

**SSU Philosophy Department RTP Criteria**  
**Effective Fall, 2022**  
**Approved Fall, 2021**

**Overview**

The department endorses the following priority of order in the three areas of faculty performance, with (1) the most important and (3) the least:

1. Teaching
2. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity
3. Service

**1 Teaching**

Departmental expectations in the area of teaching are that an instructor:

(1) *Meets* expectations with respect to retention, tenure, and promotion if they have (a) “Effective” SETE quantitative scores as defined below and overall positive SETE qualitative comments, AND (b) Adequate peer evaluations. The department will base peer evaluations on the following criteria: attendance, syllabus (clear statement of learning objectives, correlation of objectives with grading and assignments), relevance and interest of academic content, in-class student participation, faculty engagement.

(2) *Exceeds* expectations with respect to retention, tenure, and promotion, including for the purposes of early tenure and/or promotion, if they have (a) “Excellent” SETE quantitative scores as defined below and overall positive SETE qualitative comments AND (b) Excellent peer evaluations; in addition excellence in one of more of the “additional criteria” below will be considered.

Note: a necessary precondition for either meeting or exceeding expectations is that the instructor satisfy the Department’s curricular standards for the course, including (but not limited to) topics, readings, and assignments.

**QUALITATIVE SETE QUESTIONS**

Students will be asked to answer the following set of four questions:

1. How satisfied were you with *your* effort in this course?
2. Please identify what you consider to be the strengths of the course.
3. Please identify area(s) where you think the course could be improved.
4. How successful was the instructor in creating an inclusive and equitable learning environment for your learning needs?

## QUANTITATIVE SETE QUESTIONS

Instructors are expected to show growth toward or maintenance of an effective to excellent SETE rating across courses.

**Effective:** 3.5-4.39 average on all quantitative questions AND fewer than three “1” or “2” scores on any question for any class with up to 30 students. For each additional 10 students per class, one additional “1” or “2” scores is permissible with a cap at ten such scores. Question 8, “encourages independent study”, is excluded from this measure.

**Excellent:** 4.4 or higher average on all quantitative questions AND fewer than three “1” or “2” scores on any question for any class with up to 30 students. For each additional 10 students per class, one additional “1” or “2” scores is permissible with a cap at ten such scores. Question 8, “encourages independent study”, is excluded from this measure.

Note: The department recognizes that special circumstances, such as the instructor introducing innovative techniques or suffering a family crisis, could be a legitimate reason to excuse a rating of “ineffective”; in that case the instructor is invited to explain such special circumstances in writing. The department may, at its discretion, take these special circumstances to be sufficient grounds for delaying or reversing a judgment of “ineffective”.

Note: Being deemed ineffective or unqualified can be challenged on grounds of inadequate SETE response rates. The department recognizes that averages (as opposed to single 1 or 2 scores) are less representative as response rates get lower, and judges that response rates below 10% are not informative.

## SUPPLEMENTAL INDICATORS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

The department considers the following as potentially offsetting a sub-effective rating, in a manner to be determined on a course-by-course basis

1. Use of innovative technology in instruction.
2. Professional development in the area of teaching.
3. Curricular innovation, especially with an emphasis on interdisciplinary courses.
4. Integration of service learning into courses.

## 2 Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity

The department endorses traditional and alternative scholarly and creative activity (2.1 and 2.2) and supports candidates who pursue quality activity in either or both streams. Given the professional familiarity with the standard academic research path, the department uses the following system as a basis from which to assess research output.

For standard academic research (2.1), all venues (journals, presses, conferences, etc.) must be recognized as legitimate by the Philosophy Department. (Products that are self-published or published by predatory or otherwise marginal publishers, will not be recognized as “published” for the purposes of this policy.) Venues for produced alternative work (2.2) must meet standards parallel to those for academic venues. Candidates are encouraged to consult with the Department if there are questions about what counts as a “legitimate” or an “especially prestigious” venue, as those terms are used here.

