

Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II: RTP

Department of Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II Primary Unit Criteria and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

The Philosophy Department seeks to provide its majors, minors, and elective students skills and knowledge that will serve them in their roles as citizens and as professionals. We expect our students to explore Western cultural ideas, to learn to think analytically and critically, to deepen their knowledge of ethics, and to become familiar with some of the most important figures in the history of philosophy. In addition to serving the community through the communication of philosophical knowledge to future generations, the Department is also committed to the pursuit of new philosophical knowledge through scholarship. Given this mission, the Philosophy Department expects its Tenure Track Faculty (TTF) faculty to make substantial contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and Leadership and Service, and its non-TTF faculty in areas specified in their contracts.

Regents policy. For TTF faculty, the department follows the policy set forth by the Regents.

With regard to Comprehensive Review, the System Administrative Policy on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion states, “The comprehensive review is a critical appraisal designed to identify a candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in sufficient time to allow promising candidates to improve their records before the evaluation for tenure. The review may include evaluation by external reviewers, as determined by the campus/school/college, or library policy. Candidates may also request additional feedback from the primary unit head in the second year of their appointment and any subsequent year prior to the tenure and/or promotion decision (except in the year in which the comprehensive review is undertaken).” (“Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review,” APS 1022.)

With regard to promotion to Associate Professor and tenure, the System Administrative Policy on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion states, “Tenure may be awarded only to faculty members who have demonstrated, at a minimum, meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service (to the university, profession, and/or public); and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or scholarly/creative work.” And, further, “Associate professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, considerable successful teaching experience, and promising accomplishment in scholarship or in research.” (“Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review” APS 1022; Faculty Appointments, APS 5060.)

Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II: RTP

With regard to promotion to Full Professor, the System Administrative Policy on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion states, “Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and (A) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (B) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (C) a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service.” (“Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review,” APS 1022.)

PRIMARY UNIT CRITERIA

I. RESEARCH

In its deliberation on this element of professional performance, the Department concluded that there are two main rationales for research: (1) to contribute to the wealth of knowledge that is the discipline of philosophy, and (2) to remain active and current in areas of specialization. Considering the mission of the Department, the second reason is at least as important as the first. The Department recognizes that both of these goals can be accomplished in various ways and that different faculty members will vary in the extent of their success at either task. In light of its needs, the Department values not only the more typical scholarly forms of production (the publication and submission of articles, books, and book reviews) but also other forms of scholarly activity such as commentaries, papers presented in professional venues, and collaborative research and editorial work with other scholars. These other activities entail not only research but also encourage the development of the skills and professional associations that keep faculty members active as scholars.

Given the variety of work that can be done in philosophy and the unique circumstances of each faculty member, it is, of course, difficult to say in advance exactly what criteria must be met in order to receive a particular rating for purposes of review and promotion. Nevertheless, the Department has resolved that the following point system shall serve as a general guide.

Quality is difficult to quantify, and we expect that the committees evaluating candidates will use judgment in the application of this scheme to particular cases. Judgment of this sort can be illustrated by a couple of examples: (a) The Department gives special recognition to articles that are considered path-breaking in the field and adjusts the number of points awarded to those articles accordingly. (b) “Refereed” articles and conference presentations are weighted more than non-refereed ones. Invited articles may or may not be peer-reviewed (depending on the outlet); an invited article that is peer reviewed may be awarded more points than one which is not peer-reviewed. In addition, articles may also have their value adjusted if they are placed in a highly prestigious volume published, for example, by Cambridge, Oxford, Yale, or Harvard Press.

On the whole, the Department believes that a mechanical application of a point system is counterproductive. Point totals, while providing an important metric, cannot *alone* support a

Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II: RTP

rating of meritorious or excellent. Evidence of an ongoing peer-reviewed research program is an important expectation of the department. In the application of the scheme set out below, our guiding question is: “Has this faculty member shown that he or she is an active scholar with a quality, sustainable research program?” In other words, the candidate’s body of work as a whole, as judged by the voting members of the department, will be the ultimate and determining factor.

