



Department of Philosophy
Dorothy F. Schmidt College of Arts and Letters
777 Glades Road, SO 283
Boca Raton, FL 33431
tel: 561.297.3868
fax: 561.297.2095

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Revised and Adopted / February 20, 2017

Amended / May 1, 2017

Amended / December 10, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- **General statement of ratings – p. 1**
- **Annual Performance Evaluation Criteria – p. 2**
 - **Instruction – p. 2**
 - **Scholarship, Research, and Publication – p. 3**
 - **Service – p. 5**

Consistent with Florida Atlantic University policies and the BOT/UFF collective bargaining Agreement, each year the department chair shall be responsible for completing a written assessment of faculty member's (other than eminent scholars, who are evaluated by the Dean) performance during the preceding academic year. Evaluations are based on the faculty member's annual assignment. Faculty members in the department of Philosophy are normally evaluated in terms of three general categories: (A) Teaching; (B) Research, and (C) Service.

The results of the evaluations are recorded on the college evaluation form, signed and dated by the chair and then reviewed and signed by the faculty member. The signature indicates only that the concerned faculty member has read the review not that she/he agrees with the assessment. Tenure-earning faculty are also provided a progress toward tenure report from the chair. These documents are then sent to the Dean of the college for review and assessment. Each faculty member under review is responsible for providing the chair with a properly completed assessment form and all appropriate supporting material in a timely fashion. Normally, such information is called for at a time sufficiently before the end of the spring semester to enable the chair to complete the evaluations by the deadline.

Annual evaluations play a significant role in promotion and tenure recommendations, merit awards and other matters requiring faculty assessment.

The Chair's overall rating of a faculty member's annual performance shall be in accordance with the following criteria:

Exceptional: Must receive an overall rating of Exceptional in Research and Instruction, and Outstanding in Service.

Outstanding: Must receive an overall rating of Outstanding in two categories and at least Good in the other category.

Good: a) Must receive an overall rating of At least Good in all three, or b) Outstanding in one and at Good in one, or c) Exceptional in one, and at least Good in one.

Needs improvement: Must receive an overall rating of Needs Improvement in at least two, and at most Good in the other.

Unsatisfactory: Must receive an overall rating of Unsatisfactory in all three categories.

Annual Performance Evaluation Criteria

The rating of a faculty member in an assigned category is a judgment of the departmental chair and should be informed by the evaluations criteria articulated below, which are based upon the usual teaching load, and research and administrative assignment. In accordance with college policy, each faculty member shall be rated in each assigned category as excellent, above satisfactory, satisfactory, below satisfactory.

A. INSTRUCTION

Factors in Evaluation of Instruction may include, but may not necessarily be limited to:

- Type of courses taught.
- Student assessment (SPOT form).
- Honors, awards, etc.
- Peer evaluation (departmental or outside review as appropriate).
- DIS supervision, and thesis and dissertation committee membership.
- Participation in teaching enhancement activities.
- Participation in undergraduate research activities, including OURI designated research-intensive courses and research-focused independent studies.
- Participation in undergraduate research projects, including OURI grant participation.
- Production of pedagogical publications and/or course proposals.
- Other materials as referred to in the contract at (10.4(a)).

Evidence of significant instructional achievement may include, but may not necessarily be limited to:

1. Receiving an average rating of 2.20 or better on question #6 of the university evaluation form or SPOT evaluation (1.0 being the highest rating and 4.0 being the lowest rating on SPOT evaluations).
2. Receiving a peer reviewed teaching award or grant.
3. Developing one or more new courses, or significantly revising one or more existing courses.
4. Publication(s) addressing new instructional methods and/or strategies for teaching philosophy, or providing materials geared to teaching philosophy.
5. Active participation in teaching enhancement activities, including teaching WAC courses.
6. Good peer (faculty) evaluation that include a written evaluation and critique of the faculty member's teaching, completed by a tenured member of the Florida Atlantic University philosophy faculty based on at least one classroom visit.
7. Supervising Directed Independent Study.
8. Participating in thesis or dissertation committee.
9. Chairing thesis or dissertation committee.

Instructional Ratings:

Exceptional: Must meet at least 3 of 9 instructional criteria listed, at least one of which must be from 1-6.

Outstanding: Must meet at least 2 of 9 instructional criteria listed, at least one of which must be from 1-6.

Good: Must meet at least #1 instructional criterion.

Needs Improvement: Evidence of some teaching activities, but none of the items listed in 1-9.

