

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES
Iowa State University
BASIC GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT
(Last revised May, 2015)

Table of Contents

Preamble	2
I. Duties of the Chair	2
II. Selection, Substitution and Replacement of the Chair.....	3
III. The Department Meeting.....	4
A. Voting Eligibility.....	4
B. Rights of Members on Leave	4
C. Quorum	4
D. Scheduling of Meetings.....	4
E. Majority Rule.....	5
F. Procedure for Challenge By Absent Members.....	5
G. Procedure if Chair Cannot Attend a Meeting.....	5
H. Voting By the Chair	5
IV. Committees	5
A. Formation of Committees.....	5
B. Voting in Committees.....	6
C. Standing Committees.....	6
D. Ad Hoc Committees.....	8
V. Retention, Promotion and Tenure	11
A. Lecturers	11
B. Permanent Appointments	15
C. Timing of Reviews	15
D. Composition, Duties and Procedures of Faculty Status Review Committees	16
E. Dismissals.....	21
VI. Post-Tenure Review.....	22
VII. Adoption and Amendment Procedures for This Document.....	24
Appendix A:	26
Criteria Concerning Excellence and Effectiveness in Teaching, Research and Service	26
Appendix B: Peer Evaluations	30

Preamble

The Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies consists of faculty members from two distinct units, each with its own disciplinary traditions. All faculty members in the Department have the same basic rights and duties, including especially the right to be evaluated by standards appropriate to his or her disciplinary tradition.

I. Duties of the Chair

The Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies shall have a Chair. The primary duties of the Chair are to encourage excellence among the members of the Department in the performance of their duties; to inform the members of the Department of University and College policies and of opportunities within the University for research grants, leaves, etc.; to inform the Dean of the College on all pertinent matters; and to execute Departmental policies on a day- to- day basis. The duties of the Chair are further articulated in the Faculty Handbook. The following list sets out several more specific duties of the Chair along with procedures to be observed in their execution.

1. Managing Department Funds

The Chair shall manage funds for current operating expenses. Any member of the department may, however, raise an issue about allocation of operating funds, and such questions are within the purview of departmental voting. The Chair shall provide information necessary for intelligent resolution of any issue that is raised. Records of past expenditures shall be made available to department members once a year

2. Annual Evaluations

The Chair shall make an annual written evaluation of each faculty member. Each member shall receive a copy of the evaluation. Each faculty member shall have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation with the Chair prior to its being used to set the faculty member's salary for the following year.

3. Chair Department Meetings

The Chair shall chair meetings of the Department, which should be held no less frequently than once a month during the Fall and Spring Semesters, although members may vote to meet more or less frequently. The Chair may call a meeting other than the next scheduled one anytime there are important matters requiring consideration. The Chair shall have decisions recorded and shall be responsible for maintaining a record of actions which shall be accessible to all the members of the department. If the agenda of a particular meeting will not include items of general interest to one or the other of the disciplinary units in the Department, the Chair will inform faculty members in that unit of that fact.

Any member of the Department may raise issues at meetings. However, the Chair has the responsibility to make sure that all matters requiring the formulation of policy are discussed in Department meetings both in cases affecting the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies alone and in cases where the Department contributes to interdepartmental, college- wide or university- wide policy. The Chair shall do this as soon as possible after a question has been raised. There may be cases that require immediate action. These shall be reported by the Chair at the earliest opportunity so that the Department can discuss and adopt a policy covering future occurrences of such cases. The Chair shall, in every way possible, further the majority view of the members in extra- departmental affairs.

4. Further Duties

The Chair shall carry out certain further duties relating to committees as shall be specified below.

II. Selection, Substitution and Replacement of the Chair

A. The Chair shall serve for a term of three to five years. As the end of each term approaches, the Department, minus the Chair, shall vote on the question whether the Chair shall serve a further term and if so whether to recommend a three, four or five year term. To aid the deliberations of the members, the Chair shall make available to them the most recent evaluation of the Chair. (See IV.D.3 below.) The Department shall determine a method of communicating its view to the Dean which shall seem appropriate at the time.

B. A member of the Department who is dissatisfied with a Chair's performance has the right to request the Dean to review that performance. Furthermore, a member may request the formation of a conciliation committee (see IV.D.2 below) to examine the cause of the dissatisfaction and make whatever recommendations to either party it may deem appropriate.

C. If, for any reason, an incumbent Chair is not going to continue in office, or if the Department is to be without a Chair for a period so long that the Dean determines that an Acting Chair is required, then the Department shall meet and decide upon a recommendation for the filling of that position. The Department shall determine a method for communicating its view to the Dean which shall seem appropriate at the time.

D. Each August or September, the department shall elect an Assistant Chair. The Assistant Chair shall become the Temporary Chair if the Chair is unable to perform departmental duties for a limited period due to illness, vacation or other cause. The Temporary Chair shall assume all those duties that it is practicable to assume for the limited period of the Chair's absence, and shall make all discretionary decisions expected of a Chair. The Temporary Chair may be

expected to perform other duties beyond those listed above. The Chair shall inform the faculty of such duties prior to the election of the Assistant Chair.

III. The Department Meeting

A. Voting Eligibility

All persons occupying faculty positions in the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies are voting members of the department. Lecturers, whether full or part- time, shall be excluded from voting on decisions concerning hiring, selection of Chair and Assistant Chair, from voting for members of Faculty Status Review Committees and from sitting on Faculty Status Review Committees. "Lecturers" shall be defined as non-tenure eligible faculty. Members of the department shall in no case vote concerning their own employment.

B. Rights of Members on Leave

Members on leave retain their voting privilege, their right to attend Department meetings, the right to raise challenges as described in III, F below. They may submit a vote by mail. While they are not required to exercise any of these rights, they are entitled to receive information which will enable them to exercise them intelligently should they wish to do so. Such information shall be transmitted in any of the following ways. (a) A member may request to be kept informed on a weekly basis of upcoming agenda matters and minutes of Department meetings. The Chair shall send such material to a member who requests it. (b) A vote of one- third of the Department shall require the Chair to contact a member on leave about a specific matter. The Chair shall present to the absent member the circumstances in which the matter has arisen and the arguments which have been advanced on all sides. (c) Members of the department, including the Chair, may, upon their own initiative, contact a member on leave on any matter they deem sufficiently important.

