

Philosophy Department Bylaws and Policies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREAMBLE	1
I. The Faculty.	
A. Membership.....	1
B. Voting faculty.....	1
C. Responsibilities.....	1
II. The Officers.	
A. The Chairperson.	
1. Role.....	1
2. Responsibilities.....	2
3. Ex officio.....	2
4. Term.....	2
5. Election.....	2
6. Annual review.....	3
7. Vote of Confidence.....	3
B. Acting Chairperson.	
1. Less than a semester.....	4
2. More than a semester.....	4
C. The Assistant Chairperson. .	
1. Role.....	4
2. Responsibilities.....	5
3. Term.....	5
D. The Philosophy Advisement Coordinator	
1. Role.....	5
2. Voting member of Undergraduate Committee.....	5
3. Appointment and Term.....	5
III. The Standing Committees.	
A. The Undergraduate Committee	
1. Membership.....	5
2. Responsibilities.....	6
B. Personnel Committee.	
1. Membership.....	6
2. Terms.....	6
3. Election.....	6
4. Responsibilities.....	6
C. Annual Merit Review Committee.	
1. Membership.....	7
2. Terms.....	7

3. Chair.....	7
4. Election.....	7
5. Responsibilities.....	7
D. Planning Committee	
1. Membership.....	7
2. Responsibilities.....	8
E. Library Committee	
1. Membership.....	8
2. Responsibility.....	8
IV. Other Committees, Subcommittees, and Appointments.	
A. Ad hoc committees.....	8
B. Subcommittees.....	8
C. Advisor to the Philosophy Club.....	8
D. Colloquium Coordinator.....	8
E. Parliamentarian.....	9
V. Departmental Representatives.	
A. Appointed Representatives.....	9
B. Elected Representatives.....	9
VI. Meetings.	
A. Meetings of the Department.	
1. Regular meetings.....	9
2. Special meetings.....	9
3. Agenda items.....	9
4. Agenda for meeting.....	10
5. Rules of order.....	10
B. Committees and Subcommittees.....	10
VII. Procedures.	
A. For Hiring New Faculty.	
1. - 5.....	10
B. For Annual Merit Review of Tenured and Tenure-track faculty.....	10
C. For Recommendations Concerning Retention of Faculty.....	12
D. For Recommendations Concerning Promotion of Faculty.	
1. - 11.....	13
E. For Recommendations Concerning Tenure for Faculty.	
1. - 6.....	14
F. For Resolving Conflicts and Settling Grievances.	
1. Of Students.....	15
2. Of Faculty Members.....	16
G. For Determining Recipients of Sabbatical Leaves.	
1. Eligibility.....	16
2. Obligations.....	17

3. Notification of eligibility.....	17
4. Application.....	17
5. Personnel Committee Review.....	17
6. Chair Review and Transmittal.....	17
VIII. Student Organizations.	
A. The Philosophy Club.....	18
IX. Adoption and Implementation.	
A. Two-thirds.....	18
B. Supersecession.....	18
C. No ex post facto.....	18
X. Amendment Procedure	
A. Two-thirds.....	18
B. Two readings.....	18
1. First.....	18
2. Second.....	18
3. Changes.....	18
XI. Departmental Policy Statements.	
A. Policy statements.....	19
B. Simple majority.....	19
C. Policies as Appendices.....	19
Appendix I: Responsibilities of the Chair.	
• Administration.....	20
• Information.....	20
• Leadership.....	21
Appendix II: Policies	
Policy 1. Faculty Profile.....	22
Policy 2. Evaluation of Faculty.....	22
Policy 4. Open Salary Information.....	27
Policy 5. Student Involvement.....	27
Policy 6. Sabbatical Leave.....	27
Policy 7. Student Appeal of Grades.....	29
Policy 8. Emeritus Status.....	30
Policy 9. Robert A Gray Memorial Award.....	31
Policy 10. Objectives of Baccalaureate Degree in Phil.....	32
Policy 11. Senior Assignment.....	33
Policy 12. Summer Program.....	35
Policy 13. Overload Teaching Assignments.....	39
Policy 15. Faculty evaluation for Annual Review and Salary Adjustments.....	41
Policy 16. Recommendations for Tenure and Promotion in Academic Rank.....	46

Policy 17. Contents of Personnel Files.....	48
Policy 18. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion and Tenure.....	50
Policy 19. Carol A. Keene Scholarship in Philosophy.....	58
Policy 20. John Mareing Philosophy Scholarship.....	60
Policy 21. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	62

April 1975
Amended 1981
Amended 1995

PREAMBLE

The department of Philosophical Studies is a unit of the College of Arts and Sciences at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. As such, its principal purpose is to foster humane learning in a free, pluralistic, democratic society. By means of its special philosophic competencies and contributions, it strives to discern and to give expression to the highest and deepest of human values and skills, and to reflect these in the manner in which it fulfills all of its responsibilities. Specific responsibilities are detailed in the Operating Papers of the College of Arts and Sciences and in the Bylaws of the Department of Philosophical Studies which follow.

I. The Faculty

A. Membership.

The Faculty of the Department of Philosophical Studies shall consist of those having an academic title in the Department of Philosophical Studies, such as Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Lecturer, or Emeritus.

B. Voting Faculty.

The voting faculty shall consist of those full-time members of the Department of Philosophical Studies who are budgeted for at least 50% of their salary in the School of Humanities, and Emeritai or Emeriti. All voting members of the Department who are on leave, with or without pay, retain full voting rights, but it is the responsibility of the individual member to make arrangements to exercise those rights. In addition, the Chairperson of the Philosophy Club, representing the undergraduate students, shall have full voting rights in all matters regarding which the Department acts as a whole. The voting faculty may, upon two-thirds vote, extend voting rights to other individuals as it sees fit.

C. Responsibilities.

Subject to the pertinent Operating Papers and policies of the College of Arts and Sciences, the responsibilities of the faculty include teaching, engaging in research and creative activities, providing service to the community, and participating in the governance of the Department and the University. This latter includes the responsibilities of determining and reviewing all academic policies of the Department and all other matters affecting its welfare.

II. The Officers

A. The Chairperson

1. Role. The Chairperson is the chief academic and administrative officer of the Department. The Chairperson is a member of the Department selected to serve as a representative of, and spokesperson for, the Department, its faculty, and its students. In reaching any decision, the Chairperson must weigh and balance a broad range of relevant interests and responsibilities, many of which are often in conflict with one another. Among the competing interests and responsibilities are those to faculty, to program, to general education, to other programs, to

students, to the College and University at large, and to the community. Moreover, there are often difficult issues regarding the balancing of teaching, research and service. In fulfilling these responsibilities, the Chairperson also functions as an officer of the College of Arts and Sciences, appointed with the approval of the Dean, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Trustees.

2. Responsibilities. Specific responsibilities of the Chairperson are detailed in Appendix I. They may be summarized here by saying that the Chairperson mediates between the Department, on the one hand, and the College and other University offices and external entities, on the other. It is the capacity of the Chairperson to represent the Department to the College and University administration that enables the Chairperson to represent the University and College administration to the Department.

3. Ex officio. The Department Chairperson is an ex officio member with vote on all Department committees, except the Personnel Committee.

4. Term. The normal term of office for a Department Chairperson is three years. Ordinarily, the term of office begins on July 1 or August 16. No person may serve as Department Chairperson for more than three terms consecutively.

5. Election. The election for the Chairperson will be initiated no later than the Fall Term prior to the expiration of the Chairperson's three-year term.

- a. The Personnel Committee of the Department asks each voting member of the Department to nominate up to three persons for the office of Chairperson. If voting members wish to nominate anyone not then on the faculty, they will cast one of their votes simply for "outsider."
- b. The Personnel Committee of the Department declares the three persons (more if necessary because of a tie vote or less if no more are nominated) who have been nominated most frequently and who are not unwilling to serve to be nominees. All "outsider" votes are counted together.
- c. The Personnel Committee of the Department asks each voting member of the Department to vote by secret ballot for up to two of the three nominees. One nominee may be "outsider."
- d. The Personnel Committee of the Department counts the votes. The two nominees receiving the largest number of votes become faculty candidates for Chairperson. If all three nominees should receive the same number of votes or if there is a tie for second in the number of votes, all three nominees will be faculty candidates for Chairperson. One faculty candidate for Chairperson may be "outsider."
- e. The names of two (or three in the case of tie votes) faculty candidates for Chairperson, together with the tally of votes on the final ballot, are submitted by the Personnel Committee of the Department to the Dean and also, as a matter of information, to the faculty of the Department.
- f. If the Dean chooses "outsider" to be Chairperson, and assuming the person sought is already under the employ of the University, the Personnel Committee of the Department will serve as a Nominating Committee, whose function it is to nominate to the faculty for Chairperson some person not then on the faculty. Any "outsider" so nominated must

receive both a majority of "yes" votes of the voting faculty of the Department in a secret mail ballot election conducted by the Personnel Committee of the Department and the approval of the Dean. If the nominee is turned down at either step, the Nominating Committee nominates another "outsider." This procedure is repeated until a nominee is selected to be Chairperson or until there is a petition signed by over 50% of the faculty to start the selection procedure again so that an "insider" could be nominated.

- g. If the Dean chooses "outsider" to be Chairperson, and wishes to seek a person not currently under the employ of the University, then the Department will treat the case as having a new position.

6. Annual Review. An annual review of the performance of the Chairperson will take place as follows:

- a. Each year during the Spring Term, an evaluation form will be distributed by the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS). CAS will collect and tally the results.
- b. After CAS distributes the evaluation results to departmental faculty through the Department's representative on the CAS Personnel Committee, and after the Chair of the Department Personnel Committee has verified that no information on the original evaluation forms has been left out of the typed summaries, the Department Personnel Committee will meet to discuss them and to fulfill its advisory responsibilities. The Personnel Committee will meet, independently of the Chair, to formulate a summary of faculty opinion, and to add such comments as it deems advisable. The results will be communicated to the Dean, the Chair, and the Department faculty.

7. Vote of Confidence. A faculty vote of confidence concerning each Department Chairperson will take place as follows:

- a. Proceedings for a vote of confidence will be instituted upon the receipt by the Personnel Committee of the Department of a petition signed by one-third or more of the voting members of the Department. This vote is conducted by a secret mail ballot of all voting faculty members of the Department except the Department Chairperson offering three choices (Approval, Disapproval, No Opinion) and inviting comments. The Personnel Committee will present to the Dean, the Chairperson and the Department faculty the results of the balloting and a summary of the comments.
- b. If 50% or more of the ballots register Disapproval, the Personnel Committee will recommend that the Dean ask the Chairperson to resign from office. Should the Chair not resign, the Personnel Committee will recommend that the Dean vacate the Chair. The Committee will also recommend an Acting Chairperson to the Dean to serve until such time as a new Chairperson can be elected.

B. Acting Chairperson.

An Acting Chairperson is required in such cases as the temporary non-availability (e.g., illness or vacation), leave, or resignation, or removal from office of the Chairperson. When appointed in accordance with the standards and procedures which follow, an Acting-Chairperson serves with the full authority of the office of Chairperson.

1. One Semester. For periods not longer than one academic semester, the appointment of an Acting Chairperson may simply be recommended by the Chairperson with the concurrence of the Dean, or by the Dean if the Chairperson is unable to act. In either event, an individual so recommended to the Provost must be a regular full-time member of the Department.

2. Longer. For periods in excess of one academic semester an Acting Chairperson is selected in the following manner:

- a. At the appropriate time, the Personnel Committee of the Department asks each voting member of the Department to nominate up to three persons for the post of Acting Chairperson. Nominees are restricted to current full-time members of the Department who hold tenure.
- b. The Personnel Committee declares the three persons (more if necessary because of a tie vote or less if no more are nominated) who have been nominated most frequently and who are not unwilling to serve to be the Department's nominees.
- c. The Personnel Committee asks each voting member of the Department to vote by secret ballot for up to two of the three nominees.
- d. The Personnel Committee counts the ballots. The two nominees receiving the largest number of votes become the Department's candidates for Acting Chairperson. If all three nominees should receive the same number of votes or if there is a tie for second in the number of votes, all three nominees will be the Department's candidates for Acting Chairperson.
- e. The names of the two (or three in the case of tie votes) Departmental candidates for Acting Chairperson, together with the tally of votes on the final ballot, are submitted by the Personnel Committee to the current Chairperson, if available, or to the Dean if the Chairperson is not available. The Personnel Committee also submits this information to the voting members of the Department as a matter of information. The Chairperson, if available, selects one of the Department candidates for recommendation to the Dean. If the Chairperson is not available, the Dean makes this selection. In either event, the Dean may recommend the candidate selected to the Provost for appointment as Acting Chairperson for a specified term, or the Dean may decline to accept the candidate so recommended or selected. If either the Dean or the Provost reject all candidates presented to them, the Personnel Committee begins the nominating process anew.

C. The Assistant Chairperson.

1. Role. The Assistant Chairperson is a member of the Department, appointed by the Chairperson to share some of the routine responsibilities of the Chairperson, and to advise and assist the

Chairperson on matters relating to the administration of the Department, and to represent the Chairperson at meetings when so designated.

2. Responsibilities. In addition to other responsibilities as a member of the faculty, the responsibilities normally delegated by the Chairperson to the Assistant Chairperson are as follows:

- a. To be in charge of the scheduling of classes. In so doing, it is the responsibility of the Assistant Chairperson to determine the preferences and needs of the faculty and students, regarding what courses are to be offered.
- b. To assist in the evaluation of part-time faculty. This shall include such things as classroom visitation, writing annual evaluation letters of each part-time faculty member's teaching performance, and providing copies of such letters to the Chairperson and the Dean.
- c. To maintain a record of the use of reassigned time for research and public service and to advise the Chairperson on this matter.

3. Term. The term of office is one year, and the Assistant Chairperson may succeed himself or herself twice.

D. The Philosophy Advisement Coordinator

1. Role. The Philosophy Advisement Coordinator coordinates between Philosophy majors and minors, CAS advising, the Department, and other University units. Typical duties of the Philosophy Advisement Coordinator include mentoring, recruitment, advising the Department on programmatic issues, and reporting to the Department on numbers of Philosophy majors and minors, trends, etc.

2. Undergraduate Committee. The Philosophy Advisement Coordinator shall be a voting member of the Department's Undergraduate Committee.

3. Appointment and Term. The Philosophy Advisement Coordinator is appointed by the Department Chair from among the tenure-line members of the Department. The normal term is two years. The Philosophy Advisement Coordinator may serve additional terms.

III. The Standing Committees.

A. The Undergraduate Committee.

1. Membership. The Undergraduate Committee shall consist of four tenure-line faculty members appointed by the Department Chair for one-year, renewable terms. The Chair of the Undergraduate Committee shall be appointed by the Department Chair from among the Committee members. The composition of the Undergraduate Committee shall include (these may overlap):

- a) The Philosophy Advisement Coordinator.

- b) At least one member with significant experience in the Religious Studies minor.
- c) At least one member with significant experience in online teaching.

2. Responsibilities. The Undergraduate Committee has the principal responsibility of recommending policy to the Department concerning the Undergraduate Philosophy Program and other courses offered by the Department. Typically, this responsibility includes, although this is not limited to, the following:

- a. The initiation of changes in the Philosophy Programs.
 - b. The approval of proposals to add, drop, or alter courses offered by the Department (Form 90s).
 - c. The approval of any initial offering by a faculty member of any course in which instruction is to be conducted fully or partially online.
- d. The approval of rental textbooks for courses offered by the Department.

B. Personnel Committee

1. Membership. The Personnel Committee consists of three tenured voting members of the Department elected at large by the voting members of the Department.

