with only minor revisions. If a manuscript is forthcoming or accepted with minor revisions, a letter to this effect from an editor must accompany submission of the work. Co-authored journal articles, book chapters, invited papers and books, as well as edited or co-edited works will be evaluated based on the extent of the candidate's contribution to the work; it is the responsibility of the candidate to describe and, if possible, offer supporting materials (e.g., a letter or email from a co-author) regarding the percentage of the candidate's contribution toward the work.

In making its evaluations, the peer committee will examine the following materials in tandem with the above criteria:

- a. The individual's self-evaluations and annual reports
- b. Previous evaluations by the peer committee, chair, and dean
- c. Publications of a book(s), book chapter(s) and/or article(s)
- d. Papers delivered at professional meetings or in other academic settings, including refereed papers, invited presentations, and presentations for scholarly panels
- e. Editorial work for a scholarly journal or press
- f. External or intramural grants to support scholarly research or curricular development (including those that were submitted but not ultimately funded)
- g. Professional non-peer reviewed writings, such as an on-line blog, book reviews, or editorials
- h. Other evidence of scholarly growth or contribution

## **Service**

The peer committee may distinguish between two types of service: (1) “*applied scholarship*” or “*outreach*” (as when using one’s philosophical education in giving talks, writing articles, or providing consultation for a non-philosophical audience or community), and (2) *other professional activities* not involving specific philosophical training (such as serving on various university and community committees and projects). In making its evaluations, the peer committee will examine the following materials in tandem with the above criteria:

- a. The individual’s self-evaluations and annual reports
- b. Previous evaluations by the peer committee, chair and dean
- c. Contributions to departmental governance, planning, and programs through participation in department discussions, committee work and taking on specific tasks
- d. Contributions to college and university governance, planning, and programs through committee work and taking on specific tasks
- e. Serving as faculty advisor for a student or other university organization
- f. Community service related to one’s academic interests. This may take local, regional, national, and international forms.
- g. Professional contributions to national, regional, or local associations, such as chairing panels, reviewing manuscripts, acting as a respondent at conferences, or serving as an officer in such an association
- h. Participation in interdisciplinary initiatives with other faculty members or units on campus that extend beyond teaching or research arenas (e.g., participating in a focus or planning group or community-oriented outreach project, etc.)
- i. Exceptional service for which one does not receive released time from teaching or compensation may also be recognized

### **External Evaluation**

For tenure and promotion, external letters of evaluation from experts in the candidate’s discipline will be provided. The department chair will solicit letters in accordance with University of Maine procedures.

## **E. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

**Professor:** A person having the rank of Professor will have sustained and developed all of the expectations listed for an Associate Professor with regard to teaching, advising, research, and service. For a faculty member to be promoted from Associate Professor to Professor, he or she must demonstrate significant scholarly contributions made since achieving the rank of Associate Professor. The rank of Professor will be awarded only as a result of evidence of professional distinction and significant contribution to the field of philosophy. The Professor must have a national and/or international reputation in their

areas of specialization as assessed by departmental and outside evaluators. The department does not require that a candidate for promotion to Professor have published a book.

Under the terms of the Union contract, the peer committee is responsible for evaluating all faculty members and for evaluating faculty members for promotion to the rank of Professor.

In making evaluations of tenure-track faculty members for promotion to Professor, the peer committee will consider the factors listed below.

### **Teaching**

The department places a high priority on teaching. It looks to its members to have developed a repertoire of courses that address both areas of specialization and the overall needs of the department. The candidate for Professor should show sustained evidence of high-quality teaching and advising. The expectations and measurements for effectiveness in these areas are similar to the requirements for consideration for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The specific materials and criteria considered when evaluating teaching and advising mirror those of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (as itemized in section D above).

### **Research**

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires that a candidate demonstrate professional distinction and significant contribution to the field of philosophy. The candidate must have a national and/or international reputation in their areas of specialization as assessed by departmental and outside evaluators. In general, there is an expectation that since being tenured, the candidate will have continued the level and rate of publication and research productivity outlined in the criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The department of philosophy does not require the publication of a book for promotion to Professor; if a book was published post-tenure and is included for consideration in the application for promotion to Professor, it will hold the weight described in section D above. The materials and criteria considered when evaluating research mirror those of Associate Professor (as itemized in section D above).

### **Service**

The department expects candidates applying for promotion to Professor to have demonstrated a continuing engagement with service activities. The peer committee may distinguish between two types of service: (1) “*applied scholarship*” or “*outreach*” (as when using one’s philosophical education in giving talks, writing articles, and providing consultation for a non-philosophical audience or community), and (2) *other professional activities* not involving specific philosophical training (such as serving on various university and community committees and projects). The materials and criteria considered when evaluating service mirror those for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (as itemized in section D above).