C. Quorum

A quorum for a Department meeting will be constituted by two- thirds of the eligible voting members of the faculty who are not on leave. A quorum for decisions on hiring tenured or tenure-track faculty shall be two- thirds of those not on leave who are eligible to vote on such decisions.

D. Scheduling of Meetings

Department meetings shall be regularly scheduled not less frequently than once each month during the Fall and Spring Semesters. The Chair may call additional meetings (see I.C). Additional meetings must also be called by the Chair if one- third of the voting members who

are not on leave request it. Meetings may be held in the Summer Sessions to decide matters of a pressing nature. However, no major, permanent policy decisions shall be made during the Summer Sessions.

E. Majority Rule

All questions shall be decided by a simple majority of the eligible, non-abstaining voters unless otherwise specified in this document.

F. Procedure for Challenge By Absent Members

Members who are not present at a Department meeting may challenge a decision taken at that meeting, provided they do so within two full weeks following it. They may demand that the issue be reconsidered at the next Department meeting (i.e., either the next regularly scheduled one or one called in accordance with III.D). The Chair shall not implement a challenged decision unless the decision is reaffirmed in a subsequent Department meeting.

G. Procedure if Chair Cannot Attend a Meeting

If the Chair is unable to attend a Department meeting, the Assistant Chair (see II.D), shall chair the meeting. If both the Chair and Assistant Chair are unable to attend, the Chair shall appoint a member to Chair the meeting.

H. Voting By the Chair

The duty of the Chair to chair Department meetings shall not be construed as a bar to participation in the discussion or voting. The Chair shall count as one in determining whether there is a quorum. The same right of challenge as exists for any member (see III.F) shall apply in the case where it is the Chair that misses a meeting.

IV. Committees

A. Formation of Committees

Part of the Department's work shall be carried out by committees. Unless otherwise specified, committees on the level of the department as a whole shall be formed as follows.

1. The Chair shall solicit nominations from the members of the Department.
2. The Chair shall recommend a slate of nominations to the Department.
3. The Department shall vote to accept or reject each nominee. In case of rejection, the Chair shall make substitute nomination(s) which shall again be submitted to a vote; and

so on until a committee is formed. The same procedure shall be followed in filling vacancies on committees.

4. The Chair and the Department shall be careful to avoid conflicts of interest in committee appointments where ever these may arise or even appear to arise.

B. Voting in Committees

All members of committees are voting members of those committees.

C. Standing Committees

The following shall be the standing committees of the disciplinary units.

1. Curriculum Committees

A separate Curriculum Committee will be formed for each disciplinary unit in the Department. In the case of the Religious Studies unit, the Religious Studies faculty shall function as a committee of the whole.

The responsibilities of these committees are:

(i) To consider what the disciplinary unit's course offerings should be for the period of the next catalogue. These considerations shall culminate in a draft of the copy for the next catalogue, which embodies each committee's recommendations both as to courses offered, course descriptions and the general statements in the relevant disciplinary unit's section of the catalogue. This draft shall then be presented to the disciplinary unit which shall discuss it and vote upon its provisions.

(ii) To inform and explain to the members of the disciplinary unit the reasons behind the catalogue proposal.

(iii) To assist the Chair in presenting and defending the disciplinary unit's final proposals before other departments, college committees and the Dean.

(iv) To present the Department's catalogue copy in the proper form to the proper offices at the deadlines stated by the letter.

(v) To consider and bring to the attention of the members of the Department questions of long or short range educational policy.

2. Speakers Committee

The responsibilities of this committee are

(i) to find, in consultation with other members of the disciplinary unit, speakers both on and off the Iowa State University campus of interest to the disciplinary unit's students, its members and colleagues in other departments;

(ii) to search out ways and means of paying for off- campus speakers;

(iii) to handle correspondence with potential visitors and to arrange time, place and publicity for their presentations;

(iv) to coordinate the intra- departmental presentation of papers and research projects.

3. Outcomes Assessment Committees

A separate Outcomes Assessment Committee will be formed for each disciplinary unit in the Department. The main responsibilities of these committees are to inform the department of any changes in the Outcomes Assessment test, to collect data relevant to determining whether desired student outcomes are being attained, and to propose curriculum improvements to better meet those outcomes, when appropriate.

4. Faculty-Student Relations Committees

A separate Faculty- Student Relations Committee will be formed for each disciplinary unit in the Department. The responsibilities of these committees are (a) to advise the departmental clubs and (b) to act as a liaison between faculty members and the students. The members of this committee will also propose a graduate senior to be recognized at the LAS graduating senior recognition ceremony (subject to department approval).

5. Awards Committee

The responsibilities of this committee are to solicit nominations for College and University awards from faculty in the relevant unit, to select the candidate(s) to be nominated by the unit in consultation with the Chair and to assemble and submit the nomination package(s).

6. Scheduling Committee

The duties of the Chair include constructing the teaching schedule for the disciplinary unit of the Chair, in consultation with the faculty members of that unit. A committee of members of the other disciplinary unit will be charged with the construction of its teaching schedule.

In the Religious Studies unit, one faculty member may be designated to serve as the simultaneous chair of the following committees: Curriculum, Outcomes Assessment, and Scheduling. The person so delegated by the Religious Studies unit will be entitled to one course release per academic year.

The following shall be the standing committees of the department as a whole and shall have representation from both units:

7. Alumni Committee

The members of this committee will i) send out a short annual newsletter to alumni who were majors, and ii) nominate alumni for alumni recognition awards whenever appropriate.

8. Computing Committee

The duties of the member(s) of this committee are to provide advice to the Chair regarding purchases of computer software and hardware. Its members are also to monitor the department website, make suggestions for its improvement, oversee the process of implementing suggestions approved by the department, and assist colleagues in solving minor computer problems that arise. When it is appropriate to hire someone with technical skills outside the department to help with these and related tasks, the members of this committee would participate in this process.

D. Ad Hoc Committees

1. Search Committee

1. This committee shall be composed of four faculty members, three from the disciplinary unit in which the search is being held (hereafter the “search unit”), and one from the other disciplinary unit (the “non-search unit”). Members of the committee will be elected by their respective units.
2. The role of the committee member from the non-search unit is to function as a liaison between the search committee and members of the non-search unit. This member is not expected to engage in critical peer review of candidate dossier materials.
3. The members of the search committee shall elect one of their number to be Chairperson. A search committee shall be formed whenever it appears likely that a position (whether a new or a vacated one) will be able to be filled. EXCEPTIONS: See below, V.A.
4. The Search Committee shall
 - a. Develop job descriptions upon consultation with the faculty.
 - b. Advertise the position.
 - c. Invite all members of the Department to review dossiers and pass on thoughts and recommendations to the committee.
 - d. Facilitate the interviewing of candidates at professional meetings if deemed necessary.