I.A. Research: the Rating Scheme

TTF: Comprehensive/4th Year Review: For Comprehensive Review, we have the following expectations:

Meritorious: To receive a rating of *on track for meritorious* in research for the fourth year review, which typically covers roughly the first three years of appointment, faculty members are expected to accumulate approximately 6 points, including at least 3 of those points coming through conference presentations and/or article, book, or other recognized scholarly publications as specified in Philosophy’s criteria, below.

Excellent: To receive a rating of *on track for excellent*, approximately 9 points, including at least 5 of those points coming through conference presentations and/or article, book, or other recognized scholarly publications as specified in Philosophy’s criteria, below. Verifiable evidence of significant progress on a scholarly book manuscript can be counted as an additional factor in promotion.

TTF: Tenure Review: For promotion to Associate Professor and tenure, we have the following expectations:

Meritorious: To receive a rating of *meritorious* in research for the tenure review, the department expects approximately 14 points for a rating of *meritorious*, including at least 7 of those points coming through conference presentations and/or article, book, or other recognized scholarly publications as specified in Philosophy’s criteria, below.

Excellent: To receive a rating of *excellent* in research for the tenure review, the department expects approximately 20 points, including at least 12 of those points coming through conference presentations and/or article, book, or other recognized scholarly publications as specified in Philosophy’s criteria, below.

We note, again, that our system of points is meant to acknowledge that there are many facets to scholarly life but we take articles, presentations, and scholarly book manuscripts (research and translation work) as integral to answering the guiding question above: “Has this faculty member shown that he or she is an active scholar with a quality, sustainable research program?”

Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II: RTP

TTF: Promotion to Full: For promotion to Full Professor, we have the following expectations:

For promotion to full professor, we expect a level of sustained accomplishment that would entail the accumulation *since the initial appointment* of approximately 40 points. At least 24 of those points should be coming through conference presentations and/or article, book, or other recognized scholarly publications as specified in Philosophy's criteria. Still, we note that "excellence" for promotion to Full also connotes an overall demonstration of *continuing development of scholarship since tenure* in terms mentioned above [that is, (1) contribution to the discipline of philosophy, and (2) remaining active and current in areas of specialization]. The Department also notes that "Excellence" for promotion to Full Professor may also reflect a shift of research focus and, thus, need not be a continuation of the research program presented for promotion to Associate Professor.

I.A.1 Numerical Points for Faculty Research

For purposes of evaluation, the department has assigned the follow point values to the following kinds of scholarship:

(0.5) Invited conference paper or commentary (non-refereed), book review, participation on a scholarly panel.

(1.0) Refereed conference paper or professional address, co-publication, invited article, chapter, encyclopedia article, or translation.

(1.0) Translation (philosophical, article-length).

(2.0) Refereed article, article based on conference paper, extended review essay (40+ pages), book chapter accepted or published. Points can be adjusted upward at petition of evaluatee for especially prestigious placement if the evaluation committee and Department Chair agree.

(2.0) Curation of exhibit (advancing and applying philosophical ideas) at recognized non-profit museum or gallery space. Curation of an exhibit includes at least some of the following activities: conceptualization of exhibit theme, review and selection of submitted work; selection and editorship of artist(s)' and other statements and supporting materials; management of project details and budget. Points can be adjusted, including by petition by evaluatee, for especially complicated exhibitions or extensive intellectual production, if the evaluation committee and Department Chair agree.

(3.0-6.0) Edited anthology published or in advance page proof/galleys, under contract (committing the press). Points will be determined by scholarly significance, philosophical contribution and difficulty, etc. Points can be adjusted up at petition of evaluatee for especially prestigious placement if the evaluation committee and Department Chair agree.