2. Terms. Two members will be elected to serve one-year terms. One person will be elected to serve a two-year term, the first year as Chair-elect, and will serve during the second year as Chairperson of the committee. (During the first year of implementation, the candidate elected for a two-year term will serve as chairperson for two years.) The terms run from July 1 to June 30.

3. Election. During the spring semester, the Chairperson of the Personnel Committee will solicit nominations for membership. The slate of those nominated and willing to serve will be sent by secret mail ballot to the voting faculty of the Department. The candidate with the highest number of votes will serve the two-year term, and the candidate with the second highest number of votes will serve the one year term. If necessary, alternates will also be elected by secret mail ballot. Under extraordinary circumstances, the Chair of the committee will proceed collegially to insure the integrity of the election process. In cases of a tie, the chair of the committee will break ties. During the first year of implementation, the Chairperson of the Department will be responsible for conducting an election in a suitable and appropriate manner.

4. Responsibilities. Various University, College and Department policies require or allow for a committee within the Department with responsibility to review and make recommendations concerning important personnel matters, such as decisions involving salary, retention, promotion, tenure, and sabbatical leaves. In general, the procedure is for the committee to submit a written recommendation with rationale to the Chairperson of the Department, who will forward the report to the Dean, along with the Chairperson's own recommendation and rationale. The committee is also responsible for conducting elections as specified elsewhere in these Bylaws. The responsibilities of the Personnel Committee include but are not limited to the following:

- a. To provide advice on matters about which the Chairperson of the Department solicits counsel.

- b. To review sabbatical applications from eligible members of the Department and to submit appropriate recommendations to the Chairperson of the Department, in light of applicable policies. A written report, with the recommendations and supporting rationale, shall be forwarded to the Chairperson of the Department, who will then transmit the report to the appropriate College authority, along with the Chairperson's own report, with recommendations and rationales.
- c. To review the files of candidates for tenure, promotion, and retention, and to submit appropriate recommendations to the Chairperson of the Department, in light of applicable policies. A written report, with the recommendations and with rationales, shall be forwarded to the Chairperson of the Department.
- d. To conduct the election for the Chairperson of the Department.
- e. To conduct the annual review of the Chairperson of the Department.
- f. To conduct the election of the Annual Merit Review Committee.

C. Annual Merit Review Committee

1. Membership. The annual merit review committee consists of three voting members of the department. One is the chair-elect of the personnel committee. The other two are elected at large from among the tenured and untenured voting members of the department.
2. Terms. Members serve one year terms, from July 1 to June 30.
3. Chair. The committee elects its own chair.
4. Election. During the spring semester, the chair of the personnel committee will solicit nominations for membership. The slate of those members nominated and willing to serve will be sent by secret mail ballot to voting members of the department. The two candidates with the highest number of votes will become members of the committee. It is hoped that at least one untenured member will be elected to the committee. In cases of a tie, the chair of the personnel committee will break the tie.
5. Responsibilities. The primary responsibilities of the annual merit review committee will be to review the annual merit review letters of faculty written by the chair and the annual merit review letter of the chair written by the personnel committee. The committee shall receive drafts of such letters, along with supporting material provided by the faculty member being evaluated. In accordance with procedures for such reviews written elsewhere in this document, the committee shall provide appropriate feedback and recommendations.

D. Planning Committee.

1. Membership. The Planning Committee consists of the Undergraduate Advisor, the Assistant Chair, the Chairperson of the Personnel Committee, and one at-large representative from among the voting members of the Department. The at-large representative will be elected for a two year term in the Spring semester, with duties being assumed for the Fall semester. The Chair will be responsible for conducting the election.

2. Responsibilities. The Planning Committee is advisory to the Chairperson on matters pertaining to planning, resource allocation, or other relevant issues.

E. Library Committee

1. Membership. The Library Committee shall consist of three faculty members appointed by the Department Chair for three-year, renewable terms. The terms will be staggered in one-year intervals so that, in any given year, there will be a past chair, a present chair, and a chair-elect. (During the first year of implementation, 2006-2007, one member will begin serving a two-year term and another member, the chair-elect, will begin serving a three-year term.) The terms run from July 1 to June 30. The Chair of the Committee shall be appointed by the Department Chair from among the members of the Committee.

2. Responsibilities. The Library Committee has the responsibility of serving as department liaison to Lovejoy Library. It shall, at least once a year, solicit requests from the Department, compile a list of requests to the Library, and report to the Department on Library acquisitions.

IV. Other Committees, Subcommittees, and Appointments.

A. Ad hoc committees.

The Department Chairperson shall be empowered to appoint such ad hoc committees as are, from time to time, needed. Such need may be determined by the Chairperson alone or by the Department as a whole. Such committees shall have a clearly written charge and shall dissolve when the purpose for which they were appointed has been accomplished. Where appropriate, such committees shall have student membership with full voting rights.

B. Subcommittees.

The Chairperson of any of the various Departmental committees shall be empowered to appoint subcommittees as the need arises. Such need may be determined by the appropriate chairperson alone or by the committee as a whole. Such subcommittees shall have a clearly written charge and shall dissolve when the purpose for which they were appointed has been accomplished. Members of subcommittees need not be members of the parent committee. Where appropriate, such subcommittees shall have student membership with full voting rights.

C. Advisor to the Philosophy Club.

The Department Chairperson shall appoint an advisor to the Philosophy Club every fall with the advice of the Philosophy Club as expressed through its Chairperson. The Advisor shall be the liaison officer between the Department and the Philosophy Club. Members of the Club have the right to petition the Department Chairperson, through the Chairperson of the Philosophy Club, to replace the Philosophy Club Advisor.

D. Colloquium Coordinator.

The Department Chairperson shall appoint a Colloquium Coordinator every spring for the

following year. The Coordinator's duties shall include the organization and scheduling of regular faculty colloquia.

E. Parliamentarian.

The Department Chairperson shall appoint a Parliamentarian every fall.

V. Departmental Representatives.

From time to time the Department is required or requested to provide representatives from among its faculty or students to serve in various posts, offices, and committees. Such representatives allow the Department's voice to be heard in matters which affect its interests, and they permit its expertise to be made available for the larger business and purposes of the University.

A. Appointed Representatives.

When the Department is called upon to appoint or to recommend an individual as its representative, the Chairperson acts on behalf of the Department in making the appointment or recommendation. Student appointments are to be made with the advice of the Chairperson of the Philosophy Club or the Chairperson of the Graduate Caucus as appropriate.

B. Elected Representatives.

When the Department is called upon to elect an individual as its representative, whether at a Departmental Meeting or by mail ballot, ordinarily there will be a round of nominations, followed by an election, the latter to be conducted from among those nominated and willing to serve, and to be decided by a majority of the votes cast. It is the responsibility of the Chairperson to conduct these nominations and elections.

VI. Meetings.

A. Meetings of the Department

1. Regular meetings. Regular meetings shall be called by the presiding officer, who shall be the Chairperson or Acting Chairperson of the Department. In the absence of the Chairperson or Acting Chairperson, the Assistant Chairperson will serve as presiding officer. At least one regular meeting per semester will be held during the fall and spring semesters of the academic year. Regular meetings will normally be announced one month in advance.
2. Special meetings. A meeting may also be called by the presiding officer at any time, and shall be called when so directed by a petition signed by a majority of the voting members of the Department.
3. Agenda items. Individuals wishing to submit items for the agenda of a regular meeting shall normally present them to the presiding officer at least two weeks prior to the time of the meeting.

4. Agenda. The presiding officer shall normally provide the voting members of the Department with an agenda at least one week prior to the time of the meeting.

5. Rules of Order. Meetings of the Department shall be conducted in accordance with the principles of Robert's Rules of Order. Voting members who must be absent from a meeting may submit a formal request to the presiding officer that the vote on any item on the agenda be by mail ballot. Such a request must be submitted before the meeting convenes, and will be proposed to the members present for a decision. One-third of those present voting in favor shall suffice for requiring a mail ballot. Proxy voting will not be allowed.

B. Meetings of Departmental Committees and Subcommittees.

Committees and subcommittees of the Department shall meet at the call of the Chairperson of the respective committee or subcommittee, or at the call of the Department Chairperson.

VII. Procedures.

A. For Hiring New Faculty.

The following procedures are to be supplemented in this Department, by provision, wherever possible, for student participation in the interview and hiring process.

1. The Department Chairperson informs the faculty of that Department that an opening for a new faculty member exists. Suggestions are solicited from them and the opening is publicized through appropriate means.
2. The Chairperson secures material from the candidates and makes their dossiers available for faculty inspection.
3. The Chairperson confers with faculty of the Department to determine which candidates seem most promising and arranges for interviews on campus with them.
4. The Chairperson solicits written evaluations from the faculty concerning those candidates who have been interviewed. Student representatives may also participate.
5. The Chairperson, acting on the advice of the faculty, makes recommendations to the Dean. With the approval of the Dean, the Chairperson makes a job offer to the candidate. If the Dean disapproves of a candidate, he or she will notify the Department Chairperson in writing of his or her reasons.

B. For Annual Merit Review of Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty.

1. At least once a year (usually in the spring semester) the Chairperson is required to conduct an individual personnel conference with each member of the Department. The purpose at this conference is to review the professional activities of the individual faculty member, both in the past and for the foreseeable future; to discuss the past actions of the Chairperson insofar as they bear on the particular faculty member, and to anticipate future personnel actions.

In accord with the CAS "Faculty Performance Evaluation and Salary Increase Plan,"

either during the annual conference or at another mutually agreed upon time, the Chair and the faculty member shall engage in a goal-setting discussion for the coming year. Tenured faculty may choose to establish goals once every three years. The extent to which these goals are achieved is relevant to future evaluation and salary adjustments. Goals should be established which are consistent with the individual faculty member's own needs and interests, sensitive to the stage of his or her career, and appropriate in light of the mission of the University, College, and Department. They should be challenging but realistic.

Also in accord with the CAS policy, either during the annual conference or at another mutually agreed upon time, the Chair and the faculty member must reach a mutually agreeable understanding of "percentage of effort" to be assigned for the categories of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. The percentage of effort allocated to teaching may range from 50% to 80%, while that allocated to scholarly and creative activity may range from 10% to 40%; and that allocated to service may range from 10% to 40%.

Under special circumstances, as explained in the CAS policy, faculty members may request an alternative set of percentages, subject to the approval of the Chair and the Dean. Moreover, although the percentages will generally not be changed once the evaluation period has begun, under certain unanticipated circumstances adjustments may be made with the mutual consent of the faculty member, the Chair, and the Dean.

An item of explicit attention for non-tenured members of the Department will be the matter of retention and prospects for a positive tenure decision.

2. Following annual individual personnel conferences, the Chair will prepare a written summary of the main items of discussion and a recommendation for a merit rating (L0, L1, L2, or L3) in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service, in accord with the criteria set forth in Philosophy Department Policy #15. The summary and recommendation will be submitted to the Annual Merit Review Committee for their review along with the Annual Faculty Activities Summary and supporting materials provided by the faculty member. After an appropriate period of time for their review, the Chair will discuss with the Annual Merit Review Committee their recommendations. Following this discussion, the Chair will revise the summary and merit ratings if necessary. When the Chair's ratings remain inconsistent with the recommendations of the committee, this should be clearly stated in the letter. A copy of the letter will be provided to the individual faculty member who will be offered an opportunity to suggest corrections and alterations, or to add a supplementary statement. A copy of the letter, including any revisions, and if applicable any supplementary statement, will then be included in the individual's Department, College, and University personnel file. The Chair will forward the evaluation letter to the Dean in a manner consistent with the deadlines established by the college.

3. Salary increases will be calculated according to procedures articulated in the CAS "Faculty Performance Evaluation and Salary Increase Plan."

4. Any faculty member may have at any time a personnel conference of this type with the Chairperson. Faculty members are also encouraged to add relevant material to their personnel files at any time, and to submit updated vitae at least on an annual basis.

C. For Recommendations Concerning Retention of Faculty.

In order to reach a decision on the retention of non-tenured members of the faculty, the Chair will solicit the recommendations of either the Personnel Committee (first, second, and sixth retention reviews) or all tenured members of the Department (third, midpoint, and fifth retention reviews). All recommendations shall be based on the candidate's record in teaching, research, and service, in accordance with departmental criteria, as well as programmatic needs.

The procedures are as follows:

For the first retention review, the candidate shall submit two peer evaluations of teaching and a CV for review by the personnel committee and the Chair. The Personnel Committee will provide the Chair with a recommendation of retain or not retain. Having reviewed the committee's recommendation as well as the peer review of teaching and CV, the Chair will explain in writing his or her recommendation. The recommendation will be communicated to the individual concerned, and a report will be submitted to the Dean of the College.

For the second retention review, the candidate will submit teaching materials (Student Evaluation of teaching, peer evaluations of teaching, one course portfolio, and spreadsheet with weighted averages), CV, and service data into the promotion and tenure dossier. The dossier will be reviewed by the Personnel Committee, who will provide the Chair with a form that indicates the weighted Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) average and the accumulated points in service and teaching (as outlined in Policy 18). Having reviewed the Personnel Committee form and the submitted material, the Chair will explain in writing his or her recommendation. The recommendation will be communicated to the individual concerned, and a report will be submitted to the Dean of the College.

For the third, midpoint, and fifth retention review, the Chair shall distribute the candidate's **full dossier** to all tenured members of the Department, who will be asked to review the dossier and report their judgment in writing by submitting a ballot to the Chair of the Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee will consider the ballots in making their recommendation. The Committee will submit a written report to the Chair, explaining its recommendation. Having reviewed the ballots and the Personnel Committee report as well as the dossier, the Chair will explain in writing his or her recommendation. This report will disclose the principal judgments of the tenured members of the Department, together with the Chair's reasons in any case where the recommendation diverges from the sense of a sizable portion of these voting members of the Department or from the recommendation of the Personnel Committee. The recommendation will be communicated to the individual concerned, and a report will be submitted to the Dean of the College.

For the sixth retention review, the Chair shall distribute the candidate's **full dossier** to the personnel committee. The committee will provide the Chair with a form that indicates the weighted SET average and the accumulated points in research and service along with rankings in each area. In addition, the chair of the personnel committee should meet with the candidate to discuss the formatting of the dossier in preparation for the upcoming tenure review. Having reviewed the Personnel Committee form and the dossier, the Chair will explain in writing his or

her recommendation. The recommendation will be communicated to the individual concerned, and a report will be submitted to the Dean of the College.

During any review, the candidate can request a full review as described for the third, midpoint, and fifth retention review discussed above.

Should the final retention decision during any review be in the negative, the individual shall be given notice in accordance with the applicable principles of the American Association of University Professors and the requirements of University policy. The individual concerned is entitled to an informal explanation of the decision and, if he or she requests, a written statement of the reasons for the action.

D. For Recommendation Concerning Promotion of Faculty.

The University tenure and/or promotion review process is detailed within University policy in the Faculty Handbook [<http://www.siue.edu/provost/fhb/index.shtml>], with review at each level being advisory to the next level.

The departmental procedures are outlined below.

1. When a faculty member first becomes eligible in terms of years in rank to stand for promotion she or he will be notified by the Department Chair by the end of March of the year in which a promotion dossier would be submitted. A faculty member who wishes to stand for promotion in the fall must inform the Department Chair no later than the prior spring semester. Persons who are not eligible for promotion in terms of years in rank, but who have an outstanding record, may choose to stand for promotion, following consultation with the Chair and Dean (Faculty Handbook II.6 [<http://www.siue.edu/provost/fhb/pro2.shtml>]).

2. In the case of a Department Chair who wishes to stand for promotion, the Dean's office must be notified no later than the end of the spring semester prior to submitting a promotion dossier in the fall. The Dean's office will, in consultation with the candidate, select a person to act as chair for the purposes of the promotion review only. This person cannot simultaneously serve as a member of the department's Personnel Committee.