- e. Study dossiers and comments of members of the Department and select a list of no more than 12 to present to the search unit for further consideration and development of a short list.
 - f. Arrange schedules for candidates who come to Iowa State University for interviews.
 - g. Conduct every phase of its operations in a manner concordant with the spirit and the letter of the affirmative action and equal opportunity policy.
5. When a Search Committee has presented its list of candidates to the search unit, the major part of its work will ordinarily be done. (The handling of correspondence and the scheduling of interviews may go on for some time after this point.) The search unit will then meet as a whole to decide whom to bring to the campus for interviews, and then inform the Department as a whole of its results.
6. Members of the faculty are expected to qualify themselves to vote on the hiring of new members by reading each candidate's curriculum vitae and attending all of the main interview sessions (usually, a paper presentation and an informal discussion) with each candidate. If this is impossible, substantial individual talks with candidates may substitute for one of the sessions in the case of each candidate. Although non-qualified members may contribute relevant information to the discussion of candidates, the voting that selects a candidate for appointment shall be taken only among qualified members.
7. In unusual cases, e.g., if offers are declined by the first two or three candidates, the Search Committee may be asked by the search unit to renew its efforts.

2. Conciliation Committee

1. Faculty members who believe they have been treated unfairly by the Chair have a right to the appeals described under the section of the Faculty Handbook entitled "Faculty Grievance Procedures" (Fall 2009 edition, Section 9). The intent of the present section is to provide an alternative and less cumbersome method by which a member of the Department may seek relief from a grievance. The procedure here described may be used as a first step in cases of the most serious kind or in less serious but persistent cases of alleged unfairness.
2. A conciliation committee shall be formed only at the request of a member of the Department other than the Chair. Upon such a request, the Chair shall, without going into the particulars of the issue, inform the Department of the need for such a committee. The Chair shall then appoint one member to the committee. The faculty member requesting the formation of the committee shall appoint one member. The Department shall then elect an additional member (but neither the Chair nor the aggrieved member) who shall be the Chairperson of the committee.

3. The conciliation committee shall hear both sides of the issue and shall do whatever it can to remove the source of contention and restore collegial trust.
4. A conciliation committee shall serve until it has done all it can to try to bring the Chair and the aggrieved member to a point of mutual understanding. It shall report to the Department that it has done all it can and only such further particulars of the case as shall seem appropriate to it.
5. A member who requests a conciliation committee shall be expected to seek a resolution in good faith and to give the committee a reasonable time to make recommendations. However, the formation of and recommendations by a conciliation committee shall in no way interfere with a member's right to the use of the Faculty Grievance Procedures.

3. Chair Review Committee

1. At certain Department meetings of certain years the Chair shall be excused and the remaining members shall elect three of their number to be the Chair Review Committee. These three shall elect one of their number as Chairperson. The periods in which the committee shall be formed are as follows. (a) The second semester of the second year of a Chair's first term or first non- consecutive term; and (b) thereafter, in the year prior to the last year of a Chair current term.
2. The Chair Review Committee shall sit in on the Chair's courses; and solicit evaluations of the Chair's performance from students and members of the Department. It shall prepare a document analogous to the annual evaluation of members of the Department, except that it shall include a section on the administrative functions of the Chair. The committee shall present this document to a meeting of the members of the Department minus the Chair for revision and, finally, approval. The committee shall then present the final document to the Chair and shall meet with the Chair to discuss it. The document shall be filed and made available in accordance with II.A.

4. Faculty Status Review Committee

The formation and functioning of this committee will be described in section V.

5. Evaluation and Review of Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty Committee

The formation and functioning of this committee will be described in section V.

6. Other Committees

The Department or a disciplinary unit may from time to time vote to form a committee to consider a specific question or carry out a specific task. Its members shall be appointed

according to IV.A. Its duties, its manner of proceeding and the conditions under which it will be dissolved shall be clearly specified by the Department at the time the committee is formed.

V. Retention, Promotion and Tenure

Minimum Qualifications for Employment

Candidates for faculty positions in the department, both tenure eligible and NTE, are expected to have a Ph.D. or equivalent in philosophy, religious studies, or related fields. Candidates who do not meet these minimum standards can be considered for a faculty position provided that a search committee, in consultation with the chair, deems it appropriate to seek a waiver for the candidate from the Dean. If a waiver is sought, the chair shall forward such request together with a justification to the Dean. In case a search committee was not used, such as if spousal accommodation is sought, the tenure-line faculty in the relevant program will vote on whether the chair will seek a waiver for the appointment.

A. Lecturers

1. Types of Lecturer Appointments

The types of lecturer appointments include the following:

- a. *Lecturer*: a limited term, full- or part-time renewable appointment of from one semester to three years.
- b. *Senior Lecturer*: a limited term, full- or part-time renewable appointment not to exceed five years, requiring a notice of one year of intent not to renew. To be eligible for appointment as Senior Lecturer the individual must have served as a Lecturer for a minimum of six years or completed the equivalent of 12 semester FTEs of employment.
- c. The department also distinguishes part-time or full-time lecturer contracts of one semester or one year, that are intended to fill *ad hoc teaching needs* ("L1" appointment) and full-time multi-year lecturer contracts that are intended to fill *persisting teaching needs* ("L2" appointment).

2. Appointment of Lecturers

- a. L1 appointments shall be made by the Chair and wherever possible with the assistance of an ad hoc committee from the relevant discipline. If ad hoc teaching needs persist, the Chair may reappoint lecturers for an additional semester or year contingent on satisfactory teaching performance and after consultation with the department.

- b. L2 appointments are made using established departmental search procedures. (see IV.D.1)
- c. Initial appointment for all lecturers will be no longer than one year.
- d. For L2 appointments the initial one year appointment can be followed by a two year appointment conditional on satisfactory performance review after the first year.