### 2.1 Standard academic research:

#### 2.1.1 Scale

##### Group A: Major Publications

- 8 points Peer-reviewed academic book
- 3 points Externally peer-reviewed academic article or book chapter

##### Group B: Presentations, Grants, and Minor Publications

- 2 points Major (> \$9,999), external grants or fellowships
- 3 points Major reference works, such as encyclopedia entries
- 2 points Conference presentations, colloquia, or lectures
- 2 points Published book reviews
- 2 points Editing an anthology, journal or journal issue, or textbook

##### Group C: Research activity

- 1 point Internal and/or small (<\$10,000) grants and fellowship received
- 1 point Completed unpublished manuscripts (under review)
- 1 point Works in progress: manuscripts, grant applications

**BONUS points:** The department will add one point to the above scale for each research product judged to have been especially meritorious, such as publishing in a “top” journal or press or being invited to keynote a prominent conference. Determining what counts as an especially prestigious venue is at the discretion of the Department.

Note on quality: This scale is used as a starting point that can be added to or subtracted from based on the RTP committee's judgment of the quality of the work.

### 2.1.2 Meeting and Exceeding Expectations

In order to meet departmental expectations for tenure and promotion, an Assistant Professor must, by the year they apply for tenure and promotion:

- Accumulate a minimum of 8 total points on the scale, and
- Have produced at least one item from Group A, and at least one item from Group B

In order to exceed departmental expectations for tenure and promotion, including for early tenure or promotion, an Assistant Professor must, by the year they apply for tenure and promotion:

- Accumulate at least 15 total points on the scale, and
- Have produced at least three items from Group A
- Have at least one item from Group B

In order to receive promotion to Professor, an Associate Professor must, since being appointed Associate Professor:

- Accumulate at least 7 (new) points on the scale, and
- Have at least three (new) items in either Group A or Group B

## 2.2 Alternative Scholarship and Creative Activity

The Department supports alternative intellectual products that evidently draw upon and express a faculty members' academic expertise, such as (but not limited to):

- Op-Eds and essays published in popular venues (rather than standard academic venues)
- Published fiction
- Published art
- Published technical white papers and research documents for industry, government, and NGOs.
- Published computer programming
- Podcasts or other audio/video productions

In terms of credit toward tenure or promotion, translating such work into the point system above is done on a case-by-case basis by the Department RTP Committee. Candidates are encouraged to consult with the Department to get a sense of how an alternative product might be evaluated. The RTP Committee will, upon request by the candidate, provide a written rationale for such case-by-cases judgments.

Note: candidates should be able to explain how an alternative scholarly or creative activity draws on their expertise and why the result should be considered equivalent to research. The candidate will be evaluated both on whether the product is equivalent to research and on the significance of the project.

### **3 Service**

#### **3.1 Service to the University**

3.1.1 The following meets Departmental expectations for tenure and for any level of promotion for *University* service:

3.1.1.2 First year at SSU: attendance at departmental meetings and participation in at least one departmental committee or activity each semester. Such activities can include (but are not limited to) the following: advising a student club, participating in a speaker series, retreat participation, and peer observation of teaching. Departmental committees can include (but are not limited to) curriculum committee, CELS/Philosophy Integration Committee, or Lecturer hiring committee.

3.1.1.2 All other faculty: one departmental committee or activity each semester and one school or university committee or activity each semester. [See 3.1.1]

3.1.2 The following exceeds Department expectations for tenure and any level of promotion, including for early tenure and promotion, regarding University service

- Satisfaction of the requirements in 3.1.1, and
- Exceptional service to students or the Department, as judged by the Department

NOTE: More than one meaningful School or University committee is not recommended

#### **3.2 Public Service**

The Department values service to the local community and to the profession. The following are the standards to meet expectations for tenure and any level of promotion.

3.2.1. Departmental Expectations for Community Service: At least one community activity in relation to academic expertise, which can include presentations/lectures to professional and/or civic organizations, in the entire period prior to tenure and/or promotion.

3.2.2 Departmental Expectation for Professional Service: Serve in some official capacity academic societies, publishers, journals, or other scholarly institutions. Some

examples are: being on a board of directors, serving as an officer, editing or guest editing a professional journal, helping to organize a conference or workshop, and acting as a peer reviewer. One such activity per year minimum.

Service in this form at greater quantities or intensities may be considered for exceeding expectations, including for the purposes of early tenure and/or promotion