3. The candidate will present the Chair with a list of 3 names of external reviewers of the candidate's scholarly work and the Personnel Committee will prepare a list of 5 names of external reviewers of the candidate's scholarly work. The complete list of eight names shall be given to the candidate, who has the right to strike out two of them. The Chair will secure two external reviewers from the list. The Chair shall then

- Ask the two reviewers for how long and in which capacity they have known the candidate or the candidate's work.
- Provide the two reviewers with a letter containing a brief description of the department and university, the candidate's curriculum vitae, and a sample of scholarly work chosen by the candidate. A part of the sample must be from the period of review.
- Ask the two reviewers to evaluate the candidate's scholarship on the basis of the sample and any other acquaintance with the candidate's work.

In the case of the Chair standing for promotion, the chair of the Personnel Committee will be responsible for compiling the list of reviewers, according to the above procedures, and for soliciting the letters.

4. The candidate shall submit a promotion dossier early in the fall semester. After the candidate submits the dossier, the chair shall add the letters from external reviewers to the dossier.

5. Review of the Dossier. All recommendations for Promotion shall be based on the candidate's record in teaching, research, and service, in accordance with departmental criteria. The Chair shall distribute the candidate's dossier to all tenured members of the Department. Tenured faculty will be asked to review the dossier and report their judgment in writing to the Chair by submitting a ballot. The Personnel Committee will be given these ballots for review, and will consider them in making their recommendation. The Committee will submit a written report to the Chair explaining its recommendation. Having reviewed the ballots and Committee report as well as the dossier, the Chair will explain in writing his or her recommendation. The Chair's report will disclose the principal judgments of the tenured members of the Department and Personnel Committee, together with the Chair's reasons in any case where the recommendation diverges from that of a sizable portion of the tenured faculty, or from that of the Personnel Committee.

6. Before sending the dossier to the College, the Chair is to meet with the promotion candidate to discuss the nature of the departmental recommendations. The candidate will be given an opportunity to submit a rebuttal, or to withdraw from the process before the dossier is submitted to the College. A candidate wishing to submit a rebuttal or to withdraw from the process at a later stage would need to negotiate with the unit handling the process at that stage.

7. The Chair will include the letters from the Personnel Committee and the Chair in the dossier, as well as any letter of rebuttal, and submit it to the Dean of the College. Copies of the letters will be given to the candidate.

E. For Recommendation Concerning Tenure of Faculty

The University tenure and/or promotion review process is detailed within University Policy in the Faculty Handbook [<http://www.siu.edu/provost/fhb/index.shtml>], with review at each level being advisory to the next level.

The departmental procedures are below. Should the final tenure decision be in the negative, the individual shall be given notice in accordance with the applicable principles of the American Association of University Professors and the requirements of University policy. The individual concerned is entitled to an informal explanation of the decision and, if he or she requests, a written statement of the reasons for the action.

1. The Chairperson must advise each candidate eligible for tenure to prepare all evidence of his/her qualifications.

2. The candidate will present the Chair with a list of 3 names of external reviewers of the candidate's scholarly work, and the Personnel Committee will prepare a list of 5 names of external reviewers of the candidate's scholarly work. The complete list of eight names shall be given to the candidate, who has the right to strike out two of them. The Chair will secure two external reviewers from the list. The Chair shall then

- Ask the two reviewers for how long and in which capacity they have known the candidate or the candidate's work.
- Provide the two reviewers with a letter containing a brief description of the department and university, the candidate's curriculum vitae, and a sample of scholarly work chosen by the candidate. A part of the sample must be from the period of review.
- Ask the two reviewers to evaluate the candidate's scholarship on the basis of the sample and any other acquaintance with the candidate's work.

3. The candidate shall submit a tenure dossier early in the fall semester. After the candidate submits the dossier, the chair shall add the letters from external reviewers to the dossier.

4. Review of the Dossier. All recommendations for Tenure shall be based on the candidate's record in teaching, research, and service, in accordance with departmental criteria. The Chair shall distribute the candidate's dossier to all tenured members of the Department. Tenured faculty will be asked to review the dossier and report their judgment in writing to the Chair by submitting a ballot. The Personnel Committee will be given these ballots for review, and will consider them in making their recommendation. The Committee will submit a written report to the Chair explaining its recommendation. Having reviewed the ballots and Committee report as well as the dossier, the Chair will explain in writing his or her recommendation. The Chair's report will disclose the principal judgments of the tenured members of the Department and Personnel Committee, together with the Chair's reasons in any case where the recommendation diverges from that of a sizable portion of the tenured faculty, or from that of the Personnel Committee.

5. Before sending the dossier to the College, the Chair is to meet with the tenure candidate to discuss the nature of the departmental recommendations. The candidate will be given an opportunity to submit a rebuttal.

6. The Chair will include the letters from the Personnel Committee and the Chair in the dossier, as well as any letter of rebuttal, and submit it to the Dean of the College. Copies of the letters will be given to the candidate.

F. For Resolving Conflicts and Settling Grievances.

1. Of Students. Students who believe themselves aggrieved in any way should adhere to the following procedure in order to resolve the difficulty: first, when appropriate, by appealing to the particular instructor or advisor in question; second, failing satisfaction from the instructor or advisor, or in any other case, by appealing to the Department Chairperson; third, failing satisfaction from the Chairperson, by appealing to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

2. Of Faculty Members:

All faculty members should attempt to resolve complaints informally whenever possible, making use of the formal grievance procedure of their department or faculty unit, if one has been previously enacted, the Faculty Ombuds Service, and/or informal resolution, including mediation, if available. – Faculty Grievance Procedure, Personnel Policies, SIUE II 12-19.

- a. Ignoring disrespectful behavior sends a message that it is acceptable or will be tolerated. Some of the following steps may be taken in attempts to resolve conflicts informally:
 - Faculty members are encouraged to address the issue directly with the person(s) involved. If they choose, they may wish to mention the conversation with the Chairperson. This exchange should take place in a private and comfortable area and as soon after the conflict occurs as possible. The focus should be on work issues, and attempts should be made to see the conflict from the other person's point of view
 - If confronting a colleague directly or in private seems to difficult, awkward or stressful, one might elicit the advice, help, or intervention of mentors, chairs, ombudspersons, or other trusted intermediaries. The goal is to work toward a mutually satisfactory solution.
 - It is strongly recommended that one seek help and advice with issues of recurring and malicious disrespect.
- b. Some of the following more formal steps may be taken to resolve grievances:
 - If possible, resolution of grievances should be settled within the department.
 - Each faculty member has a right to seek resolution of his or her grievances from the Department Chairperson.
 - If the aggrieved party finds it too difficult, awkward, or stressful to approach the Chairperson, s/he may seek resolution through the Personnel Committee.
 - Failing satisfaction within the department, a faculty member may appeal to the Dean of the College. An aggrieved party must file a formal complaint in writing to the Dean with a copy to the Chairperson within sixty days of knowledge of the grounds for grievance.
 - If the aggrieved party disagrees with the actions taken at the College level, s/he may file a formal grievance through the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or the Provost's designated representative, in accordance with Faculty Grievance Procedures set forth in SIUE Personnel Policies, SIUE II, 12-19 <http://www.siu.edu/provost/fhb/grievances.shtml>

Policies enacted by the Board of Trustees and the University will be followed in dismissal, grievances, and appeal procedures, in conformity with the principles of the American Association of University Professors guidelines.

G. For Determining Recipients of Sabbatical Leaves.

1. Eligibility. Faculty members on continuing appointment are eligible for full sabbatical leaves for scholarly activity and study in accord with University policy at the end of not less than six

years of full-time service from the initial date of full-time employment or six years of full-time employment from the terminal date of a previous sabbatical leave. Half sabbatical leaves may only be granted after completion of a three-year period of full-time employment or three years after the terminal date of a previous sabbatical leave. Recipients of half sabbatical leaves will be eligible for another half sabbatical leave after three years of full-time employment from the termination date of a previous sabbatical leave, and will be eligible for a full sabbatical leave after six years of full-time employment from the terminal date of a previous sabbatical leave.

2. Obligations. Full sabbatical leaves are normally granted for one semester at full salary or for two semesters at one-half salary. Faculty members who are granted sabbatical leaves shall recognize an obligation, at the termination of the leave, to return to the University for a period of service not less than the equivalent of the duration of the leave. They shall also submit written reports of sabbatical leave accomplishments to the Provost within ninety days of return from leave.

3. Notification. Faculty members who will become eligible for a sabbatical leave shall be notified by their Chairpersons of that fact by April 7 of the academic year prior to the academic year when they will become eligible. After July 1 eligible faculty members shall keep their Chairpersons informed concerning their plans with regard to applying for sabbatical leave.

4. Application. In order to allow for evaluation of proposals for sabbatical leaves by the Chairperson, the Personnel Committee of the Department, and the Dean, formal applications for a sabbatical leave must be submitted to the Chairperson by August 16 of the academic year prior to the academic year in which the leave is to be taken. An application shall describe in specific terms the nature of the proposed activity, and shall provide an estimate of the value of such activity in the professional development of the applicant. Copies shall be forwarded to the Personnel Committee of the Department.

5. Personnel Committee Review. Consistent with the University Calendar and deadlines established by the Dean and the Provost, and usually by September 6, the Personnel Committee shall recommend to approve or disapprove all formal applications for sabbatical leaves submitted by August 16 from faculty members eligible for leave, and submit to the Chairperson of the Department a written report providing a rationale for the recommendations, and where appropriate, a ranking of the proposals with justification.

6. Chair Review and Transmittal. Consistent with the University calendar and deadlines established by the Dean and the Provost, the Chairperson of the Department shall submit to the Dean the following:

- a. A written report expressing the recommendations of the Chairperson, together with a ranking (when required), and a rationale,
- b. A copy of the report of the Personnel Committee,
- c. The sabbatical proposals which have been recommended by either the Chairperson or the Personnel Committee, and,
- d. Appropriate forms.

VIII. Student Organizations.

A. The Philosophy Club.

The Department encourages the existence of a Philosophy Club, the membership of which shall be open to all undergraduate and graduate students. The Club shall be organized in accordance with its own constitution and shall exercise the rights and privileges specified in these Bylaws.

IX. Adoption and Implementation.

A. Two Thirds.

The provisions of these Bylaws become effective when they are adopted by a two-thirds vote of the current voting members of the Department.

B. Supersession.

When in force the provisions of these Bylaws supersede all previous departmental policies with which they are in conflict. Policies in force at the time of the adoption of these Bylaws and which do not conflict with the provisions of these Bylaws will continue in force unless revoked or altered in accordance with Section XI, A, below.

C. No ex post facto.

None of the provisions of these Bylaws apply retroactively. Selection or appointment procedures for a new Assistant Chairperson, Undergraduate Advisor, and members of the departmental committees will take effect as the terms of the present incumbents are completed.

X. Amendment Procedure.

A. Two Thirds. These Bylaws may be amended by two-thirds vote of the voting members of the Department. Voting on proposed amendments shall be by mail ballot, and shall be conducted by the Chairperson.

B. Two Readings.

Proposed amendments shall require two readings.

1. First. Circulation of a proposed amendment at least two weeks prior to a meeting at which it is to be debated shall constitute first reading.
2. Second. Second reading of a proposed amendment may be given at any subsequent meeting of the Department.
3. Changes. Changes in wording or style of proposed amendments shall be permitted at the time of discussion. Changes in the sense of an amendment shall constitute a new amendment. The presiding officer at the meeting shall determine whether changes in wording constitute changes in sense.

XI. Departmental Policy Statements.

A. Policy Statements.

In order to guide its various activities, the Department may adopt policy statements which do not conflict with the provisions of these Bylaws. The Chairperson will determine when a policy statement is or is not in conflict with these Bylaws, or when a proposed policy statement is of such a character as to require an amendment to the Bylaws.

B. Simple Majority.

Policy statements may be adopted, revoked or amended by majority vote of the voting members of the Department.

C. Policies as Appendices.

All policy statements adopted by the Department, including those continuing in force at the time of the implementation of these Bylaws., will be given a numerical designation, circulated to each voting member of the Department, and attached in numerical order as an appendix to these Bylaws.

APPENDIX I
RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CHAIR
(Based on II.D.2 of the SOH 1992 Bylaws)

Among the responsibilities of the Chairperson are the following:

1. Administration:

- a. To serve as the chief fiscal officer of the Department.
- b. To maintaining the records of the Department.
- c. To call meetings of the Department or of Departmental committees, in accordance with Departmental policy.
- d. To preside at meetings of the Department.
- e. To appoint individuals and committees in accordance with the policy of the Department.
- f. To serve as the Department's principal representative to the Dean, the Administration, and other University agencies or bodies in transmitting such recommendations as the members of the Department may wish.
- g. To keep the Departmental personnel files in good order and to transmit to the Dean for inclusion in the College personnel files copies of pertinent material.
- h. To make recommendations on promotion tenure, and salary in accordance with policy had procedure as established by the University, School College, and Department.
- i. To consult with members of the Department and to make recommendations to the Dean concerning the hiring of new faculty members.
- j. To assign teaching loads in accordance with policy and procedure as established by the University, College and Department.
- k. To coordinate the scheduling of courses within the Department.
- l. To ensure that substitute instruction is provided when faculty members cannot meet their classes because of illness, attendance at professional meetings, or any other legitimate reason.
- m. To ensure a periodic review of the Departmental policy.
- n. To approve in consultation with the Dean the graduation of students from the Department.
- o. To consult with and advise the Dean in establishing advisement procedures.
- p. To conduct an annual evaluative conference with each member of the Department's faculty. For each faculty member, the Chairperson will formulate a written summary of the important points raised during their conference. This statement will then be signed by both the Chairperson and the faculty member involved, and copies will then be placed in the Departmental and School files.
- q. To maintain the equipment of the Department.
- r. To carry out other administrative functions this office.

2. Information:

- a. To submit regular reports to the Department on budgetary expenditures.

- b. To keep members of the Department informed concerning policies that have been established by the Department, decisions affecting its welfare that have been made by the Dean or the Administration, and any other matters which may be important for the Department to know.
- c. To submit to each member of the Department notice of the general recommendation for salary which he or she proposed for that faculty member for the following year, in accordance with University and College policy and procedure.

3. Leadership:

- a. To encourage and facilitate the improvement of instruction and the development of new academic programs within the Department.
- b. To encourage members of the Department to do research and to engage in other creative activities, and to provide assigned released time for such activities in accordance with policy and procedure established by the University, college, and Department.
- c. To make budget recommendations for the Department.
- d. To present policy recommendations to the Department or its committees.
- e. To serve as a member of the Executive Committee Chair's Advisory Committee of the College.

APPENDIX II
POLICIES

Department of Philosophical Studies
Policy #1-95
April 1995
Policy on Faculty Profile

The Department of Philosophical Studies at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville believes that a broad diversity of perspectives is essential in creative interchange in philosophy. Consequently, it seeks to reflect in the members of this faculty a variety of philosophical perspectives, problematic concerns, historical interests, and other qualities which are relevant to the educational aims of the Department.

The Department also believes that while scholarly vitality, productivity, and participation in governance are necessary, an emphasis on teaching is essential to the character of this University. Consequently, we seek to reflect in each member of this faculty the capacity to teach students at every level of the program: general education students who wish to sample the problems and perspectives of philosophy; advanced undergraduate students who wish to concentrate on philosophy; and students who, while concentrating on some other field, wish to support their principal interest with the services of philosophy faculty.