3. Review of Lecturers

- a. A Lecturer Review Committee (LRC) will be formed whenever there is a request from a lecturer for a promotion. In addition, in accordance with the Faculty Handbook, all lecturers must be reviewed at least every six semesters of employment.
- b. Normally an LRC will be formed in the fall and all review activities and reports will be completed before the end of the fall semester.
- c. Only tenure-eligible faculty can serve on an LRC.
- d. Each lecturer under review in a given year will be assigned a three-person LRC composed of at least two eligible members of their home unit and one liaison representative from the other unit. Liaison members are not required to participate in classroom observation or drafting of the committee report. The liaison representative may serve as liaison on more than one review committee.
- e. Lecturers may choose one member of their LRC. The other member will be chosen by the faculty in their unit.
- f. The candidate shall submit to their LRC background information and documentation of the candidate's performance in teaching by a date selected by the committee. This information will include
 - i.a summary of teaching assignments and responsibilities
 - ii.information on participation in teaching-related development activities (e.g. CELT workshops)
 - iii.a table summarizing teaching evaluation scores since the last review
 - iv.copies or originals of student course evaluations since the last review
 - v.selections of teaching-related materials (course syllabi, sample tests and assignments)
 - vi.a one-page statement outlining the candidate's self-assessment of teaching performance in relation to their personal teaching goals and feedback from the previous review (if applicable)

- g. The LRC will arrange classroom observation of at least one section of each course the candidate teaches in a given term, and may solicit confidential feedback from students.
- h. The LRC will present their report to the department for discussion and (if applicable) vote on reappointment and/or promotion by the tenure-eligible faculty in the department.
- i. The Department Chair will write a report to the candidate summarizing the committee's conclusions and recommendations. The candidate will have an opportunity to meet with the Department Chair and the Chair of the LRC to discuss the report and the department vote.

4. Nonrenewal of Lecturers

- a. Appointments of Lecturers for periods of one semester to three years do not require a notice of intent not to renew. Lecturers who have been employed continuously at one-half time or greater for three years or more must be given advance written notice of nonrenewal of his or her current contract at least one year before its expiration. In case notice is not given and a new contract has not been entered, the appointment automatically renews for a one-year terminal term for which no further notice of non-renewal is required.
- b. Lecturer contracts may fail to be renewed due to unsatisfactory performance, lack of funding, a change in department teaching needs, or by conversion of a lecturer line into a tenure-track line.
- c. If either disciplinary unit loses one or more lecturer positions and the department can decide which position is cut, the decision of which lecturer position will be terminated will be determined by a vote of the tenure-eligible faculty of the relevant unit based on the following considerations:
 - i. Seniority (as determined first by rank and second by length of employment)
 - ii. Teaching needs
 - iii. Teaching performance
 - iv. Hiring arrangements related to partner/spousal accommodations
 These considerations may conflict and the decision will necessarily involve judgment and weighting of considerations in the particular circumstances in question. Other considerations may include non-standard appointments such as those associated with partner accommodations.

5. Criteria for Contract Renewal

- a. The evaluation of lecturer performance for purposes of contract renewal and promotion is based on the faculty Position Responsibility Statement. Standard lectureships are teaching appointments and the PRS for these positions only makes reference to teaching. Consequently, faculty performance in research and

service shall not be taken into consideration when evaluating lecturers for contract renewal and promotion unless such duties are noted in their PRS.

- b.** Guidelines for teaching performance are outlined in Appendix A of the Governance Document,
- c.** For purposes of contract renewal of L1 and L2 appointments in the strongest cases, observation of the candidate's teaching will support the judgment that the standard of strength with the potential for excellence has been reached. In determining whether the standard of strength with potential for excellence has been reached, the committee will focus especially on those aspects of teaching identified in Appendix A to the Governance Document. Reappointment will typically require that the candidate is strong in all or most of the identified areas, and shows a willingness to improve in any substantive areas of weakness.

In the strongest cases, the candidate's teaching evaluations will be generally supportive of the judgment that the standard of strength with the potential for excellence has been reached. To determine whether the evaluations provide the requisite support, the committee will consider not only the numerical scores on Q1 and Q2, but will focus especially on the qualitative comments in all or most of the candidate's evaluations over a 3 year period. These comments must show that the candidate is strong in all or most of the areas of teaching identified in Appendix A. Candidates whose evaluations indicate persistent weaknesses in the central areas of teaching identified in 2.1 in the Appendix must demonstrate through action a willingness to improve in those areas. Although the department recognizes the difficulties in relying extensively on teaching evaluations, the numerical scores and the qualitative comments must provide the committee with evidence on which to base the judgment that the standard of strength with the potential for excellence has been reached.

- d.** For purposes of promotion to Senior Lecturer, in the strongest cases, observation of the candidate's teaching will support the judgment that the standard of excellence has been reached. In determining whether the standard of excellence has been reached, the committee will focus especially on those aspects of teaching identified in Appendix A to the Governance Document. Promotion will typically require that the candidate excels in all or most of the identified areas.

In the strongest cases, the candidate's teaching evaluations will be generally supportive of the judgment that the standard of excellence has been reached. To determine whether the evaluations provide the requisite support, the committee will consider not only the numerical scores on Q1 and Q2, but will focus especially on the qualitative comments in all or most of the candidate's evaluations over a 3 year period. These comments must show that the candidate excels in all or most of the areas of teaching identified in Appendix A,

and they must indicate no persistent, unaddressed weaknesses in any of the areas of central importance identified in 2.1 in the Appendix. Although the department recognizes the difficulties in relying extensively on teaching evaluations, the numerical scores and the qualitative comments must provide the committee with evidence on which to base the judgment that the standard of excellence has been reached.

- e. As outlined in Appendix A, assessment of teaching performance demands consideration of many factors, including quantitative teaching scores and qualitative student feedback, selection and use of teaching materials, classroom management and pedagogical methods, etc. Judgments of teaching performance must assess and weigh these different factors on a case-by-case basis.

B. Permanent Appointments

1. Each member on a permanent appointment (tenured or tenure-track) shall have a position responsibility statement. This shall consist of a general description of those responsibilities that are most important in evaluating that member in the promotion and tenure process. The position responsibility statement shall not violate the member's academic freedom in teaching, research or extension activities.
2. For new appointments, the chair and the new faculty member will agree on a position responsibility statement based on the job advertisement. It shall stand for at least the first three years of the appointment, and typically through the probationary period.
3. Tenured faculty members may review their position responsibility statement with the Chair as part of the annual review process or at other times if need arises. Tenured faculty members shall review their position responsibility statement with the Chair at least once every seven years.
4. A faculty members' position responsibility statement must have the approval of the Chair. But a position responsibility statement cannot be changed unilaterally by either the Chair or the faculty member.