### **External Evaluation**

For promotion to Professor, external letters of evaluation from experts in the candidate’s discipline will be provided. The department chair will solicit letters in accordance with University of Maine procedures.

## F. POST-TENURE REVIEW

Tenured Associate Professors and Professors as well as Lecturers are subject to peer reviews at four-year intervals following tenure (or achievement of just-cause protection, for Lecturers). They are expected to show evidence of active, productive engagement in research, teaching, and service in the case of tenured faculty members and teaching and service in the case of lecturers. As required by the AFUM contract, the department has developed standards governing post-tenure review that are different from those used for tenure and promotion.

The review determines whether individuals are performing their job satisfactorily. Satisfactory performance does not require excellence, nor does it necessitate the same level of accomplishment that is expected for tenure and promotion reviews. The following are the guidelines used in the Department of Philosophy to measure “satisfactory” performance for the purposes of post-tenure review. Tenured faculty members have performed their job satisfactorily if they have performed satisfactorily in each of the three areas of research, teaching, and service. Lecturers have performed their job satisfactorily if they have performed satisfactorily in the areas of teaching and service. A tenured faculty member qualifies for an “above satisfactory” rating if they achieve an “above satisfactory” review in at least two of the three categories of research, teaching and service. For a lecturer to qualify for an “above satisfactory” rating, teaching performance must be above satisfactory.

### Research

It is expected that each faculty member will have demonstrated on-going research activity during the previous four years. **Satisfactory** activity requires *at least one* of the following:

- Two peer-reviewed articles accepted for publication (To be considered as “accepted,” articles must be either published (in-print or online), forthcoming, or accepted with only minor revisions. If a manuscript is forthcoming or accepted with minor revisions, a letter to this effect from an editor must accompany submission of the work.)
- A peer-reviewed book in philosophy accepted for publication (To be considered as “accepted,” a book manuscript must be published, forthcoming, or accepted with minor revision. If forthcoming or accepted with minor revision, a letter to this effect from an editor must accompany submission of the work.)
- Two professional conference presentations or workshops
- Two professional publications that are not peer-reviewed, such as invited book reviews, accepted for publication
- Two articles submitted to a peer-reviewed journal
- Editing a professional volume that has been accepted for publication
- Evidence of an extended work-in-progress being advanced
- Receipt of an extra-mural grant for philosophical research

A case for higher merit in the category of research can be made on the basis of the following:



- The faculty member has gone beyond the criteria set above for satisfactory research activity by publishing additional articles or books, giving additional conference presentations, or editing multiple volumes.
- The faculty member has received an academic award from their peers for their research.

### Teaching

It is expected that each faculty member will have demonstrated an on-going commitment to teaching during the previous four years. **Satisfactory** activity requires the following:

- Offering the courses in the curricular rotation for which the individual member is responsible and/or that the department needs fulfilled
- Near or above the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences averages on student evaluation statistics
- Effective support of assigned advisees
- Absence of substantial and well-founded complaints and concerns raised in writing by students against a member's teaching

A case for higher merit in the category of teaching can be made on the basis of criteria such as the following:

- Creation and implementation of new courses that meet Department needs
- Directing students in service-learning or internship activities
- Participating in Honors or graduate committees
- Preparing students for publishing in undergraduate philosophy journals or for participating in conferences
- Extended work with student advisees or in mentoring students
- Exceptionally positive student evaluations of classroom teaching

### Service

It is expected that each faculty member will have demonstrated an on-going commitment to service during the previous four years. **Satisfactory** activity would include at least *two* of the following:

- Sustained substantial participation on a university or college committee or participation in a number of committees with smaller levels of commitment
- Membership on the Faculty Senate
- Cooperation and collegiality in the carrying out the business of the Department
- Professional service such as: evaluating manuscripts, being an officer in a professional society, serving on the editorial board of a journal, or being the editor of a journal or book series
- Service to the community such as: writing newspaper editorials, publishing on philosophy in popular media, writing a philosophy blog aimed at popular audience outside philosophy, giving talks to community organizations on philosophical topics, doing philosophical/ethics consulting, directing outreach activities for K-12 students related to philosophy
- Serving as a faculty advisor to a student organization

A case for higher merit in the category of service can be made on the basis of criteria such as the following:

- The faculty member has gone beyond the criteria set above for satisfactory service activity by engaging in multiple service activities.
- The faculty member has been involved with a committee assignment requiring an unusually extended time commitment.
- The faculty member's service is shown to attract students to the major or to attract positive media attention to the Philosophy Department.

All of these criteria of satisfactory performance are subject to qualification due to extenuating circumstances.

The Department recognizes that a substantial part of the Chair's energies is devoted to service related to the interests of the Department and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. While the Chair is subject to the same criteria of satisfactory performance as all other members of the Department, particular attention to the satisfactory performance of the Chair's responsibilities is appropriate and subject to the Dean's own assessment.