Department of Philosophical Studies
Policy #2-1997 [Replaces #2 - 1995 & #14 - 1995]
April 1995/December 10, 1997
Policy on Evaluation of Faculty

It is the policy of the Department of Philosophical Studies to expect in each of its faculty members the co-presence of those skills which serve the roles of teacher, scholar, and academic citizen. Individuals whose professional activities do not demonstrate strength in all three areas would, in our judgment, not serve the needs and aims of this Department.

In terms of the evaluation of faculty members for hiring, retention, promotion, tenure, and other professional purposes, this policy has the following implications:

1. Teaching: Each faculty member is expected to be more than merely an adequate teacher. No faculty member can expect retention or advancement in this Department who cannot be shown to meet this requirement. This means going beyond satisfying basic obligations as meeting classes and adhering to final examination schedules, maintaining regular office hours, making oneself available to students and colleagues, attending faculty meetings, being present at commencement, and maintaining a current vita in appropriate files. Meritorious performance in teaching is a necessary condition for consideration for tenure, promotion, and positive salary adjustments and other professional purposes. (See below under "Performance Evaluation

Criteria.") Ideally, the judgment of teaching performance should be made on the basis of the effectiveness with which course goals have been achieved and the degree to which the faculty member exemplifies the "Behaviors and Characteristics, Attitudes, and Activities of Outstanding Teachers" as described in the *College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Criteria*. With respect to tenure and promotion, evidence of improvement and positive results of instructional development efforts should be taken into consideration. Furthermore, it is each faculty member's responsibility to develop suitable modes of access to information about his or her own teaching. Among such modes might be included, either singly or in combination, the use of student evaluations, classroom visitations by colleagues, the use of video taping of lectures, team teaching, guest lecturing, etc. However, each faculty member must include at least one student-generated, one peer-generated, and one self-generated means of evaluation. In addition, each faculty member must submit individual descriptions of courses prior to registration each term, as well as copies of syllabi and examinations for his or her courses. Faculty members are also expected to improve existing modes of teaching when appropriate and are encouraged to explore new modes when such innovation is meaningful. Finally, faculty are expected to share the Department's serious commitment to general education and, where their expertise's make it appropriate, to the Department's courses offered in cooperation with other departments.

Faculty performance evaluation criteria for teaching are defined as follows:

Satisfactory Performance: A faculty member shall 1) meet the minimum expectations of University faculty in carrying out his or her teaching assignments, as listed in the Faculty Handbook, and 2) provide evidence of reasonable and timely advancement toward the attainment of the goals established in the annual conference with the Department Chair.

Meritorious Performance: A faculty member shall meet all of the expectations for *Satisfactory* performance. In addition, a faculty member shall 1) meet most or all of the goals agreed upon in the annual conference with the Department Chair, 2) meet the overall performance expectations for teaching as described above, and 3) provide a variety of significant evidence, also described above, documenting his or her teaching performance.

The overall rating of *Meritorious* which is required for tenure must not only be an *average* of ratings for the years of untenured service, but must also reflect a *consistent pattern* for at least the most recent years of employment.

Excellent Performance: A faculty member shall meet all of the expectations for *Meritorious* performance. In addition, a faculty member shall be recognized for his or her 1) distinguished success in achieving most or all of the goals agreed upon in the annual conference with the Chair, 2) distinguished success in meeting and/or surpassing most of the overall performance expectations as described above, and 3) having provided a variety of significant evidence documenting excellence in teaching recognized by the Department.

Unsatisfactory Performance: A faculty member who fails to meet all of the expectations for a rating of *Satisfactory* performance shall receive a rating of *Unsatisfactory*. Whenever a rating of *Unsatisfactory* is warranted, steps should be taken by the College of Arts and Sciences, the Department Chair, and the individual(s) involved to resolve what is considered to be a serious shortcoming.

2. Research and scholarly activities: Each faculty member is expected to maintain a continuing intellectual and scholarly vitality, and to demonstrate this by such means as, for example, the publication of books, articles, and reviews; the reading or circulation of papers at formal and informal meetings; and the participation in discussions of scholarly issues with members of the Department and the broader intellectual community. While it is each faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate intellectual growth, what is principally important is the fact of the growth, not the particular means by which it is demonstrated.

During the period of employment prior to being granted tenure, the percentage of effort dedicated to research and scholarly activities is also important. Over this time period, the percentage of effort must be substantial enough to establish a reliable basis for evaluation.

Faculty performance evaluation criteria for research and scholarly activities are as follows:

Satisfactory Performance: A faculty member should be engaged in significant scholarship. This would include papers accepted for publication and/or presentation but not given, research and scholarly activities in progress for articles, books, and papers to be presented; grant and contract proposals in progress, or other demonstrable examples of participation in research and scholarly activities and creative activities. Failure to generate presentations, publications, grants, or contracts within a reasonable amount of time will require the Department to withhold credit for work in progress in future evaluations until results are generated.

Meritorious Performance: A faculty member must meet the expectations for *Satisfactory* performance. In addition, a faculty member should have demonstrated an appropriate level of achievement. Evidence of achievement includes presentations of papers, submission or publication of articles, submission or award of grant or contract proposals, submission of proposals for books or book chapters, acting as an editorial board member for a journal, reviewing articles for publication or presentation, or serving as a proposal reviewer for external agencies. Finally, the Department will consider both the quality of the achievements as well as the number of documented achievements.

Excellent Performance: A faculty member must meet the expectations for *Meritorious* performance. In addition, a faculty member should have demonstrated high levels of achievement. Evidence of high achievement includes publication in peer-reviewed journals of the highest quality, invited paper presentations at international or national conferences, book publications, and funded major grants and/or contracts. Finally, the Department will consider both

the quality of the achievements as well as the number of documented achievements.

Unsatisfactory Performance: A faculty member qualifies for an *Unsatisfactory* rating if he or she does not have evidence of work in progress in scholarship. A faculty member who fails to meet expectations in scholarship (e.g., failure to produce results from work in progress, failure to complete the doctoral dissertation within a specified time period) will also qualify for a rating of *Unsatisfactory*. Whenever a rating of *Unsatisfactory* is warranted, steps should be taken by the College of Arts and Sciences, the Department Chair, and the individual(s) involved to resolve what is considered to be a serious shortcoming.

3. Service: Each faculty member is expected to assume a suitable share of responsibility for the operation of the Department, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the University. This responsibility includes such basic obligations as meeting classes and adhering to final examination schedules, maintaining regular office hours, making oneself available to students and colleagues, attending faculty meetings, being present at commencement, and maintaining a current vita in appropriate files. In addition, faculty members are expected to serve in the regular committees and administrative work of the Department, the College, and the Faculty Senate, and other specialized and University-wide units which are necessary for the governance of the University community. Finally, members of the Department are expected to participate in the hiring, advisement, and evaluation of colleagues, and to provide avenues of access for responsible assessment of their own work. Public service to the community in the area of expertise can enhance the faculty member's service evaluation but cannot substitute for service within the University.

The overall pattern of participation in University and community activities on all levels shall be considered in evaluating service.

In addition to the above-mentioned criteria, especially for tenure review, the following statement in the Statutes of the Board of Trustees should be considered:

As a colleague, the professor has obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. The professor respects and defends the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas the professor shows due respect for the opinions of others. The professor acknowledges academic debts and strives to be objective in the professional judgment of colleagues. The professor accepts a share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of the institution.

Formal procedures for faculty evaluation as related to the principal personnel actions in an academic career are outlined in the Bylaws of the Department and in the Operating Papers of the College of Arts and Sciences. We believe it is important to emphasize here, in addition, that: 1) these are essentially qualitative rather than quantitative matters, and thus they embody of necessity a judgmental element; 2) the process of faculty evaluation is both constant and cumulative; 3) the implementation of this process must inevitably be conducted so as to maintain continuity of principle within the flexibility needed to deal with individual circumstances, such

as those of new members of the Department, members on leave, and members holding administrative appointments; 4) there are a variety of ways in which each faculty member can demonstrate his or her abilities and report his or her achievements in each area; and 5) the task of maximizing the evidential base from which judgments are formulated is an obligation to be shared in appropriate ways by the Department and by each member of the faculty.

Faculty service expectations differ according to rank as follows:

Assistant Professor: The primary responsibilities of an Assistant Professor are to perform the duties of teaching and research and scholarly activities. Initially, an Assistant Professor is expected to perform service primarily within the Department. Faculty at this rank may be expected to begin gradually assuming leadership roles within Department committees as they acquire experience. After the initial years of the pre-tenure service period, the faculty member will be expected to increase appropriately his or her service commitment to the College and University at large.

As with research and scholarly activities, during the period of employment prior to being granted tenure, the percentage of effort dedicated to service is also important. Over this time period, the percentage of effort must be substantial enough to establish a reliable basis for evaluation.

Associate Professor: A faculty member at this rank is expected to participate fully in Department service activities and assume appropriate leadership roles within the Department. Faculty at this rank are also expected to broaden the scope of their service activities to include service to the College and/or the University and community.

Professor: Faculty at the rank of Professor are expected to participate in service at the College and/or University levels and assume leadership roles within the Department, the College, and/or University and community.

Faculty performance evaluation criteria for service are as follows:

Satisfactory Performance: A faculty member must perform service that meets the minimum expectations of the Department with regard to faculty rank and experience as described above.

Meritorious Performance: A faculty member must perform service that significantly exceeds the minimum expectations with regard to faculty rank and experience. To qualify for this rating, a faculty member above the rank of Assistant Professor is expected to contribute to service beyond the Department level or contribute extraordinary service to the Department.

Excellent Performance: A faculty member must perform an extraordinary level of service. This category is reserved for faculty members whose service contribution is markedly superior to that described as *Meritorious*. While quantity of service must be considered, the qualitative distinction of participating in a leadership capacity is the more relevant criterion for evaluation.

Unsatisfactory Performance: A faculty member who fails to meet all of the criteria for a rating of *Satisfactory* performance shall receive a rating of *Unsatisfactory*. Whenever a rating of *Unsatisfactory* is warranted, steps should be taken by the College of Arts and Sciences, the Department Chair, and the individual(s) involved to resolve what is considered to be a serious shortcoming.

Department of Philosophical Studies
Policy #4-95
April 1995
Policy on Open Salary Information

It is the policy of the Department of Philosophical Studies to make available to each full-time faculty member a list of the salaries of all full-time members of the Department. At the initiative of the Chair, and with the permission of the individual concerned, other members of the instructional staff may be included in this list. The Chair is obligated to circulate this information within the Department and to provide opportunities for its discussion as soon as new salary adjustments have been confirmed.

Department of Philosophical Studies
Policy #5-95
April 1995
Policy on Student Involvement

It is the policy of the Department of Philosophical Studies that, where their educational interests are directly and substantially affected by the decisions of this Department, the students have a right to formal participation and voice in the processes shaping such decisions.

Department of Philosophical Studies
Policy #6-95
April 1995
Policy on Sabbatical Leave

1. Sabbatical leaves are an important opportunity by which faculty members may, through research and scholarly activities, scholarly activity, and/or professional development, discharge their primary responsibilities to the Department, College, University, and citizens of the region and state. Therefore, the Department recognizes the obligation to approve sabbatical applications even when no outside funds are provided for replacement personnel. This obligation is to be

honored to the point where serious disruption of the Department's teaching and/or research and scholarly activities programs would occur.

2. The procedures for determining eligibility and for the submission, review, and approval of sabbatical applications are explained in the Bylaws of the Department, and in applicable College, University and Board of Trustees policy.

3. In addition to the requirements elsewhere articulated, in order to qualify for department approval of sabbatical leave, the faculty member must have a record of meritorious service and must have a plan for professional development.

(a) A faculty member's service will be judged meritorious only if his or her cumulative performance in all three areas of professional obligations -- teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service to the University -- is determined to be satisfactory.

(b) Professional development in any of the three areas of responsibility -- teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service to the University -- is a fitting objective of a sabbatical leave. Professional development is to be viewed as including the enhancement of individual effectiveness and the production of academically or socially useful results. The judgment concerning the likelihood of significant development resulting from the sabbatical is to be based on:

- (1) the quality of the sabbatical proposal and project,
- (2) the results of any previous sabbatical leaves or leaves-of-absence for purposes of professional development,
- (3) the results of the use of any reassigned time for purposes relevant to the proposed sabbatical project.

In cases of initial sabbaticals, there will be a presumption of likelihood of significant professional development, unless there is evidence to the contrary.

4. Sabbatical leaves in a given academic year should be spaced out in such a way as to achieve optimal balance. The amount of staff available for teaching should be as close to equal as possible from semester to semester.

5. The Department may require individuals to postpone sabbaticals in cases when the number of qualifying applicants is unmanageably high. In the event that the number of faculty members recommended for sabbatical leaves during one year exceeds the number of leaves that can be granted that year the guidelines listed below are to be used to determine which ranking will be forwarded to the Dean. All things being equal, the most important consideration is the quality of the project proposed, including the care with which the proposal has been worked out and the appropriateness of the proposal in terms of the person's past experiences and performance and in terms of the availability of resources at that time. These other considerations are not listed in order of importance and are merely indicative of the kinds of considerations which are relevant in reaching a fair and equitable judgment, all things considered.

(a) External grants which are directly related to the sabbatical leave or signed contracts for books involving a deadline which makes the sabbatical leave essential.

(b) Retirement, if not covered by negotiation, in the last two years before retirement, unless faculty members have not demonstrated good use of released time granted for research and scholarly activities and sabbatical leaves in the past.

(c) Past productivity of the faculty member shall be taken into account. Those who have had released time granted for research and scholarly activities or sabbatical leaves in the past and who have not demonstrated good use of that time should be ranked lower.

(d) Deferral of a sabbatical leave the previous year for the convenience of the University.

(e) An initial sabbatical.

In addition to these guidelines, it should be noted that taking a leave without pay shall not be counted for or against a faculty member's being granted a sabbatical leave as long as that person is otherwise eligible.

Department of Philosophical Studies
Policy #7-95
April 1995
Originally Approved May 1975
Policy and Procedures for Student Appeal of Grades

If a student wishes to question the grade for a course (or for an assignment), he or she should first discuss the matter with the instructor in question. If the problem is not settled to the satisfaction of the student and the student wishes to pursue the matter further, then he or she should bring the matter to the attention of the Chair (to the assistant Chair in the cases where the instructor involved is the Chair), who will discuss the problem with both the student and the instructor, and examine the relevant documentation.

If the problem is still not resolved and if the dispute is about a grade based upon a written exam or term paper, the exam or paper (without the name of the student involved) will be given to three members of the Department, chosen by the Chair, who will each independently read and evaluate the exam or paper and report (in writing) their evaluations to the Chair. The Chair will then make a recommendation to the instructor. The instructor's decision is final.

In the case of an oral exam, the necessary documentation may not exist. If it does not, the instructor will submit a written evaluation to the Chair. If it does (as in the case of tape-recorded oral exam of a graduate student), the same procedure will be followed as with a written exam.

In those cases where an examination, presentation, or paper is graded by a committee, the same procedures will be followed. As in the case of the grading of a course, test, or term paper by an individual instructor, the decision of the committee is final.

Department of Philosophical Studies
Policy #8-95
Originally adopted January 1991
October 1998
Policy on Emeritus Status

EMERITUS STATUS

Emeritus status expresses the faculty's respect for a retired colleague and consequent desire to encourage his or her continued active association with the Department. Such a retired colleague is acknowledged to be a valued source of experience and wisdom regarding academic matters.

Procedure for Selection of Emeritus Status:

Upon retirement, all tenured faculty will be considered by the Personnel Committee for emerita/us status at the highest rank achieved. The Committee will review the advisory ballots from faculty which have been solicited by the Chair. The Personnel Committee will make its recommendation to the Chair, who will in turn make a recommendation to the Dean.