C. Timing of Reviews

Members on probationary or continuous appointments shall be considered for promotion, retention or termination (this last applies only to non- tenured members) when either:

1. They are in the third fall semester of their first four- year contract; or

2. A decision is required by the impending end of a contract other than the first. In this case, consideration shall be carried out far enough in advance to comply with College deadlines; or
3. The member requests to be considered, subject to the limitation that such a request from the same member shall not be acted upon more than once a year. Departmental colleagues may encourage those members whom they feel are qualified for promotion to apply for it. However, the final decision whether to apply for promotion rests with the member concerned in all cases other than those coming under 1 or 2 of this section.
4. On occasion, special circumstances may occur that would justify postponement of a review for renewal or promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure. The assumption of parental responsibilities or major change in assigned responsibilities might be such circumstances. A faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period based upon such circumstances. The request for an extension should be submitted in writing to the department chair, the dean of the college, and the provost as soon as possible but no later than April 1 before the academic year in which the third-year review or tenure review is scheduled to be conducted. Requests should clearly explain the reasons for granting an extension of the probationary period and will be acted upon promptly. Requests for extension due to the birth of a child or the adoption of a child under age five will be submitted to and approved by the chair, dean of the college, and provost. The chair, dean of the college, and provost, must approve requests based on other circumstances.
5. If the faculty member requests an extension, the faculty member must acknowledge that tenure cannot be claimed on the basis that the total length of employment has by then extended beyond seven years. A faculty member may be granted only two one-year extensions during the probationary period.
6. Scholarship accomplished by a tenure-track faculty member during an extension period shall be counted as part of a candidate's record. Standards regarding what constitutes a record deserving of tenure shall not be raised to adjust for any granted extension.
7. The date that a faculty member actually begins the performance of his or her duties at or on behalf of Iowa State University marks the beginning of the probationary period.

D. Composition, Duties and Procedures of Faculty Status Review Committees

All considerations for promotion, retention or termination (except those cases coming under V, 1) shall begin with the selection of a Faculty Status Review Committee. The manner of selection and the procedures of these committees is set out below.

1. Faculty Status Review Committees shall consult and abide by the provisions set forth in the sections of *The Faculty Handbook* devoted to the renewal of probationary contracts, promotion, and tenure, as well as official policies regarding these matters adopted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
2. A separate Faculty Status Review Committee shall be formed for each candidate for retention and promotion and/or tenure. This committee shall be composed of four faculty members, three from the disciplinary unit of the faculty member under review (hereafter the "primary unit"), and one from the other disciplinary unit (the "secondary unit"). Of the three members from the primary unit, two shall be chosen by members of the primary unit, and one chosen by the candidate. The order in which these selections are made will be determined by the member being considered. The candidate shall have the option of selecting the fourth member of the committee from the secondary unit. The Chair must inform the candidates in writing of the identity of the members of the Faculty Status Review Committee.
3. The selection of Faculty Status Review Committees must be done in such a way as to avoid conflicts of interest, that is, serious biases due to personal relationships, family relationships, or activities outside of work. The Chair shall ask those appointed to such committees whether they have any conflict of interest. Department members, including candidates, shall inform the Chair of any conflicts of interest they believe to exist. Upon becoming convinced that there is a credible appearance of a conflict of interest, the Chair shall ask the candidate, or the department, to nominate a new member of the Committee (depending on whether the apparent conflict involves the candidate's nominee, or the department's, respectively).
4. In accordance with University expectations as articulated by the Provost concerning combined departments such as Philosophy & Religious Studies, eligible faculty from both units are expected to vote on all promotion and tenure cases coming from the Department.
5. Only associate and full professors are eligible to vote on retention, and promotion and tenure for assistant professors to the position of associate professors. Only full professors are eligible to vote on promotion and tenure of associate professors to the position of full professor. If there are fewer than four senior faculty members eligible to serve on the Faculty Status Review Committee, a senior faculty member (or, if necessary, two or three senior faculty members) will be chosen from a field related to the candidate's discipline. The members of the committee shall elect one of their members to be Chairperson. A quorum for a meeting of the committee shall be the whole.
6. The procedures below shall be followed in each case of consideration of a member by a Faculty Status Review Committee.

- a. The candidate shall submit to the Department by a date selected by the committee the background information and documentation of the candidate's Performance in scholarship and position responsibilities, following the format provided by the College in Tab 1 and Tab 2 of the LAS Preliminary Review and P&T Dossier Templates. The submitted up-to-date Vitae that is requested in Tab 1 shall include at least the following: (i) Candidate information (name, current rank, degrees held [when, where], and a record of professional experience); (ii) Research (a list of refereed publications, invited publications, book reviews, invited lectures, conference papers, grant activity, current projects, etc.); (iii) Teaching (assignments and responsibilities, advising activities, service on masters and doctoral committees, curricular development activity, grant activity, service in professional organizations or events devoted to teaching, textbooks, videos, scholarly publications or presentations concerning teaching); (iv) Service (membership on department, college and / or university committees and organizations, editorial responsibilities, referee responsibilities, service in professional societies, organizations and events).
- b. Candidates will also be asked to provide representative teaching materials (e.g., syllabi, handouts), and student evaluations for the six semesters prior to the review if they have taught at Iowa State for at least that length of time; otherwise, candidates shall submit student evaluations for each semester they have taught at Iowa State. In addition, candidates may choose to submit solicited and unsolicited materials, such as student letters, peer evaluations, a description of creative teaching techniques, a statement of teaching philosophy (if not otherwise required), evidence of effectiveness in academic advising (e.g., student or peer evaluation), participation in professional societies concerned with pedagogy, publications concerned with pedagogy, including textbooks. (Textual publications shall be evaluated under "teaching" in so far as they consist of anthologized materials and under "research" in so far as they contain introductions, papers, chapters or whole texts written by the candidate.)
- c. Candidates will be required to submit a complete set of reprints/publications and submissions. Candidates may choose to submit works in progress as well.
- d. The Faculty Status Review Committee will encourage all faculty members eligible to vote on a given case to familiarize themselves with the candidate's dossier.
- e. The Faculty Status Review Committee shall gather as much significant information as possible. This shall include at least the following: (i) Evaluation of the candidate by as many majors in the candidate's discipline as possible. (ii) In cases of tenure and promotion, peer evaluations by non- local colleagues. Candidates shall suggest potential external reviewers to the committee. The committee will then solicit evaluations from a certain number of external reviewers (normally 6). The committee shall take all reasonable steps to ensure

that at least two (but no more than half) of the external reviewers are among those suggested by the candidate. Candidates will also be provided the opportunity to submit to the committee a short list of no more than three potential reviewers who they have reason to think may be biased against them. The committee will make every reasonable effort to accommodate this request. Reviewers will be requested to refrain from judging whether the candidate would be tenured or promoted at his or her institution. (iii) Attendance at the candidate's classes by members of the committee (or, if this is not feasible, by an assistant to the committee, nominated by the committee and approved by the disciplinary unit).

