ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

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 is based upon the following evaluative determinations:

**Excellent:** Excellent in two categories and at least satisfactory in the other.

**Above Satisfactory:** Excellent in one category and at least satisfactory in at least one other or above satisfactory in at least two.

**Satisfactory:** a) At least satisfactory in all three, or b) above satisfactory in one and at least satisfactory in one, or c) excellent in one, and at least marginally satisfactory in one, or d) Excellent in at least one.

**Below Satisfactory:** Below satisfactory in at least two, and at most satisfactory in at most one.

**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 or below satisfactory.

A. **INSTRUCTION**

Factors in evaluation of instruction may include, but may not necessarily be limited to:

- Type of courses taught (large, difficult, etc.)
- 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
- 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 a rating of 2.75 or better on the university on question #20 of the student 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) evaluations 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.

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

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

Satisfactory: Must meet at least #1 instructional criterion.

Below Satisfactory: Meets none of the above criteria

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:

Category 1
- Publication (in print or online) of:
  1) Refereed or invited authored books
  2) Edited books (including anthologies, textbook, journals or special editions thereof)
  3) Chapters (including encyclopedia and dictionary entries and articles in symposia) and substantial introductions or commentaries
  4) Refereed or invited journal articles
  5) Substantial introductions or commentaries
- Acceptance of the above by publishers or editors.
- Acceptance and/or presentation of paper at a professional meeting and/or conference.
- Copies of publishable manuscripts, articles, chapters, and other substantial work in progress, evaluated on the basis of scholarship and progress.
- Substantial translations, by faculty members, of significant philosophical work.
Category 2
- Book reviews or book notes in or accepted by referred publications (print or electronic).
- Discussant at a session of a scholarly meeting.
- Receipt of a fellowship or grant, or other equivalent award.

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.

Excellent: Either a) 2 in category 1, or b) at least 1 in category 1, and a further 2 from category 2.

Above satisfactory: 1 in category 1 and a further 1 in category 2.

Satisfactory: At least 2 in category 2.

Below Satisfactory: None of the above criteria.

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
   • 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
   • Refereeing manuscript for scholarly journals, presses, and grant proposals for funding agencies

Service Ratings
Excellent: Must meet at least 3 of the above criteria, at least one of which should be from categories 1 or 2.

Above Satisfactory: Must meet at least 2 of the above criteria, at least one of which should be from categories 1 or 2.

Satisfactory: Meets 1 of the above criteria from category 1 or 2.

Below Satisfactory: None of the above