Benefits of Emeritus Status in the Department:

As ongoing members of the Department, College, and University faculty, emeritus faculty (and their immediate family) will continue to receive the same benefits to which they have been entitled as members of the faculty, consistent with University policy. Such benefits include a faculty identification card, library privileges, parking privileges, access to campus health and recreational facilities, and discounts at on-campus events.

Emeritus faculty will be listed as emeritus members of the Department for the remainder of their lifetimes. They will be eligible to attend Department meetings as nonvoting members and to serve as nonvoting members of Department Committees. They will have the right to continue to use Department stationery and to cite affiliation with the Department.

Emeritus faculty who have been members of the Graduate faculty will be eligible to serve as members of Master's committees for students in accord with Graduate School policy.

The previous experience of emeritus faculty in our program is a factor that may be taken into account in hiring for part-time positions in the Department.

In addition to the above and upon request from the emeritus faculty member, the Department will seek to make available:

(1) office space with telephone extension, typewriter, computer, and other appropriate equipment.

(2) a faculty mail box and reasonable access to Steno Pool services.

(3) a reasonable use of mailing privileges.

Department of Philosophical Studies
Policy #9-95
Policy on the Robert A. Gray Memorial Award
April 1995

1. Name. Robert A Gray Memorial Award in Philosophy.

2. Stipulations.

a. Purpose. To provide an annual award to recognize leadership and academic excellence on the part of a current student in the Philosophy Program.

b. Restrictions. The award may be given each year to one student who has been admitted to the Philosophy Program and has registered for at least three philosophy courses during the current academic year. The student is to be selected on the basis of exemplary academic performance in the Philosophy Program, and on the basis of leadership. These criteria seek to perpetuate the memory of the outstanding traits of Robert Gray. At the appropriate time, the Undergraduate Adviser will supply a list to the Department faculty of those students who are eligible to receive the award. From this list, each member of the Department faculty will be asked to make nominations for the award recipient, and to indicate briefly the rationale behind each nomination. The selection committee will consist of faculty on the Undergraduate Committee of the Department. The award will not be given to more than one person each year. The selection committee may decide to decline to give the award in any given year. No individual student shall receive this award more than once. The decision of the selection committee shall be considered final. Subsequent changes in these restrictions may be made by a majority vote of the Department faculty.

Department of Philosophical Studies
Policy #10-95
Policy on the Objectives of the Baccalaureate Degree in Philosophy
April 1992

The goal of the major in philosophy is the cultivation of knowledge, skills, and appreciation's which pertain to philosophy.

Pertinent knowledge includes some grasp of the history and of the current state of philosophy as well as some grasp of basic philosophical fields and of representative philosophical issues. Such knowledge is of major ideas, doctrines, solutions, explanations, principles, methodologies, and arguments. These derive from concerns unique to philosophy itself and from concerns which are philosophical in any other area of study or endeavor and from the whole range of human experience and expression.

Pertinent skills include some proficiency in philosophical investigation and in philosophical expression. These include skill in recognition, examination, and resolution of issues; skill in interpretation of texts; skill in clear articulation in speaking and writing. More specifically, these include skill in making critical analyses and appraisals, in delineating differences and in making appropriate distinctions; skill in making integrative syntheses, in the exercise of imagination in constructing analogies, abstract formulations, and concrete applications, and in constructing explanatory theories and unified wholes.

Pertinent appreciation's are of those values to which philosophy contributes for growth and development as human beings. These include enhanced and enlightened self-knowledge; enjoyment of a wider range of peoples, ideas and cultures; enhanced capacities for thinking and communication; from all of which come individuality and self-esteem, and which contribute to one's work or career. These values include also the richness of human experience and the diversity of perspectives, from which come a sense of citizenship, even of the world.

The goal of the major in philosophy is mutually integrated with the purpose of general education and the baccalaureate degree at SIUE, which is "to provide students with a solid foundation for intellectual development and an ability and desire to make meaningful contributions to society" (CC#8-90-91).

The base of knowledge is found in the liberal arts and sciences, to which philosophy contributes fundamentally and from which the major in philosophy receives a breadth of resources and perspectives as well as concentration in a minor field.

To general education philosophy contributes skills in analysis and synthesis, in problem solving and in decision making, in value judgments and in leadership, as well as in oral and written communication. At the same time, general education contributes these to the major in philosophy through the study of languages and mathematics, extended practice in speaking and writing, experience in the methods of scientific inquiry and in laboratory and library investigation.

Philosophy contributes to the desire to make contributions to society through the appreciation's which it fosters. At the same time, general education contributes to this for the major in philosophy through fostering appreciation's of cultural traditions, diversities, and global interdependencies. Through providing understandings of the world and the human condition, general education fosters appreciation for the contributions of the arts and sciences to the civilization and to the quality of life.

Both general education and the major in philosophy contribute to the baccalaureate degree in philosophy by providing preparation in philosophy at a level of achievement which will enable the student to pursue graduate study either in philosophy or in an appropriately related discipline, or to begin a career appropriate to a person with a general education.

Department of Philosophy
Policy #11-95 on Senior Assignment
Revised Dec 2000, Jan 2008, Fall 2009, Apr 2012, Sept 2012,
Dec 2016

I. The Senior Assignment provides a capstone experience for graduating seniors. In the senior year, each philosophy major, whether a first or second major, must satisfy the university graduation requirement of a senior assignment by successfully completing PHIL 480, whose goal is to engage students in independent research culminating in a substantial paper and presentation. Students are expected to produce the sort of paper that could be submitted to conferences (such as the Undergraduate Conference held at SIUE), or as a writing sample for Philosophy graduate programs. The PHIL 480 paper should be a development of work conducted in a previous Philosophy class. Exceptions require approval of the Department chair. While PHIL 480 will involve some discussion and instruction on good philosophical writing, it is not a goal of the course to teach students from scratch how to write a philosophical paper. Rather, the goals are to provide instruction and guidance on conducting independent philosophical research, to provide constructive criticism, including peer review, as the project progresses, and to provide the opportunity to engage the work of one's peers. Students will receive a letter grade for Phil 480. As for other Philosophy courses, to count for credit toward the philosophy major the grade must be C or better. A senior assignment paper may be accepted, and a student may receive a C or better in this class, only if the course paper is free of misspellings and usage errors. While the course and the grading are fully the responsibility of the instructor, philosophy faculty members are expected to be available at least once to discuss senior assignment projects with students who contact them.

II. The Senior Assignment, including the oral presentation and the final paper, is also a tool for the internal assessment of the effectiveness of the philosophy program. To that end, on the basis of equitable distribution, if the teaching schedule permits, each faculty member will be required to attend and evaluate student presentations and to read and evaluate student papers. On the basis of the learning objectives of the philosophy curriculum, the criteria for assessment include:

- (a) Cogency of argument
- (b) Clarity of expression
- (c) Knowledge of issues and alternatives

- (d) Accuracy of interpretation
- (e) Creativity and originality of expression

The criteria are applied as follows.

- Cogency of argument:
 - 3. Exceeds expectations: The argument of the paper is organized well, tightly constructed, philosophically sophisticated, and plausibly valid.
 - 2. Meets expectations: The argument is clearly organized, philosophically interesting, and either plausibly valid or interestingly invalid.
 - 1. Does not meet expectations: The argument is poorly organized, loosely constructed, or uninterestingly invalid.

- Clarity of expression:
 - 3. Exceeds expectations:
 - (Presentation) The student is able to articulate verbally philosophical ideas sufficiently clearly that the philosophical points are easily grasped, as are the connections between ideas
 - (Paper) The paper is so clearly written that the philosophical points are easily grasped, as are the connections between ideas.
 - 2. Meets expectations: Meets (3) with only a few lapses.
 - 1. Does not meet expectations:
 - (Presentation) The paper is presented in such a way that the philosophical points are frequently obscured.
 - (Paper) The paper is written in such a way that the philosophical points are frequently obscured.

- Knowledge of issues and alternatives:
 - 3. Exceeds expectations:
 - (Presentation) The student exhibits awareness and sensitivity to alternative positions and responds appropriately.
 - (Paper) The paper clearly and accurately identifies and evaluates the relevant major theses in dispute in the literature, and adequately responds to relevant issues raised at the presentation.
 - 2. Meets expectations:
 - (Presentation) Meets (3) with only a few lapses.
 - (Paper) The main argument of the paper exhibits sensitivity to the disputes in the relevant literature that bear on it, and acknowledges relevant issues raised at the presentation.
 - 1. Does not meet expectations:
 - (Presentation) The student is unaware or dismissive of alternative positions, does not answer questions directly, or is overly defensive.
 - (Paper) The main argument assumes without comment or defense a significant position that has been disputed in the relevant literature, or makes no attempt to address relevant issues raised at the presentation.

- Accuracy of interpretation:
 3. Exceeds expectations: Interpretations of philosophical positions fit within the standard interpretations (including emerging views that have gained substantial acceptance) or are justified by careful exegesis developed in the paper.
 2. Meets expectations: Meets (3) with only a few lapses, which don't materially affect the argument of the paper.
 1. Does not meet expectations: The main argument depends on interpretations that neither fit within the standard range nor are defended by careful exegesis.

- Creativity or originality of expression:
 3. Exceeds expectations: The paper exhibits philosophical originality.
 2. Meets expectations: The paper employs original arguments, analogies, metaphors, or examples in the development of the main argument.
 1. Does not meet expectations: The paper relies on common analogies, metaphors, and examples in the development of the main argument--so much so that the author's own philosophical vision is not manifest.

The assessments are due to the chair within two weeks of the end of the semester during which the student presentation took place and the senior paper was completed.

III. At the beginning of the fall term, the Chair of philosophy will appoint a faculty member to review the assessments, interview the PHIL 480 instructor, and on that basis write a report on his/her findings about the effectiveness of the philosophy program. The faculty member will serve for the academic year. At the end of the academic year s/he will promptly provide information to the Chair noting the number of students who exceeded, met, or failed to meet expectations in each semester.

**Department of Philosophical Studies
Policy #12-95
Policy for Summer Program
April 1995**

This policy shall govern planning for Summer courses and the assignment of instructors to those courses. It does not deal with the assignments of faculty members on variable contracts or those who have negotiated early-retirement contracts.

A. Priority of Student and Program Needs.

The determination of what courses to offer shall be based on student needs and the necessity of maintaining crucial course offerings. Extension courses, courses involving foreign travel, and courses scheduled on other than the regular full-time basis shall be examined with particular care in order to maintain the integrity of the summer program.

B. Faculty Participation in Summer Teaching.

Summer teaching assignments are to be limited to regular faculty with permanent or continuing appointments in the four ranks (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor) unless clearly recommended by program and staffing requirements, in which case funding must be secured from outside.

C. Projected Schedule of Course Offerings.

The Chair will prepare a projected schedule of summer course offerings based on the principles above. These proposed schedules will be justified by the Chair by reference to past summer enrollments and present program needs.

D. Assigning Courses to Individual Faculty Members.

1. In assigning courses for summer teaching, the Chair shall compile a list of faculty in the Department indicating who has priority over whom for receiving teaching assignments in the coming summer. The ranking will depend on the number of months of summer pay each faculty member has received during the past four summers. This calculation will include not only past assignments for teaching summer courses (including workshops and weekend courses). For faculty who have served as administrators during the past summers, each month of summer administrative salary received will be calculated as equivalent to one-half of a course taught. For purposes of this list calculations for newer faculty members who have not been at the University for the past four summers will be made as if they had taught one course per summer before they became a member of this faculty.

Those faculty members who have received the fewest number of months of salary from these sources during the past four summers will be at the top of the list while those who have received the greatest number of months of salary during that period will be at the bottom of the list.

It should be noted that funds received directly by the individual from the higher administration of the University on the basis of University-wide competitive proposals for teaching, research and scholarly activities projects, service projects will not be counted when this ranking is being made. Also any funds or salary received from other sources outside the Department or this University will not be counted when this ranking is being made. If there is any doubt whether

funds received from the University are to be counted, except for administrative pay the test will be: Did this person receive this assignment and pay as an individual in competition with other individual faculty members (in which case it will not be counted when the ranking is being made), or did this person receive payment from funds allocated by the Department (in which case it will be counted when the ranking is being made).

2. In general but limited by the exceptions listed in D.3. below, the procedure will be for the Chair to start at the top of the list and assign one three-hour course or equivalent assignment to each faculty member in the Department who desires to teach during the coming summer. If after doing this there is still Summer Instructional money available, the Chair again starts at the top of the list and assigns a second three-hour course or the equivalent assignment to each faculty member who desires to teach during the coming summer. If there is still Summer Instructional

money available, the Chair again starts at the top of the list assigning a third three-hour course or its equivalent assignment to each faculty member who desires to teach during the coming summer. This procedure will terminate at that point where the Summer Instructional money remaining is less than one month's salary of the next eligible faculty member. In case two or more persons have the same ranking and there is not enough Summer Instructional money for those persons in a tie to each receive a course, the tie will be broken in accord with the following rules:

- (a) Persons of higher rank will be given priority over those of lower rank.
- (b) In case a tie still exists, persons with more years in rank will be given priority over those with fewer years.
- (c) In case a tie still exists, the faculty member receiving the course assignment shall be selected by lot.

If money still exists in the budget, but not enough for assigning another three-hour course or equivalent, the Chair will determine what should be done to make the best use of this money. In no case shall a person higher in the rank order be passed by to the advantage of a person lower in the rank order without the consent of the person higher in the rank order.

3. Exceptions to the general procedure provided in D. 2. above are as follows:

- (a) Program needs may require particular faculty members to teach particular courses. However, all such needs shall be taken care of without violating the results of the general procedure so far as that is possible.
- (b) Any faculty members who are eligible to teach only one course during a given summer may indicate to the Chair that they wish to postpone that course assignment for one year. In that case, the following summer those faculty members will be assigned one course before the procedure in D. 2. above is implemented and before any of the exceptions listed below. This one course will not count against the total number of courses that faculty member is assigned during that second summer, but it will, of course, be counted as a course taught when rankings are made for subsequent summers. The aim of this provision is to permit a faculty member to convert one situation where he or she teaches one course in one summer and again teaches one course in the following summer to a different situation where he or she teaches no courses in the first summer but two courses in the second summer. In no case can this postponement of a summer teaching assignment be for more than one year and in no case can it be for more than one course. Furthermore, the Chair may deny the request for postponement if it adversely affects the scheduling of courses the Department needs to offer.
- (c) A class of faculty members designated "pre-retirees" shall be given the special consideration of being moved to the top of the rank-order list described in E.2. above after one course has been assigned to each faculty member who desires to teach a course. That is, pre-retirees will have top priority in being assigned a second course; and, after all faculty members desiring two courses

have been assigned those courses, pre-retirees will have top priority for being assigned a third course. The class of pre-retirees will consist of those faculty members:

- (i) who have not negotiated early-retirement contracts, and
- (ii) who will be 61 years of age or over on September 1 immediately following the summer for which a schedule is being planned, and
- (iii) who have not been in the class of pre-retirees for more than four years, and
- (iv) who have not indicated that they wish to have their entry into the class of pre-retirees delayed by one year or more. (Note that faculty members who plan to continue teaching beyond the age of 65 may find it advisable to delay their entry into the class of pre-retirees since they can remain in that class for only four years.)

Rank-order within the class of pre-retirees will be determined as follows:

(i) Persons of higher rank will be given priority over those of a lower rank.

(ii) In case of a tie at this point, persons with fewer years remaining until they must leave the class of pre-retirees will be given priority over those with more years remaining until they leave the class of pre-retirees. (Note that a person can remain in the class of pre-retirees for only four years.)

(iii) In case a tie still exists, persons with more years in rank will be given priority over those with fewer years.