- f. Any member of the Department who requests it shall be invited to meet with the committee. The committee itself may initiate such meetings.
- g. The candidate may advise the committee, orally or in writing, of any dissatisfaction with the contents, completeness or estimates of reliability of the evidence that the committee intends to use in forming its decision.
- h. Unless otherwise stated in the faculty member's responsibility statement, the criteria for retention or promotion are set forth below. (See Appendix A for elucidation of the criteria.)
 - i. The criteria for retention for a second appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor shall be the demonstration of adequate progress toward the fulfillment of the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor (see (2) below). Progress shall be deemed "adequate" if in the judgment of eligible voting members the candidate has a reasonable chance of fulfilling the criteria for Associate Professor by the time that a mandatory decision for tenure must be made.
 - ii. The criteria for promotion to Associate Professor shall include excellence in scholarship, and actual demonstration of effectiveness in the three areas of Teaching, Research, and Service.

To be recommended for promotion to full Professorship, a candidate must continue to develop his or her talents and must show a considerable degree of achievement above the criteria for Associate Professor. The candidate's record must exhibit significant institutional Service and national distinction in scholarship in Teaching or Research, as evident in his or her wide recognition and outstanding contributions to the profession. The candidate's contributions must be such as to give review committees confidence that a high degree of performance will be sustained throughout his or her career.

- i. When the Faculty Status Review Committee has collected and read all relevant materials it will meet, discuss them, and draw up a list of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
- j. Eligible faculty members shall have access to all the material on which the Review Committee bases its presentation except for the solicited external faculty letters. The Chair shall grant any request by an eligible faculty member to review copies of the external faculty letters. However, the Chair shall make reasonable efforts to maintain the confidentiality of the letter writers (e.g., by limiting the number of copies made of the letters or by asking eligible faculty whether they would be willing to review letters in which information identifying the authors is hidden).
- k. The Review Committee will then call a meeting with the eligible faculty of the primary unit, at which it will present its list of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. In any case in which external faculty letters are solicited, part of the committee's report shall include a thorough description of the solicited letters consistent with confidentiality constraints. The faculty will then have an opportunity to question the committee. At no point in the process will the committee provide a recommendation regarding retention/promotion/tenure.
- l. The Review Committee will then call a meeting with the eligible faculty of the whole Department, at which it will present its list of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. In any case in which external faculty letters are solicited, part of the committee's report shall include a thorough description of the solicited letters consistent with confidentiality constraints. The faculty will then have an opportunity to question the committee. At no point in the process will the committee provide a recommendation regarding retention/promotion/tenure.
- m. In the case of a preliminary review, eligible faculty may vote immediately after the committee's presentation to the Department. In cases where promotion and/or tenure are at stake, eligible faculty will vote at a subsequent meeting of the Department. Committee members, not having made a recommendation, are eligible to vote. The Chair is not eligible.
 - i. For decisions concerning retention prior to tenure, a simple majority of eligible, non-abstaining voters shall be required for the vote to be counted favorable to the candidate.
 - ii. For all other decisions concerning tenure and / or promotion, a two-thirds majority of eligible, non-abstaining voters shall be required for the vote to be counted favorable to the candidate. In cases where the issue of promotion can be separated from the issue of retention, two votes shall be taken; i.e., it

will be possible for faculty members to vote against promotion but for retention.

iii. After this vote the committee will proceed with the drafting of appropriate documents.

iv. If a request is made for a ranking of candidates for promotion the relevant faculty shall decide whether and how the ranking shall be done.

v. If a change in the candidate's scholarship record occurs prior to submission of the department document to the College, the candidate may revise Tabs 1 and 2, and the committee may revise the Departmental Recommendation and Report, in order to take this change into account.

7. Each Faculty Status Review Committee shall meet in such a way as to ensure timely execution of their charge, including compliance with College deadlines.
8. Before the Department's recommendations are submitted to the college, the Chair will inform each candidate in writing whether a recommendation will be forwarded and, if so, the nature of the recommendation or recommendations. If a candidate receives a negative recommendation from the Department or the Chair, the candidate will be informed by the Chair in writing of the reasons. This information should be presented in a constructive manner and, where appropriate, should include guidance for improving performance in terms of the Department's criteria for promotion and tenure.
9. Each person for whom a recommendation is being forwarded to the College will be given the opportunity to review the factual information therein, and to inform the Chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information to be incomplete or inaccurate.
10. Should a decision different from that of the Department be made by some governing body above the Department (e.g., Dean, President, Regents, etc.) the Chair shall report this to the Committee and to the candidate and aid in establishing consultation between this body or person and the committee and candidate if requested by either of the latter parties.

E. Dismissals

A member may be dismissed (severed from a position before expiration of the stated term of office) only in accordance with the procedures stated in the Faculty Handbook. However, a member shall have the right to one further form of pre-hearing settlement than is provided for in those procedures. The member may choose any other member or members of the department (up to and including the whole department) to meet jointly with the Chair in order to find some way of resolving the issue.

VI. Post-Tenure Review

A. Purpose of Reviews

The purpose of Post-Tenure Review (hereafter PTR) in the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies shall be to encourage the professional development of faculty members through a self-directed review that respects academic freedom. The PTR should provide an opportunity for faculty members to review and assess their past accomplishments and to formulate a viable set of goals that will guide them towards their future achievements.