Unsatisfactory: None of the Above

B. SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION

Contributions to the above are generally understood to include the following:

- Contributions that offer new knowledge.
- Research that aids colleagues in the discipline in advancing their own research
- Critical evaluation of new or traditional arguments and/or evidence to determine their validity and/or truth.
- Develop new perspective upon a philosophical issue.
- Integration of philosophical concepts into other disciplines in ways that advance knowledge.
- Integration of concepts from other disciplines into philosophy in ways that advance new areas of philosophical inquiry

Evidence of significant contributions to scholarship, research and/or publication include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following;

List #1

1. Publication (in print or online) of:
 - a. Articles in professional journals
 - b. Refereed or invited authored books
 - c. Edited books (including anthologies, textbook, journals or special editions thereof)
 - d. Chapters in edited volumes (including substantial encyclopedia and dictionary entries and articles in symposia)
 - e. Substantial introductions or commentaries
2. Acceptance and/or presentation of paper at a professional meeting and/or conference
3. Translation of significant philosophical work

4. Acceptance of the above by publishers or editors (receipt of final contract in List #1, acceptance by publishers in List #2).
5. Demonstrable evidence of works in progress (publishable manuscripts, articles, chapters, and other substantial work in progress, evaluated on the basis of scholarship and progress).
6. Receipt of a fellowship, grant, or equivalent award

List # 2

1. Book reviews or book notes in or accepted by referred publications (print or electronic)
2. Discussant at a session of a scholarly meeting
3. Submission of a grant application, whether or not the application successfully results in the receipt of a grant
4. Demonstrable evidence of substantial progress made towards completion of an article or book.
5. Note much philosophical research is part of multi-year investigation, research and writing, which should also be born in mind *vis a vis* assessment.
6. Where applicable, publication outlets, as well as publications, will be judged in relation to the pertinent school of thought

Scholarship, Research and Publication Ratings:

The Chair's judgment will take cognizance of the faculty member's annual assignment. The ratings guidelines below are for a full-time faculty member with a normal research assignment. Any significant deviating from such a normal assignment will be taken into account and assessed appropriately.

Exceptional: a) 2 in List # 1 or b) at least 1 in List #1 and another 2 from List #2.

Outstanding: 1 in List #1 and a further 1 in List #2.

Good: At least 2 in List #2.

Needs Improvement: 1 in list #2.

Unsatisfactory: None of the Above

C. SERVICE

Factors in evaluating Service may include, but may not necessarily be limited to:

1. Type of service
2. Assessment from committee chairs, committee peers, and other appropriate individuals
3. Peer evaluation (departmental or outside reviewers as appropriate)

Service Criteria may include, but may not necessarily be limited to:

1. Departmental Service

- Chairing a departmental committee
- Officer of a committee
- Chairing or serving on a search committee
- Membership on departmental standing or *ad hoc* committee
- Advising a Student Club or Honor Society
- Building the university library collection or departmental library collection in one's discipline
- Fundraising
- Promoting Intellectual life of department beyond normal instructional activity. For example, organizing and/or participating in a symposium or lecture in, or for, the department.
- Serving as a mentor to other faculty in the department

2. College and University Service

- Directing a certificate program
- Chairing college or university committee
- Membership on college or university committees
- Managing or serving on college or university Initiative
- Serving as a mentor to faculty in other departments.

3. Professional Service

- Refereeing manuscript for scholarly journals, presses, and grant proposals for funding agencies
- Serving as officer or as an editorial board member for a professional journal
- Serving as an officer or as a board member for a professional organization
- Serving as outside reviewer for promotion and tenure candidates at other universities
- Serving as outside reviewer for program evaluation at other universities
- Organizing sessions at professional meeting
- Organizing seminar, symposium or conference
- Received (appropriate) rewards or honors for service to a professional organization
- Serving in a professional capacity connected to philosophy on a community board

- Presenting a public lecture.
- Serving as a chair at a scholarly meeting

4. Community Engagement

- Giving public lectures in the local community
- Organizing courses in philosophy for local high school students (e.g., summer camps in philosophy)
- Visiting local schools to talk about the benefits of studying philosophy

Service Ratings:

Exceptional: A total of any 4 items from the list of Department, College or University service.

Outstanding: A total of any 3 items from the list of Department, College or University service.

Good: A total of any 2 item from the list of Department, College or University service.

Needs Improvement: A total of any 1item from the list of Department, College or University service.

Unsatisfactory: None of the Above