(iv) In case a tie still exists, persons with lower average number of summer courses (number of courses divided by the number of years) since becoming a member of the class of pre-retirees will be given priority over those with a higher average number of summer courses since becoming a member of the class of pre-retirees.

(v) In case a tie still exists, priority will be determined by lot.

(vi) All of the above rules of priority are limited by the principle that whenever one person in this class of pre-retirees has received a lesser number of courses in two consecutive summers as the result of the application of the five rules listed immediately above, that person will be advanced to the head of the list of pre-retirees for the next summer.

E. Rate of Pay for Summer Teaching

Faculty members shall be paid on the basis of one month's pay (based on their current monthly salary) for each three-hour course. When the course is other than a three-hour course, the compensation shall be proportional to the number of hours being taught.

F. Class Size of Summer Courses

The maximum number of students in a summer course should not exceed the maximum acceptable number for that same course during the regular academic year.

G. Administrative and Committee Work

Only those administrative assignments which are essential to the functioning of the Departments or programs will be made for the summer. Every effort will be made to confine committee work to the regular academic year. Faculty members who are not receiving a summer salary for teaching or administration shall not be required to serve on committees during the summer session. Replacements of committee members on those committees which function during the summer will be made according to the Operating Papers of the College of Arts and Sciences (where applicable) and the Department where appropriate, or by appointment by the Dean or Chair (whichever is appropriate) when necessary.

Department of Philosophical Studies
Policy #13-95
Policy for Overload Teaching Assignments
April 1995

This policy shall govern all assignments of teaching overloads within the Department and the rate of compensation thereof, with the exception of negotiated retirement agreements.

In the assignment of teaching loads, the Department will be governed by SIUE Senate Welfare Council Policy #4-90/91, which states that for faculty members on continuing or permanent appointment who meet normative service and research and scholarly activities expectations, the maximum teaching load shall be three courses not to exceed twelve credit hours per week. This policy is now found on pages 49-50 of the *Faculty Handbook*, "Teaching Load Policy, Welfare Council #4-90/91."

The Department overload assignment and compensation will be in compliance with the "Overload Compensation, Policies and Procedures, SIUE 1M1," pages 98-100 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

A. Determination of Need for Overload Assignments

Program needs may sometimes require that faculty members teach courses in addition to the load stated above. In such an event additional teaching loads will be assigned according to the following procedures:

The Department Chair will declare that a situation exists in his or her Department requiring that faculty members teach an overload assignment. Such declaration must be substantiated with evidence that all faculty members, excluding those on leave, have already been assigned a full teaching load, have received assigned research and scholarly activities time or assigned public service time, have received administrative released time, or any combination thereof, but that courses required to meet student needs still remain unstaffed.

In determining a schedule which may involve overload, the Department Chair shall proceed as follows:

1. Program needs for undergraduate majors and minors, shall be met first; thus, a sufficient number of 3xx and 4xx level courses to meet program needs will be scheduled and staffed.
2. Second and third level general education course requirements shall be met next; thus, a sufficient number of such courses to meet the needs of general education students will be scheduled and staffed.
3. General education skills courses, or their equivalent, will be scheduled and staffed last. Full-time faculty members will be assigned to these courses when possible. If there are insufficient numbers of full-time faculty or part-time faculty to staff these general education courses, the Department Chair may decide to staff them on an overload basis.
4. The Department Chair will determine what is a "sufficient number" of courses for program or general education needs by the procedures which are ordinarily used to make such a determination.

B. Selection of Staff for Overload Assignment

When the Chair has concluded that overload assignments are necessary to staff required courses, he or she shall announce the availability of overload assignments within that Department to determine those faculty who are interested in such an assignment. The criteria for selecting faculty members for an overload assignment will be as follows:

1. Overload assignments shall apply to the teaching of credit hour producing courses only.
2. No faculty member may be required to accept an overload assignment.
3. If there are more applicants than there are available courses, the assignments will be made according to the Policy for Summer Program, sections D.2 and D.3.a, rules by which summer term faculty are selected.

C. Conditions of Overload Assignments

1. Overload assignments will not be given during the Summer Term.
2. No faculty member shall be assigned more than three (3) credit hours of overload in one calendar year. That is, one three-hour course per year or, for example, two two-hour courses per year will be the maximum overload assignment per individual.

D. Rate of Compensation for Overload Assignments

In accordance with SIUE Personnel Policies which state that the compensation for overload "instruction shall be based upon contact hours for non-credit courses and credit hours for credit courses," faculty members shall be paid on the basis of one month's pay (based on their current monthly salary) for each three-hour course. When the course is other than a three-hour course, the compensation shall be proportional to the number of hours being taught.

E. Class Size

Maximum class sizes for courses taught on an overload basis shall be no more than that for the same regularly scheduled and staffed courses.

Department of Philosophy
Policy #15 – 2013 [Replaces #15 2009]
Policy for Faculty Evaluation for the purpose of Annual Review and Salary Adjustments
March, 2013

Introduction.

Faculty evaluation and salary adjustments are made in accord with the relevant University, College and Department policies and procedures. Of particular importance is the CAS "Faculty Performance Evaluation and Salary Increase Plan." The plan requires that early in the year each faculty member engage in goal-setting with the Chair, establishing a mutually agreeable set of goals in the categories of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. The plan also requires that early in the year each faculty member discuss with the Chair the appropriate allocation of effort within each category, and reach a mutually agreeable assignment of effort for the year.

The CAS policy requires that judgments bearing on faculty performance and salary adjustments be formulated in terms of ratings of L0, L1, L2, L3, in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. The period of evaluation is the calendar year.

Performance rated L0 does not meet expectations in a category.

Performance rated L1 meets expectations in a category.

Performance rated L2 exceeds expectations a category. In cases of uncertainty whether performance is L1 or L2, the presumption is that the performance will be judged L1. The burden of proof is upon the faculty member to provide sufficient evidence to overcome this presumption.

Performance rated L3 greatly exceeds expectations in a category. Again, in cases of uncertainty whether performance is L2 or L3, the presumption is that the performance will be judged L2. The burden of proof is upon the faculty member to provide sufficient evidence to overcome this presumption.

The set of mutually acceptable goals constitutes an important consideration in the determination of the specific set of expectations by which a faculty member is judged. Judgments are developed in light of the extent to which a faculty member has made progress toward and/or achieved significant and substantive goals.

Judgments of performance are made independently of the allocation of effort agreed upon by a faculty member. That is, one does not judge performance in a category as L3 given that a faculty member only allocated 10% of effort to that area. Rather, one judges the performance and then references the allocation of effort.

It should be understood that these judgments are formulated against a background of expectations, some of which are cultural understandings which have gradually evolved within the profession, some of which are peculiar to this particular location. Many of these are reflected in the Code of Ethics and Conduct, Academic and Teaching Policies, containing the "Statement on Professional Ethics," and the "Statement on Freedom and Responsibility." Also important is the Ethics of Instruction, Academic and Teaching Policies, especially the statement on "Minimum Expectations of Faculty as Teachers." These statements are provided in the *SIUE Faculty Handbook*.

Teaching.

The statement of the "Minimum Expectations of Faculty as Teachers," which appears in the *Faculty Handbook*, provides a useful guide to some of the most minimal expectations. Moreover, at a minimum, a faculty member as an instructor is expected to have a command of the subject matter, to present the subject matter to students in an organized and effective manner, and to consistently fulfill the other professional obligations to students.

TEACHING MERIT CRITERIA

L1: To qualify for a rating of L1, faculty members shall meet the minimum expectations of faculty as teachers, outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*, and:

- 1) Submit for review syllabi, exams, and student course evaluations for all courses.
- 2) For each course taught during the calendar year, including summer courses, online courses, and any course using an online student evaluation of teaching, determine the "course average" by averaging the means for all questions on the SIUE Department of Philosophy Course evaluation form. Then determine a "composite average" by averaging all course averages for the calendar year.
- 3) Provide evidence of competent effort in teaching. Presumptive evidence of competent teaching includes:
 - Course materials that clearly express appropriate course objectives, teaching strategies, and assessment devices
 - A composite average of at least 3.00 on student evaluations.

L2: To qualify for a rating of L2, faculty members shall meet all of the expectations for L1, and in addition provide evidence of effective effort in teaching. Presumptive evidence of effective teaching includes:

- Course materials that clearly express compelling course objectives, teaching strategies, and assessment devices
- A composite average of at least 3.75 on student evaluations.

Further evidence of teaching effectiveness includes such things as:

- Peer review letters attesting to teaching effectiveness
- Receiving a nomination for a teaching excellence award
- Narrative discussion of course development and thoughtful response to feedback.

L3: To qualify for a rating of L3, faculty members shall meet all of the expectations for L2, and in addition provide evidence of dedicated effort in teaching. Presumptive evidence of dedicated teaching includes:

- Course materials that clearly express challenging course objectives, teaching strategies, and assessment devices
- Composite averages of at least 4.15 on student evaluations.

Further evidence of dedicated teaching includes such things as:

- Use of extra-departmental teaching assessment program (e.g., GIFT)
- Serving as mentor for Dean's, Chancellor's, or President's scholar
- Serving as director of an Independent Study
- Serving as director of a Liberal Studies project
- Serving as director of an URCA project
- Attending teaching workshops
- Applying for teaching grants or other funding
- New course preparation
- Submitting a proposal for a new course or program
- Winning a teaching excellence award
- Teaching Interdisciplinary Studies courses.

If the chair wishes to assign a different rating from what the evidence listed above indicates, the burden is on the chair to document and justify the different rating.

Scholarly and Creative Activity.

The statement of "Normative Scholarship and Service Expectations of Faculty," which appears in the *Faculty Handbook*, reflects the expectations for scholarly and creative activities within this Department.

For the purposes of the following Merit Criteria, "refereed" refers to the process of selection for publication, in which a review is conducted by one's scholarly peers.

SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY MERIT CRITERIA

L0: Faculty members failing to provide evidence of research in progress will receive a rating of L0.

L1: To qualify for a rating of as L1, faculty members shall demonstrate a serious effort put forward in research. Evidence of research in progress includes such things as:

- A manuscript in progress filed in personnel file
- A narrative discussion of research in progress
- A paper presentation at SIUE
- Submission of a conference abstract or paper
- Submission of a grant proposal.

L2: To qualify for a rating of L2, faculty members shall demonstrate the completion of some research effort. Evidence of completed research effort includes such things as:

- Submission of a refereed article or book chapter
- Presenting a paper or commenting at a regional venue or conference
- The acceptance or publication of a book review, encyclopedia article, discussion note, or similar work
- Award of an internal grant
- Submission of a book proposal
- Submission of a completed book manuscript
- Refereeing papers for a journal or professional conference
- Organizing a philosophical conference
- Other analogous activities judged to be L2.

L3: To qualify for a rating of L3, faculty members shall demonstrate the high quality of some completed research effort. Evidence of high quality research includes such things as:

- Presentation of a paper at a highly selective national or international conference, or other prestigious venue
- Acceptance of a book proposal
- The acceptance or publication of a refereed or invited journal article or book chapter, or similar work
- The acceptance or publication of a book manuscript
- Editing an academic journal
- Award of an external grant or prestigious internal grant
- Other analogous activities judged to be L3.

If the chair wishes to assign a different rating from what the evidence listed above indicates, the burden is on the chair to document and justify the different rating.

Notes:

Publication of an article, book chapter, or book manuscript will only be counted once, either upon acceptance or upon publication.

Publication of a book review, encyclopedia article, or discussion note, or similar work in a prestigious venue may warrant a rating of L3. This requires sufficient justification through an appropriate narrative.

Service.

Service is any activity of the faculty member that is beneficial to the Department, the College, the University, or the community at large in the area of the faculty member's specialization.

The statement of "Normative Scholarship and Service Expectations of Faculty," which appears in the *Faculty Handbook*, reflects the expectations for service activities within this Department.

Each member of the faculty, regardless of rank, is expected to assume responsibilities for the operation and welfare of the academic community. The only exception is that newly hired Assistant Professors are expected to focus energies upon the areas of teaching and research and scholarly activities. Minimal expectations in service during the first two years are very low. Under normal circumstances, by the third year, the newly hired colleague is expected to assume his or her fair share of responsibilities within the Department, and begin to become involved in service at the College and/or University levels.

Forms of service do not bear equal weight, and consideration must be given not only to the effort devoted to certain tasks, but to the importance of the tasks, the effectiveness of the service, and so forth.

SERVICE MERIT CRITERIA

The following criteria are to be applied per term, excepting those terms for which a faculty member is on leave.

L0: Faculty members failing to participate in basic departmental duties will receive a rating of L0.

L1: To qualify for a rating of L1, faculty members shall participate in basic departmental duties including the following:

- Attendance at department faculty meetings (unless excused)
- Attendance at commencement and other regular events and ceremonial functions
- Participation in on-campus departmental job candidate interviews

- Active service on one committee or assignment.

L2: To qualify for a rating of L2, faculty members shall meet all expectations for L1 and shall in addition:

- Serve on two or more committees or assignments
- Serve on a very demanding committee or chair a committee.

L3: To qualify for a rating of L3, faculty members shall meet all expectations for L2 and in addition:

- Several L2 activities of exceptional merit may together warrant a rating of L3.
- Serve on two or more very demanding committees.
- Serve in a very demanding assignment or chair a very demanding committee.

The following are considered very demanding committees:

- a. Personnel Committee
- b. Job Screening Committee
- c. APA Interview Committee
- d. Program Review Team
- e. CAS Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee
- f. Undergraduate Committee

The following are considered very demanding assignments:

- a. Assistant Chair
- b. Major Adviser
- c. Faculty Senator

Faculty members may demonstrate, through an appropriate narrative, that a committee or assignment not listed above was very demanding during the period under evaluation.

Faculty members may demonstrate, through an appropriate narrative that a public service activity qualifies for consideration for a particular service rating.

Department of Philosophical Studies
Policy #16-97 [Replaces Policy #16-95]
Policy on Recommendations for Tenure and Promotion in Academic Rank

Department policy on recommendations for tenure and promotion in academic rank is governed by the relevant University and College policies. Specifically, University tenure procedures and policy are expressed in "Tenure Policy and Guidelines." University promotion procedures and policy are expressed in "Promotion Policy and Guidelines." College policy on promotion and

tenure is expressed in three documents: Criteria for the Evaluation and Recognition of the Teaching Activities of Faculty; Criteria for the Evaluation and Recognition of Research and scholarly activities, Scholarship, and Creative Activities of the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences; and Criteria for the Evaluation and Recognition of the Service Activities of the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences. Department Bylaws express the procedures to be followed in cases of tenure and academic promotion.

Tenure

University policy requires that to receive a positive recommendation for tenure, a candidate must have demonstrated at least satisfactory potential for continuing contributions to the Department, College, and University, ~~and~~ at least meritorious performance in teaching, and at least meritorious performance in either scholarship or service, and satisfactory performance in the other area.

In addition to University and College criteria, this Department believes that a positive recommendation for tenure should be granted only to candidates who demonstrate the likelihood and promise of advancement in academic rank to professor. Requirements for promotion in academic rank, therefore, provide a context for understanding and assessing the potential of the candidate for "continuing contributions."

Definitions of "Unsatisfactory," "Satisfactory," "Meritorious" and "Excellent" are contained in the CAS documents on promotion and tenure. Expectations within the Department of Philosophical Studies are further articulated in Policy on Faculty Evaluation. Moreover, consistent with this Department's ideal of the teacher scholar, no person shall be judged satisfactory in research and research and scholarly activities without having established a record of publication in refereed academic journals or the equivalent. That is, while a faculty member's performance in terms of salary recommendations and retention review may be judged satisfactory over the course of a period of years on the basis of scholarly activity, for tenure review the determination of "Satisfactory" is results oriented. Also it is not sufficient to have established a record of meritorious teaching, but one must provide evidence of the promise of continuing growth in teaching.