B. Schedule of Reviews

1. Each tenured faculty member shall participate in a PTR by an ad hoc PTR committee at least once every seven years. Upon written request, however, a faculty member may request an earlier or more frequent PTR (but no sooner than five years since the last PTR or review for promotion). A PTR is mandatory following two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews.
2. A PTR shall not take place when a faculty member is on phased retirement or is within one year of announced retirement.
3. A PTR shall not take place when a faculty member is being reviewed for higher rank during the same year.
4. A PTR shall not take place when a faculty member serves as Department Chair or holds an Iowa State University title that includes the name of "President," "Provost," or "Dean."

C. Procedures and Timelines

1. Each spring (by May 1) the Department Chair shall notify those faculty members who are due for PTR in the following fall semester.
2. The faculty member shall prepare a file consisting of the following items:
 - a. The faculty member's position responsibility statement (PRS).
 - b. A brief (one page) research statement describing the work since the most recent PTR or, if applicable, the most recent review for promotion.
 - c. An up-to-date curriculum vitae.
 - d. Representative examples of relevant teaching materials such as course syllabi, exams, handouts, and other evidence of teaching ability.

- e. Student evaluation numbers from all courses taught since the previous PTR or review for promotion.

Materials shall be submitted to the PTR committee by October 1 of the fall in which the PTR is conducted. At this time, the faculty member shall also expressly indicate his or her preference for specific recommendations for improvement in any areas of the PRS judged to be “meeting expectations.” Failure to indicate a preference for recommendations shall be interpreted to be a preference not to receive such recommendations.

3. The PTR committee shall be composed of four tenured faculty members, in accordance with the relevant committee composition rules set forth in V (D) above.
4. The PTR committee shall review the file. Within three weeks, the committee shall reach a preliminary recommendation of the faculty member’s overall performance and performance in each area of the PRS. The only evaluation categories are “meeting expectations” and “below expectations.” The faculty member and Department Chair shall be informed of the preliminary recommendation.
 - a. If the preliminary overall recommendation is “meeting expectations” and each area of the PRS is also judged to be “meeting expectations,” no further review is required, and the PTR committee shall compose the PTR report.
 - b. If a preliminary review of the materials includes a “below expectations” evaluation in any area of the PRS, or if in the judgment of the PTR committee they need additional materials to complete their report, the PTR committee may request clarification or more materials (which may include a class observation) from the reviewed faculty member. The committee shall articulate a clear deadline for the faculty member to reply to the request.
5. The PTR committee shall submit a PTR report to the Department Chair and the reviewed faculty member no later than the first week of the spring semester following initiation of the PTR. This report shall constitute the PTR committee’s final recommendation. Within six weeks of submitting the report, the faculty member and the Department Chair shall meet to discuss the PTR report.
 - a. The PTR report may include recommendations for development in areas of position responsibility judged to be “meeting expectations” only if the faculty member expressly requested such recommendations.
 - b. If the final recommendation includes “below expectations” in any PRS area, the faculty member shall work with the Department Chair and the chair of the PTR committee to develop a detailed action plan for performance improvement in

those areas. The action plan shall be signed by the faculty member, the Department Chair, and the chair of the PTR committee by the end of the third week of February following initiation of the PTR review. If agreement on the proposed action plan cannot be reached, the action plan shall be negotiated following the procedures outlined for PRS mediation. Failure to have the performance improvement plan in place by the time of the next academic year's annual performance review may result in a charge of unacceptable performance as defined in the Faculty Conduct Policy

- c. The areas that received "below expectations" recommendation shall be reevaluated in one year as part of the Department Chair's annual review. If the performance improvement plan is being implemented, no further action shall be taken. If the faculty member is not accomplishing the plan, the result may be an unsatisfactory annual review.
6. After meeting with the reviewed faculty member to discuss the PTR report, the Department Chair shall compose a letter to the faculty member and the Dean, summarizing the results of the discussion and stating an opinion on the PTR report.

The letter shall indicate the Department Chair's agreement or disagreement with the PTR report. If the Department Chair disagrees with the PTR report's recommendations, the Department Chair shall supply a detailed explanation. This explanation shall be communicated to both the PTR committee and the reviewed faculty member.

7. The reviewed faculty member may choose to compose a written response to the PTR report or the Department Chair's letter of evaluation, or the faculty member may simply accept the PTR report and letter of evaluation. In any case, the PTR is complete. The PTR report and the Department Chair's letter shall be forwarded to the Dean.

D. Criteria for PTR Assessment

The criteria for the PTR Assessment shall be the same as those defined in the Basic Governance Document of the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Appendix A: Criteria Concerning Excellence and Effectiveness in Teaching, Research and Service.

VII. Adoption and Amendment Procedures for This Document

1. This document may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the Department. A quorum for a meeting on an amendment shall be the whole of the Department. If such a

meeting cannot be held within two weeks after the amendment is first proposed by a member at a regular meeting of the Department, the Chair shall poll the members. The outcome shall be reported to the next regular meeting of the Department.

2. This document is derived by amendment of its predecessor, the Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies Basic Governance Document. Accordingly, it takes effect upon completion of the amendment procedure stated in that document.
-

Appendix A:

Criteria Concerning Excellence and Effectiveness in Teaching, Research and Service

Evaluation of a faculty member for retention, promotion or tenure is based primarily on evidence of scholarship in the faculty member's teaching and research activities. Scholarship involves creative, systematic rational inquiry into a topic; it builds on existing knowledge and employs critical analysis and judgment to enhance understanding; and it results in a product that is shared with others and is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product.

In any evaluation of a candidate for retention, promotion or tenure, care shall be taken not to infringe on academic freedom. In order to avoid such infringement, evaluators shall become familiar with how a candidate conceives their discipline and the relation of their discipline to activities in the classroom. This shall be done in order that there be no chance of confusing poor teaching or research with excellent presentation of views that may be unfamiliar to or in disagreement with those of the evaluator.

Guidelines for Evaluating Excellence in Teaching

It is recognized that not all excellent teachers are excellent for the very same reasons. However, the items below are marks characteristically exemplified by excellent teachers. Note that the bullet points below each heading are not intended to be exhaustive.

1. Content and Learning Outcomes

An excellent teacher will select learning materials that facilitate appropriate learning outcomes. These include:

1. stimulation and development of critical thinking, reading and communication skills
2. discipline-specific learning outcomes. For example, in the case of philosophy, these include analyzing philosophical positions and arguments; in the case of religious studies, these include helping students to understand religions empathetically and critically
3. course-specific learning outcomes. These includes using materials (texts, articles and multimedia resources) from suitable sources that accurately represent positions and developments in the field

2. Teaching Methods

Excellence in teaching requires evidence of choosing methodological strategies and instructional material that are well suited to the stated course objectives or goals, the expected student learning outcomes, differences in student learning styles, and the size of the class.

