

Adopted by resolution of the Department of Philosophy faculty, August 25, 2023.

Submitted for approval August 25, 2023

Approved by the Offices of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Provost on August 29, 2023.

Department of Philosophy Post-Tenure Review Procedure

In accordance with BOG Regulation 10.003 and USF BOT regulation XXX, tenured members of the philosophy department may be selected for post-tenure review every five years, beginning with their last promotion review or post-tenure review, whichever is later. For the Department of Philosophy, the post-tenure faculty “review packet” described in BOT XXX.II.1.a-d shall consist in the following:

1. The faculty member’s current CV;
2. The faculty member’s most recent five annual evaluations;
3. If applicable, a record of any disciplinary actions involving the faculty member;
4. An *optional* narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years, expected not to exceed 12,000 characters.

Post-tenure reviews in the Department of Philosophy will be conducted by the Department Chair in accordance with the following criteria. Faculty members may appeal the Chair’s evaluations, without prejudice, to the Department Executive Committee whose charge includes procedures for declared or perceived conflicts of interest. The Executive Committee will use the same criteria. Ratings are given on a scale of 1 (exceeds expectations) to 4 (unsatisfactory). Criteria are based on those for annual evaluation, adjusted to account for a five-year evaluation period, and barring exceptional circumstances they should not yield scores that diverge significantly from the mean of the faculty member’s last five annual evaluation scores as renormalized to the Board’s 1-4 scale. Ratings will be given separately for each component of the faculty member’s assignment, with component ratings weighted by assignment proportion in yielding the final post-tenure review score.

Research (Assumes 40% assignment. Adjustments will be made for different assignments).

For purposes of post-tenure review, the department Chair and (where applicable) the Executive Committee should consider the quality of scholarship as of greater significance than quantitative output alone. Furthermore, research projects in philosophy sometimes take ten years or longer to reach completion. While faculty members engaged in such projects often present preliminary findings in journal articles or at conferences, there are conditions under which superlative scholars may have very little demonstrable “output” during a given evaluation period. In such cases, the Chair and (where applicable) the Executive Committee should weigh project descriptions provided in optional narratives over quantitative output.

Other things being equal, the standings of journals and academic presses in which candidates publish are to be considered significant indicators of quality. Assessment of research quality in philosophy is a rigorous process, but not a quantitative one. The assessment of quality may also take into account the public recognition of a candidate’s work in the form of prizes, awards,

fellowships, and grants, though these are not a necessary condition either for a first-rate scholarly career in philosophy or for exceeding expectations in post-tenure review.

Assuming uniformly high quality of scholarship, a score of 1 will be given for five peer-reviewed articles or book chapters or equivalent productivity over the course of the evaluation period (see below for equivalences). A score of 2 will be given for between one and four peer-reviewed articles or equivalent. A score of 3 will be given if the faculty member has articles under review, or has presented work in progress at national or international conference venues. A score of 4 will be given if the review packet contains no evidence of ongoing scholarly activity.

Typical evidence of scholarly productivity includes the following:

1. Peer-reviewed Articles

A peer-reviewed article is an article in a peer-reviewed journal in philosophy (or cognate scholarly field, where appropriate), or a chapter in a peer-reviewed anthology.

2. Scholarly Monographs

A scholarly monograph is considered equivalent to approximately five peer-reviewed articles. Scholarly monographs are to be placed in reputable academic presses, enforcing rigorous peer-review practices in their acceptance of manuscripts.

3. New Editions or Translations of Major Works

New editions and translations of major works by important philosophers are absolutely essential to contemporary philosophical scholarship. The scholarly qualifications and effort required to edit a major work to contemporary scholarly standards, with appropriate annotations and apparatus, or to translate such a work, can match or exceed those required for a scholarly monograph. Such publications are to be considered equivalent to between three and five peer-reviewed articles, depending on the extent of their original scholarly contribution. They are to be placed in reputable academic presses, enforcing rigorous peer-review practices in their acceptance of manuscripts.

4. Edited Anthologies

An edited anthology should be considered equivalent to between two and four peer-reviewed articles, depending on the extent of the candidate's original scholarly contribution. Assembling and editing an anthology is an important scholarly contribution in its own right. In addition, the candidate may also have contributed an introduction and one or more original chapters. Any such chapters should be considered in determining how much weight to place on the anthology; chapters should not be counted separately as stipulated in (1).

5. Collaborative Work

In philosophy, co-authored and co-edited publications are the exception rather than the rule. Candidates may receive full or partial credit for such work, depending on the extent of their participation. A co-authored article or book in which the candidate played a leading role, or which could not have come about without the candidate's sustained and committed participation, may receive full credit.

6. Additional Publications and Other Public Scholarship

Additional publications and other public scholarship meriting consideration toward tenure include, but are not limited to the following: articles not peer-reviewed or solicited for peer-reviewed collections, encyclopedia articles, articles published in conference proceedings, and substantial critical book reviews published in major journals. Published ephemera (e.g. letters to the editor) or other work tangential to the candidate's field of philosophical expertise will not be considered.

Teaching

Mean E8 teaching evaluation scores will be considered as one of many types of evidence for post-tenure teaching evaluation, including more statistically representative, written, in class teaching evaluation scores; work directing and serving on graduate student dissertation committees and comprehensive exams; evidence of pedagogical innovation; service as instructor of record for sections enrolling 90 or more students; supervising GAs; developing online course shells; additional voluntary teaching; teaching beyond the call of duty in other respects, such as serving special department needs; and special service to the graduate or undergraduate program. Faculty members are entitled to up to two peer evaluations per year, which will be taken into account in adjusting teaching scores upward or downward. A score of 1 will be awarded to faculty members demonstrating the highest level of commitment and performance in teaching as displayed by evidence in three or more of the above categories. A score of 2 will be awarded for consistent dedication, as displayed by evidence two of the above categories. A score of 3 will be awarded to faculty whose teaching efforts merit significant improvement in one or more respects. A score of 4 will be awarded to faculty whose instructional efforts have failed to meet department needs.

Service

1 will be awarded for editing a scholarly journal, chairing a program committee for a regional or national conference, chairing a school, department, or university committee or council; or for two major, time-consuming activities each of which goes beyond routine membership in a department committee. These may include serving as Associate Editor for a scholarly journal, chairing a department committee, or membership in a school, college, or university committee or council.

1.5 will be given for multiple committee memberships or equivalent, including but not limited to

substantive contributions to the peer review process.

2 will be given for active membership in at least one standing or ad-hoc committee of the department, or for modest participation in peer review.

3 or may be given when governance participation is confined to committees that have been largely inactive during the evaluation period, or for minimal contributions to peer review.

4 may be given when there is little to no evidence of service to the community, profession, or institution.

Appeals

Any faculty member may appeal the post-tenure review score awarded by the Chair, without prejudice. Appeals will be conducted by the Department of Philosophy Executive Committee in accordance with annual evaluation appeals procedures stipulated in §V of the Department Governance Document. The outcome of that appeal will determine the post-tenure review score reported by the Chair.