Promotion in Academic Rank

A. Promotion to Assistant Professor is based on the faculty member's having (1) attained the terminal degree in his or her discipline (2) had successful experience as a teacher and given an indication that teaching is the faculty member's primary function, (3) shown intellectual and scholarly promise, and (4) shown a willingness to serve. The faculty member becomes eligible for promotion consideration in whatever year these criteria are met.

B. Promotion to Associate Professor is based on (1) possession of the terminal degree. (2) the candidate's continued achievement as a teacher and scholar, and (3) the candidate's successful assumption of Department and University responsibilities. (4) The performance of service to the community at large will also count as evidence. Promotion to this rank for other reasons rests upon proven abilities and exceptional accomplishments. No candidate will be recommended for

promotion to Associate Professor who has not established a record of publication in refereed academic journals or the equivalent.

For consideration for promotion, the candidate should show meritorious service in the area of teaching, and meritorious performance in either the area of research and scholarly activities or service, and satisfactory performance in the other area. The candidate's teaching should show both versatility and breadth in subject areas mastered. At the level of Associate Professor, service within the University is of greater importance than public service.

An Assistant Professor is normally not considered for promotion before the fourth year of his or her service but may be considered earlier in exceptional cases. The period of intensive review is during the period of his or her fifth through seventh years in rank.

C. Promotion to Professor is based on scholarly, professional, and creative achievement and service beyond that required for the associate professorship. In teaching, the candidate should help set the standards of teaching in the Department. In scholarship or creative work, the candidate should have achieved professional recognition in his or her field, recognition based in part on such work. In academic, administrative, professional, and public services, he or she should have contributed markedly to the advancement of the University, exhibiting a pattern of leadership.

For consideration for promotion to Professor, the candidate should show meritorious service in the area of teaching, and meritorious performance in either the area of research and scholarly activities or service, and satisfactory performance in the other area.

An Associate Professor is not normally considered for promotion to the rank of Professor before the fifth year of service but may be considered earlier in exceptional cases. The period of intensive review is during the period of the candidate's sixth through tenth years in rank.

Promotion to Professor is not made on the basis of length of service to the University.

Department of Philosophical Studies
Policy #17-95
Policy on Contents of Personnel Files
April 1995

1. Copies of all documents which are to be used to justify personnel actions must be kept in the official files of the College of Arts and Sciences and/or the Department of Philosophical Studies. These documents include (but are not limited to):

a. Curriculum Vitae.

b. Copies of professional publications and professional addresses.

- c. Summaries of Annual Personnel Conferences.
- d. Notices of Personnel Action Recommendations.
- e. Records of Personnel Actions.
- f. Records of official actions taken on grievances and complaints, together with supporting materials.
- g. Tabulations of student evaluation-of-teaching forms.
(Item 1.h. can be included only with the consent of the individual faculty member.)
- h. Copies of all employment contracts with the University.
- i. Copies of Faculty Statistical Reports.

(When warranted by space limitations or by convenience these materials may be kept in a separate place in the Dean's office. Access to these materials will be governed by the policy on access to personnel files. When faculty members wish to examine their individual files, these materials will be made available.)

2. Materials which must not be placed in the files include:

- a. Student evaluation-of-teaching forms.
- b. Anonymous letters of complaint.
- c. Materials relating to an individual's life style, personal values, personal financial activities, or any other matters not directly relating to performance of professional duties.
- d. Materials pertaining to grievances and complaints which are in process.
- e. Peer evaluations solicited by the Chair. (Peer evaluations solicited by the faculty member may be included in the file in accordance with Paragraph 4 below.)
- f. Letters of recommendation for hiring.

3. The materials excluded by Items 2.d. and 2.e. above are to be destroyed after relevant personnel actions have been completed. The materials excluded by Items 2.b. and are to be destroyed immediately upon receipt.

4. The individual faculty member, Chair, or Dean may place any professionally relevant materials except those items excluded by Paragraph 2 above in the official file. In the event of material being placed in the file other than by the faculty member, a copy of that material will be supplied to the faculty member at the time.

5. Responsibility for the documents listed in Paragraph 1 above is delegated as follows:
- a. Faculty members are responsible for supplying complete information about her or his professional activities for Items 1.a., and 1.b.
 - b. Chairs and the Dean are responsible for supplying the documents for Items 1.c., 1.d. 1.e., 1.f, 1.g., 1.h., and 1.i.
 - c. Chairs are responsible for forwarding copies of all appropriate documents to the Dean, and the Dean is responsible for forwarding copies of all appropriate documents to the Provost.
6. Responsibility for actions outlined in Paragraphs 2 and 3 above resides with the Chairs and the Dean.

Department of Philosophy
Policy #18
Policy on Evaluation Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

The Philosophy Department strives to avoid two opposite pitfalls: that of leaving promotion and tenure criteria so vague as to be capable of highly subjective interpretations, and that of reducing what is ultimately a process involving considered judgment to a mere numerical exercise of averages or pages published in which venues, a task more suited to a rudimentary computer program than to a university professor. To achieve a middle way between these two extremes we provide rather precise guidelines and introduce the notion of presumptive ranking in the sense that if certain signposts are passed, a candidate's activity presumptively deserves a certain ranking. This entails that the burden of proof for a different ranking rests on the party proposing it.

These Procedures should be read in conjunction with Department of Philosophical Studies Policy #16-10 (revised April 2010), "Policy on Recommendations for Tenure and Promotion in Academic Rank." The chair shall discuss this document with incoming tenure-stream faculty-members. Junior faculty-members shall feel free to request clarifications from their faculty mentors, members of the department's Personnel Committee, or the chair.

Philosophy faculty members have expertise in different areas of scholarship and vary in strength in the individual areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. However, all must achieve high levels of proficiency in those areas. Hence, the minimum requirement for tenure and/or promotion in the Philosophy Department and according to University policy, is performance, commensurate with rank, that achieves during the review period the rating of Meritorious in Teaching and at least Meritorious in either scholarship or service and at least Satisfactory in the other area (Faculty Handbook II.8) [<http://www.siue.edu/provost/fhb/pro2.shtml>]

Review Instruments and Criteria

A. TEACHING

High quality teaching is a fundamental expectation of faculty within the Philosophy Department, and therefore the evaluation of teaching is an essential component in the assessment of any candidate's overall performance. Teaching can be difficult to evaluate as often teachers have different teaching methods, and the department values different pedagogical approaches. Nevertheless, the Department believes that an assessment of the candidate's teaching by a consideration of course material, curriculum development, student teaching evaluations, peer evaluation, teaching awards, and a self-reflective narrative can provide a reasonably accurate ranking.

1. Review instruments

All candidates for promotion and/or tenure must include representative samples of the following types of documentation:

- Student-generated statistical evidence
- Peer review letters or instruments from the whole period under review
- One narrative self-reflection of teaching including a discussion of:
 - Their support for the College of Arts and Sciences Desired Characteristics and Capabilities of Graduates
 - Their own contributions in terms of curriculum development
 - Their responsiveness to feedback provided within both student and peer evaluation
 - Their commitment to their ongoing development as a teacher

In what follows, this document mentions "Average A", which is obtained differently depending on the period covered, but typically it should include student evaluation data from the last five years:

- For periods between fall 2009 and fall 2011, A is calculated as follows. First, for each section, one obtains the average of student evaluations scores for items 4 and 15 of the Department of Philosophy Instructor and Course Evaluation form revised in fall 2009. Second, these averages are themselves averaged over all sections taught during the relevant period.
- For periods beginning in spring 2012, A is calculated as follows: First, for each section, one obtains the *weighted average* of student evaluations scores for all the items of the Department of Philosophy Instructor and Course evaluation form adopted in spring 2012; each student evaluation score will have weight 1, with the exception of items 9 and 10, each of which will have weight 3, and item 13, which will have weight 4. Second, these weighted averages are themselves averaged over all sections taught over the relevant period.

2. Criteria for the evaluation of teaching

Unsatisfactory Performance

A rating of Unsatisfactory indicates that candidates have not met the minimum expectations of University faculty in carrying out their teaching assignments as listed in the Faculty Handbook I.Q2 [<http://www.siu.edu/policies/lq2.shtml>]

Satisfactory Performance

To qualify for a rating of Satisfactory, candidates shall meet the minimum expectations of University faculty in carrying out their teaching assignments as listed in the Faculty Handbook I.Q2 [<http://www.siu.edu/policies/1q2.shtml>] during their stay as a member of the Department.

An overall Satisfactory rating in teaching is insufficient for the granting of tenure and/or promotion: <http://www.siu.edu/provost/fhb/7-16-10.shtml>. Candidates with a pre-tenure rating of Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory will be required to develop a teaching improvement plan in consultation with the Department Chair.

Meritorious Performance

To qualify for a rating of Meritorious, a candidate shall meet all of the expectations for Satisfactory Performance, and in addition show substantive sustained pedagogical commitment and teaching effectiveness during the review period. Presumptive evidence of meritorious teaching includes:

- An average A exceeding 3.75 out of 5.0, and a high quality in course design, evidenced by course syllabi, online lectures, handouts, exercises, tests *et similia*.
- Plus some combination of such things as:
 - Mentoring Dean's, Chancellor's, or Presidential Scholar, or similar, students or directing some Independent Study or Liberal Studies Senior Project or serve as a member of a Master's degree committee, or similar activities.
 - Evidence of substantial efforts to contribute to interdisciplinary learning
 - Peer letters assessing the candidate's teaching as being of high quality
 - Evidence of substantial commitment to professional development as a teacher
 - Receiving nominations for a Teaching Excellence Award
 - Winning a Teaching Excellence Award or a Teaching Distinction Award
 - Detailed evidence of substantial curriculum development in terms of new courses, new forms of teaching such as online and web enhanced courses and similar initiatives.
 - Teaching scholarship

Excellent Performance

To qualify for a rating of Excellent, candidates shall meet all of the expectations for Meritorious, and in addition show exceptional sustained commitment and teaching effectiveness during the review period. Presumptive evidence of excellent teaching includes:

- An average A exceeding 4.15 out of 5.0, and an outstanding quality in course design, evidenced by course syllabi, handouts, online lectures, exercises, tests *et similia*.
- Plus a combination of such things as:
 - Mentoring Dean's, Chancellor's, Presidential Scholar, or similar students; directing some Independent Study or Liberal Studies Senior Project; serving as a member of a Master's degree committee, or similar activities.
 - Evidence of outstanding efforts to enhance interdisciplinary collaboration

- Peer letters assessing the candidate's teaching as being of outstanding quality
- Evidence of outstanding commitment to professional development as a teacher
- Receiving nominations for a Teaching Excellence Award
- Winning a Teaching Excellence Award or Teaching Distinction Award
- Detailed evidence of substantial curriculum development in terms of new courses, new forms of teaching such as online and web enhanced courses and similar initiatives.
- Teaching scholarship

B. SCHOLARSHIP

The Philosophy Department shares the University's commitment to scholarship and considers it a vital component of successful academic performance. Although not all scholarship results in publication, candidates are expected to engage in research activities that include the production of peer-reviewed scholarly products. In general, the more rigorous the peer review process and the more extensive the research the more scholarly the candidate's activity will be deemed. A determination of how prestigious a publishing venue is can be obtained by asking specialists in the relevant area of philosophy. In addition, with respect to journals one can consider acceptance rates.

The Department is aware that scholarship cannot be judged merely by adding the number of pages or the number of articles published. For example, formal rigor and symbolic condensation may result in an article in symbolic logic being typically considerably shorter than one in ethics, for example. Nevertheless, other things being equal, the longer the work, the more the candidate's scholarly activity will be valued. In addition, sole authorship typically counts more than a joint one.

The Philosophy Department recognizes peer reviewed publications and products, including interdisciplinary and digital scholarship, in scholarly venues associated with Philosophy or Religious Studies.

1. Review instruments

All candidates for promotion and/or tenure must include in the materials they submit

- A complete list of their work published or accepted for publication together with the work itself
- A complete list of work in progress together with the work itself
- One narrative discussion of their research accomplishments, and of their research goals and the plans to achieve them.

2. Criteria for the evaluation of scholarship

To assist the Chair and the Personnel Committee in evaluating the candidate's performance with respect to scholarship, the following point system, where authorship is single, is provided as a guideline:

- 4 points: the acceptance or publication of an authored monograph, or comparable product, in a peer reviewed scholarly venue.

- 2 points: the editing for one year of a scholarly journal, or the acceptance for publication of a scholarly edited book containing a substantive introduction, or comparable product, in a peer reviewed scholarly venue.
- 1 point: the acceptance or publication of a scholarly article, substantive discussion note, book chapter, university level textbook, translation of a scholarly book, or comparable product, in a peer reviewed scholarly venue.
- ½ point: any of the following
 - the acceptance or publication of a non-peer-reviewed book chapter or article in a scholarly venue
 - the acceptance or publication of an entry in a prestigious encyclopedia
 - the acceptance or publication of a translated article in a peer-reviewed, scholarly venue
 - the acceptance or publication of a book review in a scholarly venue
 - the acceptance or republication of a scholarly peer-reviewed product
 - a positive evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship from an external reviewer
 - presentation of a scholarly paper at a highly selective national or international conference or other prestigious venue
 - a product comparable to the ones listed above
- ¼ point: the presentation of a scholarly paper at a regional venue or conference, the presentation of a commentary at a professional conference, the acceptance or publication of an encyclopedia entry, or the acceptance or publication of non-scholarly philosophical material for the general public.

With respect to an authored monograph, or comparable product, in a peer reviewed scholarly venue, by “acceptance” is meant the final unconditional acceptance by the publishing house. Hence, a book contract or mere acceptance by the editor does not count.

Coauthored work will merit 2/3 of single authorship points.

No product may be counted twice. If a product is counted as an “acceptance” when standing for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, it may not be counted as a publication when standing for promotion to Full Professor.

The candidate, the Chair, or the Personnel Committee can demonstrate through an appropriate narrative that a scholarly product should receive more or fewer points than is typical. Other relevant items for the ranking of scholarship are:

- The refereeing of papers for a journal or professional conference.
- The awarding of internal grants
- The awarding of external grants, which may be considered a positive evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship from an external reviewer.
- Recognition or citation of one’s work.

Unsatisfactory Performance

A rating of Unsatisfactory indicates that a candidate has not met the normative expectations for scholarship for University faculty as set forth in the Faculty Handbook’s “Normative Scholarship

and Service Expectations of Faculty” [<http://www.siu.edu/provost/fhb/5-2.shtml>] or has not met expectations for academic integrity in scholarship and research as set forth in the Faculty Handbook’s “Policy on Academic Integrity in Scholarship and Research” [<http://www.siu.edu/policies/1q5.shtml>]

Satisfactory Performance

To qualify for a rating of Satisfactory, a candidate shall meet the normative expectations for scholarship for University faculty as set forth in the Faculty Handbook’s “Normative Scholarship and Service Expectations of Faculty” [<http://www.siu.edu/provost/fhb/5-2.shtml>], including evidence of engagement in scholarship throughout the review period and the attainment of 3 points, of which at least 2 must result from distinct peer reviewed publications or products in scholarly venues.

Meritorious Performance

To qualify for a rating of Meritorious, a candidate shall meet the requirements of Satisfactory and provide evidence of substantive engagement in scholarship throughout the review period and a substantial record of peer-reviewed scholarly products during the review period. Presumptive evidence of meritorious scholarship involves obtaining 4 points, of which at least 2½ must result from distinct peer reviewed publications or products in scholarly venues.