2.1 Methods that are central to the practice of teaching include:

1. clarity of course objectives, learning outcomes, expectations of students and evaluation criteria;

2. clarity and organization in the presentation of lecture content, and in the answering of student questions;
3. successful communication of the depth, difficulty, and significance of the subject matter;
4. classroom practices and methods of evaluation that encourage students to think reflectively and critically about the subject matter.

2.2 Methods that are less central and open to the discretion of individual instructors include:

1. effective and appropriate use of supplementary materials, such as audio-visual materials;
2. effective use of traditional and newer classroom technologies, including course management software;
3. use of evaluation methods that offer students a sufficient variety of ways of earning points.

2.3 Large Classes

Teaching and managing larger classes imposes additional constraints that must be taken into consideration when evaluating teaching performance. It is understood that

1. teaching methods that may be desirable in smaller classes (e.g. essay assignments and essay-style answers on tests and quizzes; student presentations; etc.) become less feasible as class sizes increase and more of the grading is shifted to undergraduate graders;
2. the capabilities of teaching assistants to evaluate and give feedback on student work can vary, and teachers may be required to use methods of evaluation that reflect the capabilities of their graders.

3. Attitudes

An excellent teacher will:

1. respect student opinions, thereby modeling the respect expected of students in classroom interactions;
2. be fair in his/her treatment of students, evaluation of students' work and management of classroom discussions;
3. take teaching obligations seriously (e.g. being prepared for lectures, beginning and ending classes on time, timely grading and return of tests and quizzes, being available during scheduled office hours, not canceling classes for casual reasons, etc.);
4. be committed to improving teaching performance in part through serious consideration of feedback from student evaluations and performance reviews.

Criteria Concerning Effectiveness in Teaching

Effective teachers strive for the same characteristics that define excellent teachers, but perform at a lesser degree on them, or perform at a high degree on a narrower selection of them.

“Ineffectiveness” can be used as a term of abuse. “Effectiveness” here is not to be understood

as meaning “Just good enough not to deserve to be called ‘ineffective’ in this abusive sense.” Instead, “effective” is to be understood to require that students taught by an effective teacher are receiving an education of a quality to which they are entitled.

Criteria Concerning Excellence in Teaching Scholarship

Teaching scholarship includes peer-reviewed publications, textbooks, videos, software, invited lectures, conference papers, curricular or pedagogical innovations, and teaching materials. It is evaluated in terms of its originality, significance or impact, as evidenced by its influence, use or adoption by peers. Appropriate assessments of excellence in teaching scholarship include peer and student evaluations of in-class performance, evaluations of the performance of the candidate’s students, and invitations to conduct classes, seminars, short courses or workshops by other ISU instructors or by off-campus organizations.

Course materials that communicate new understandings and insights effectively to students, or that synthesize, interpret and communicate new knowledge for students, may be submitted as supporting evidence of excellence in teaching scholarship, even though it may not have been communicated to peers outside the university. However, a significant portion of a faculty member’s teaching scholarship must have been communicated to and validated by peers beyond the university in order to justify a judgment of excellence in teaching scholarship.

Criteria Concerning Excellence in Research Scholarship

The primary sources of evidence of excellence in research scholarship are (1) publication in refereed journals, books, monographs or anthologies; and (2) receiving of grants, provided that work under them leads eventually to production of items under (1). Publication in non- refereed outlets, papers presented at meetings of professional associations and conferences, invited lectures, and reputable translations of published work into other languages can help support a judgment of excellence in research scholarship, but only when combined with a strong record in (1).

Excellent researchers and scholars publish in outlets of good quality in a sustained fashion. They maintain coherent research programs that show development and responsiveness to ongoing work in their fields.

Criteria Concerning Effectiveness in Research Scholarship

As in teaching (see above), effectiveness is to be understood in a positive way, not as the mere absence of ineffectiveness. Competent researchers and scholars strive for excellence and maintain productive activity that results in some degree of public dissemination of their work.

Criteria Concerning Excellence in Service

Excellence in service is partly a matter of quantity but must also include a qualitative component. Evidence for this within the university includes election to bodies by groups wider than or outside of the Department, and reappointment by the Dean's office or the central administration to College- wide and University- wide committees. Review committees may ask for letters from others who have served on committees with candidates they are reviewing. Evidence for excellence in service also includes work with student organizations; e.g., as advisor, and the offering of overload instruction, such as honors program seminars. Evidence for quality of service outside the university includes (but is not limited to) repeated invitations to address local or statewide groups, and service to national professional organizations.

Criteria Concerning Effectiveness in Service

Those who are effective in service make positive contributions to the department, college, university or community. In the case of on- campus service, typical contributions would arise through participation in committee work or through helping student organizations. Review committees will know the extent to which the faculty at Iowa State University is self- governing and shall regard Effectiveness as requiring candidates to do their fair share of the work that this entails.

Appendix B: Peer Evaluations

The primary objective of peer evaluation is to provide Faculty Status Review Committees with your own careful estimate of a colleague's contribution to students and peers in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Up- to- date curriculum vitae as well as manuscripts and/or off- prints are made available to you for this purpose. These documents should be helpful in the areas of research and service. Estimating a colleague's contribution in the area of teaching is another matter. We do have student evaluations available. (It goes without saying that you may have attended courses taught by the Colleague(s) being evaluated; you may also have students in your courses who were taught by those colleagues and you may have received what you take to be significant word- of- mouth comments concerning a colleague's teaching. If you choose to make use of such information, please do so - - taking care to make clear what the basis of your estimate of teaching quality is.) However we should also take into account the teaching impact a colleague has on peers. Thus, it is strongly recommended that you give close attention to ways in which you may have realized professional growth and development as a result of interacting with the colleague(s) you are evaluating.

Finally, a carefully developed peer evaluation should attempt to take into account the significance of the colleague(s) being evaluated to the development of the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies. Thus, it is important that you answer the question, Do you consider the candidate undergoing review vital to the future of the unit in Philosophy and/or Religious Studies? Clearly, your evaluation in the areas mentioned above should serve as a basis for your answer to this question. You may, if you wish, inform the Faculty Status Review Committee involved as to what specific action this committee should take in behalf of the candidate(s) being reviewed.