Excellent Performance

To qualify for a rating of Excellent, a candidate shall satisfy all the requirements for Meritorious. In addition, a candidate shall provide evidence of outstanding engagement in scholarship throughout the review period and an outstanding record of peer-reviewed scholarly products during the review period. Presumptive evidence of excellent scholarship involves obtaining 5 or more points, of which at least 3½ must result from distinct peer reviewed publications or products in scholarly venues.

C. SERVICE

The Philosophy Department considers service to be an important part of each candidate's role, and expects all members of its faculty to show good citizenship through demonstrated service to the University, the College, the department, the profession, and/or the larger community. Mentoring of undergraduate students, through events such as Ethics Bowl and Lyceum Coordinator, or graduate school and scholarship advising, will also be considered. Forms of service do not bear equal weight, and consideration must be given not only to the effort devoted to certain tasks, but to the importance of the tasks and the effectiveness of the service.

While newly hired assistant professors are required to perform only minimal service in the first two years, over the years and the course of promotion faculty members are expected to expand their role in service. In addition, leadership roles should be part of service beginning with the rank of Associate Professor. A faculty member’s scope and degree of service is expected to increase as a condition for promotion in rank. Particularly in the case of promotion to the rank of Professor, a candidate is responsible for providing leadership within the department, and for participating at the college or university level. These are to be assessed in terms of quality as well as quantity.

1. Review instruments

All candidates for promotion and/or tenure must include in the materials that they submit:

- A complete list of their service included in the curriculum vitae
- One narrative discussion of their service performance
- Letters, if any, from the Chairs of the committees in which they served, or from the Department Chair in case of departmental assignments or committee chairs, evaluating their performance.

2. Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

To assist the Chair and the Personnel Committee in evaluating the candidate's performance with respect to service, the following point system is provided as a guideline:

- 3 points: Committed service as chair of a very demanding committee for 1 year or the normal duration of the committee or organizing a scholarly conference, including the Undergraduate Philosophy Conference
- 2 points: Committed service as chair of one committee for 1 year or the normal duration of the committee or acting as an officer for a professional organization.
- 1 point: Committed service on a very demanding committee or assignment for 1 year or the normal duration of the committee
- ½ point: Committed service on a committee or assignment for 1 year or the normal duration of the committee
- Outstanding service on a committee or assignment, as evidenced by letters from the Chairs of those committees, or from the Department Chair, or from the people to whom the committee reports, increases the point score by 50%.

The following are examples of very demanding committees:

- Personnel Committee
- Job Screening Committee
- APA Interview Committee
- Program Review Team
- CAS Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee
- Undergraduate Committee

The following are examples of very demanding assignments:

- Assistant Chair
- Major Adviser, as long as this service remains in the department.
- Faculty Senator
- Chairing a CAS or university wide committee

The candidate may demonstrate through an appropriate narrative that a committee or assignment not listed above was very demanding during the period under evaluation or that a public service activity qualifies for consideration for a particular service rating.

Unsatisfactory Performance

A rating of Unsatisfactory indicates that candidates have not met the normative expectations for Service for University faculty as set forth in the Faculty Handbook's "Normative Scholarship and Service Expectations of Faculty" [<http://www.siue.edu/provost/fhb/5-2.shtml>] including and as well as:

- Attending and participating in faculty meetings
- Participating in matters of governance
- Attending such events as Commencement and Preview SIUE
- Participating in reviews of the Department's programs
- Participating in the review of personnel matters
- Participating in on-campus departmental job candidate interviews.
- Providing service on one committee or assignment.

Satisfactory Performance

To qualify for a rating of Satisfactory, candidates shall meet the normative expectations for service for University faculty as set forth in the Faculty Handbook's "Normative Scholarship and Service Expectations of Faculty" [<http://www.siue.edu/provost/fhb/5-2.shtml>].

Presumptive evidence of satisfactory service includes obtaining 4 points for assistant professors. For associate professors, presumptive evidence of satisfactory service includes obtaining 6 points, at least 4 of which come from leadership positions, e.g., chairing a committee, and service to the University, public, or profession.

Meritorious Performance

To qualify for a rating of Meritorious, a candidate shall satisfy all the requirements for Satisfactory, and in addition provide evidence of significant, sustained, and effective engagement in service throughout the review period at the departmental level and beyond. Presumptive evidence of meritorious service includes obtaining 5 points for assistant professors. For associate professors, presumptive evidence of meritorious service includes obtaining 7 points, at least 5 of which come from leadership positions, e.g., chairing a committee, and service to the University, public, or profession.

Excellent Performance

To qualify for a rating of Excellent, a candidate must satisfy the requirements for Meritorious. In addition, the candidate shall provide evidence of outstandingly sustained and effective engagement in service throughout the review period at the department level and beyond. Presumptive evidence of excellent service includes obtaining 6 points for assistant professor. For associate professors, presumptive evidence of excellent service includes obtaining 8 points, at least 6 of which come from leadership positions, e.g., chairing a committee, and service to the University, public, or profession.

Department of Philosophy
Policy # 19
Policy on the Dr. Carol A. Keene Scholarship in Philosophy
May 2014

1. Name. Dr. Carol A. Keene Scholarship in Philosophy

2. Stipulations. The stipulations are those approved by the sponsor, Dr. Carol A. Keene, as follows:

- a. Purpose: To provide scholarship support to an SIUE undergraduate student with a declared major in philosophy.
- b. Restrictions (From stipulation form signed by Carol A. Keene):
The recipient of this award will be chosen by a committee appointed by the Chair of the Department of Philosophy. The amount of the award is dependent upon the amount of funds available. Students will be eligible to apply for this award if they have completed a minimum of 45 credit hours.

The recipient will be an undergraduate major in philosophy who:

- Will be a junior or senior in the coming academic term,
- Has achieved at least a 3.0 GPA in all courses and a 3.5 GPA in philosophy courses,
- Demonstrates superior ability in critical thinking and writing skills, and
- Exemplifies general conduct consistent with the highest standards of academic and personal integrity.

This scholarship award may be renewed for the student's senior year. However, the second year award is contingent upon successful progress toward completion of the degree, submission of a viable research proposal for a senior thesis, maintenance of the GPAs specified above, and continued demonstration of the skills and general conduct specified above.

The annual spendable earnings of this endowment, as defined by the SIUE Foundation Investment Policy, shall be used to provide one or more scholarship awards made in accordance with established procedures of the University. As long as the sponsor is living, she has the authority to initiate changes, and/or approve any changes to the criteria at any time. No changes can be made without the approval of the sponsor. Also, during the sponsor's lifetime, the Chair of the Department of Philosophy may approach the sponsor with suggested changes. After the sponsor's death, the Proviso will be utilized as the default when decisions need to be made.

3. Procedure.

A committee appointed by the Chair of the Department of Philosophy shall be responsible for

selecting the awardees. This may be the Undergraduate Committee. In order to make a decision about this award in time for Honors Day, normally held each April, students should be made aware of the scholarship by the Philosophy Department during the fall semester, and the committee should begin soliciting applications at the beginning of the spring semester. Women and minorities should be encouraged to apply.

Students who have completed a minimum of 45 total credit hours may apply for this scholarship by submitting the following:

- a. Information on current overall GPA
- b. Information on philosophy courses taken, letter grades received, and Philosophy GPA
- c. Planned fall schedule of courses
- d. Writing sample that demonstrates superior critical thinking and writing skills
- e. Nomination letter from a faculty member in the department of Philosophy
- f. Students who have completed at least 75 total credit hours must also submit:
 Research proposal for a senior assignment project.

It is assumed that a student who received the award for their junior year will renew that award for their senior year, contingent upon the stipulations specified above. In order to renew the award the student must continue to make progress toward graduation, and must maintain the GPAs specified. Upon receiving the award, the student's GPAs should be monitored each semester, to ensure the minimums are maintained. In addition, during their junior year, the student should submit an application consisting of:

- a. Information on current overall GPA
- b. Information on philosophy courses taken, letter grades received, and Philosophy GPA
- c. Planned fall schedule of courses
- d. Research proposal for a senior assignment project
- e. Letter of support from a faculty member in the department of Philosophy

4. Considerations.

This is a merit-based scholarship; it is not a need-based scholarship. However, a student who is already receiving a premier SIUE scholarship that covers complete tuition costs would not be deemed eligible for the scholarship.

A consideration in favor of selecting a particular student is that student's interest in pursuing a career path that advances the profession of Philosophy.

Department of Philosophy
Policy # 20
Policy on the John Mareing Philosophy Scholarship
October 2014

1. Name. John Mareing Philosophy Scholarship

2. Stipulations. The stipulations are those approved by the sponsor, John Mareing, as follows:

a. Purpose: To promote the study of Philosophy, philosophical discussion, mentorship, and to assist SIUE Philosophy students financially.

b. Restrictions (Verbatim from stipulation form signed by John Mareing): The recipient of this award will be chosen by a committee appointed by the Chair of the Department of Philosophy, to consist of up to two SIUE Emeritus Philosophy Professors, if available. Students will be eligible to apply for this award if they have completed a minimum of 60 credit hours. The selection criteria are as follows:

- The student shall be an undergraduate Philosophy major or minor.
- The student shall have achieved at least a 2.75 GPA.
- The student shall have submitted an essay that addresses an issue concerning the relevance and role of philosophy and that demonstrates superior critical thinking and writing skills.
- The student shall exemplify general conduct consistent with the highest standards of academic and personal integrity.

The amount of the award is dependent upon the amount of funds available. The annual spendable earnings of this endowment, as defined by the SIUE Foundation Investment Policy, shall be used to provide one or more scholarship awards made in accordance with established procedures of the University. The sponsor may suggest changes to the criteria at any time; also, the Chair of the Department of Philosophy may approach the sponsor with suggested changes. No changes shall be made without approval of the sponsor. After the sponsor's death, the Proviso will be utilized as the default when decisions need to be made.

3. Procedure.

A committee appointed by the Chair of the Department of Philosophy shall be responsible for selecting the awardees. This committee shall consist of at least one current faculty member in the Department of Philosophy, and, if available, two Emeritus Philosophy Professors. In order to make a decision about this award in time for Honors Day, normally held each April, students should be made aware of the scholarship by the Philosophy Department during the fall semester, and the committee should begin soliciting applications at the beginning of the spring semester. Women and minorities should be encouraged to apply. Students should be encouraged to seek a faculty member to serve as a mentor, and faculty may wish to encourage particular students they deem especially suitable for the award, and may also volunteer to serve as mentors. A faculty

member serving as mentor should not also serve on the award committee.

Students who have completed a minimum of 60 total credit hours may apply for this scholarship by submitting the following:

- a. Information on current overall GPA
- b. An essay of 1500-2500 words, addressing the relevance and role of philosophy.

Upon being awarded the John Mareing Philosophy Scholarship, the student's essay should be disseminated in a venue that would foster philosophical discussion. For example, the student may present their essay at a colloquium, a meeting of the student Philosophy organization, or there may be an appropriate venue for publishing the essay. Also, during the sponsor's lifetime, a copy of the winning paper should be sent to the sponsor.

The amount of the award will depend on funds available. This scholarship will only be awarded in a given year to a student who submits a deserving paper, and who meets the GPA requirements. If the committee decides that there is more than one deserving paper, there is the option that multiple awards may be presented, with the available funds divided.

A student may receive this award more than once, though it would require a new essay, on a different topic.

A student who is already receiving a premiere SIUE scholarship that covers complete tuition costs would not be deemed eligible for this scholarship.

4. Guidelines for the essay.

Students may work with a faculty member as mentor, whose role would be to discuss ideas with the student, and provide general feedback on the essay. The topic of the current relevance and role of philosophy is meant to capture a broad range of possible paper topics. Students may wish to refine the paper topic to discuss a more specific issue regarding the relevance and role of philosophy. Some possible paper topics would include:

- The relevance of philosophy for another academic discipline. For example, a student with a double major in philosophy and history could write an essay on the interplay between history and philosophy, and how philosophy informs and deepens our understanding of history.
- The relevance of philosophy for public discourse. For example, a student with interests in politics and public discourse could write an essay on how the study of philosophy and its argumentative methods can clarify political disagreements and foster tolerance and productive debate.
- The role of philosophy anticipated for one's own career path. A student may wish to discuss the influence the study of philosophy has had on their choice of career path, and how they anticipate they will use their training in philosophy in the future.
- The role of philosophy for human flourishing. In an increasingly technological, digitized, and virtual world, how does the study of philosophy help an individual to fulfill her potential as a human?

- The role of philosophy in psychology and cognitive science. As empirical psychology and advances in the study of brain functioning explain more about human behavior, what contribution can philosophy make to our understanding of ourselves?
- The potential for expanding philosophical discourse and education beyond its traditional place in academia, for example in pre-College curricula, public philosophical discourse, and popular culture.
- The role and value of philosophy in determining the value of various forms of human labor/work, whether paid or unpaid.
- The role and value of philosophy for a profession to establish its unique identity and ethical obligations.
- The role and value of philosophy to the understanding global warming and other significant crises in the world.
- The role and value of philosophy for understanding what it is to be human in an age where we are becoming more reliant on technology.

Department of Philosophy
Policy # 21
Policy on Peer Evaluation of Teaching
Fall 2017

Preamble: It is assumed that all faculty can benefit from suggestions for improvement, and that faculty also benefit from the opportunity to observe and review the teaching of their peers. Thus, the practice of peer evaluation is highly valued as a means to maintaining excellence in teaching, and is regarded as an important service responsibility. Peer evaluations are kept in the personnel files of faculty members evaluated.

1. Requirements for Peer Evaluation. The following faculty members are required to have peer evaluations:

- a) Untenured Tenure-Line Faculty. At least one peer evaluation per semester (excluding summers) during the entire probationary period (normally 5 years). These should be conducted in a variety of courses and by a variety of reviewers.
- b) Tenured Associate Professors. At least one peer evaluation per year during the review period (beginning with Promotion to Associate). These should be conducted in a variety of courses and by a variety of reviewers.
- c) Instructors and Lecturers. At least one peer evaluation per year.
- d) Any faculty member offering a course in which instruction is to be conducted fully or partially online when that offering is either a) the instructor's initial online offering of that course, or b) a repeat offering following the identification of a need for revision. Such courses may not be repeated without such a review or approval of the Undergraduate Committee.

2. Definition of a "Peer."

- a) Peer evaluations should be conducted by tenure-line faculty. While it is expected that most peer evaluators will be faculty in the Philosophy Department, evaluators from outside the department are welcome and encouraged.

- b) Peer evaluation of tenured faculty should be conducted by other tenured faculty.
- c) Peer evaluations of online offerings should be conducted by tenure-line faculty members with significant online teaching experience.

3. Responsibilities of faculty arranging Peer Evaluations. Tenure-line faculty members requiring peer evaluations are responsible for arranging and scheduling peer evaluations. Peer evaluators for Instructors and Lecturers will be assigned by the Department chair. For online courses, instructors shall request that peer evaluators be given full access to the course Blackboard page.

4. Responsibilities of Peer Evaluators. Conducting peer evaluations is considered an important service contribution. Faculty are responsible for being available to conduct peer evaluations when requested.

a) Face-to-face courses. A peer evaluator is expected to review the course syllabus and any other related material provided by a faculty member, and to attend one full class session (50 - 75 minutes).

b) Online courses. A peer evaluator is expected to review the course Blackboard page including site organization, syllabus, and sample of lectures and discussion boards.

c) Content of Evaluation. An evaluation letter should summarize the findings and observations of the evaluator, including feedback on the syllabus, organization, and structure of the class, an account of what transpired during the class observation (or an account of the content of online lectures or discussions), and any relevant suggestions for improvement.