(6.0-14) Translation (philosophical, book-length) published or in advance page proof/galleys, under contract (committing the press). Points will be determined by scholarly significance, philosophical contribution and difficulty, etc. Points can be adjusted up at petition of evaluatee for especially prestigious placement if the evaluation committee and Department Chair agree.

Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II: RTP

(12.0-14.0) Book of individual research published or in advance page proof/galleys, under contract (committing the press). Points can be adjusted up at petition of evaluatee for especially prestigious placement if the evaluation committee and Department Chair agree.

II. TEACHING

II.A. Teaching: the Ratings Scheme

In order to evaluate candidates for promotion and tenure on the basis of teaching, the department developed the categories listed in this section. Candidates also include, in their dossier, evidence defined in “Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation” (APS 1009) which informs the department’s evaluation, as well. A candidate must demonstrate that he or she has made a positive and constructive impact on the philosophical development of students; minimum standards necessary to convey this accomplishment will rely on the following measures:

II.A.1. TTF: Comprehensive/4th Year Review: For Comprehensive Review, the criteria for [on track for] *meritorious* and [on track for] *excellent* will apply as measured across the period specified as the pre-Comprehensive review period in their contract.

Meritorious: For a rating of “on track for *meritorious*” the candidate must satisfy at least 6 categories, including at least 3 from Category II, one of which must come from the “Teaching Effectiveness” subcategories.

Excellent: For a rating of “on track for *excellent*” the candidate must satisfy at least 8 teaching categories below, with 5 coming from Category II, at least two of which must come from the “Teaching Effectiveness” subcategories. In addition, per Regents rule (Policy 5D), “a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one’s immediate instructional setting.” Impact can be demonstrated by activities including but not limited to scholarship on teaching or pedagogy, mentoring of students, guest lecturing, serving on the curriculum committees in a variety of venues, including professional organizations.

II.A.2. TTF: Tenure Review: For tenure and promotion to associate, the listed criteria for *meritorious* and *excellent* will apply as measured across the faculty member’s career, pre-tenure, at CU Denver. Note: While the category metrics here are the same as Comprehensive, they are more difficult to accomplish because they are measured across a more extended period.

Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II: RTP

Meritorious: For a rating of *meritorious* the candidate must satisfy at least 6 categories, including at least 3 from Category II, one of which must come from the “Teaching Effectiveness” subcategories.

Excellent: For a rating of *excellent* the candidate must satisfy at least 8 teaching categories below, with 5 coming from Category II, at least two of which must come from the “Teaching Effectiveness” subcategories. In addition, per Regents rule (Policy 5D), “a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one’s immediate instructional setting.” Impact can be demonstrated by activities including but not limited to scholarship on teaching or pedagogy, mentoring of students, guest lecturing, serving on the curriculum committees in a variety of venues, including professional organizations.

II.A.3. TTF: Promotion to Full: For promotion to full professor, the listed criteria will apply as measured across the faculty member’s career taken as a whole. Note: While the category metrics here are the same as Comprehensive and Tenure, they are more difficult to accomplish because measured across the faculty member’s career, taken as a whole.

Meritorious: For a rating of *meritorious* the candidate must satisfy at least 6 categories, including at least 3 from Category II, one of which must come from the “Teaching Effectiveness” subcategories.

Excellent: For a rating of *excellent* the candidate must satisfy at least 8 teaching categories below, with 5 coming from Category II, at least two of which must come from the “Teaching Effectiveness” subcategories. In addition, per Regents rule (Policy 5D), “a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one’s immediate instructional setting.” Impact can be demonstrated by activities including but not limited to scholarship on teaching or pedagogy, mentoring of students, guest lecturing, serving on the curriculum committees in a variety of venues, including professional organizations.

II.B Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Quality

The teaching performance of faculty undergoing the comprehensive review, promotion to associate and tenure, and promotion to full professor will be evaluated on the basis of the following criteria. (See, also, “Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation” are defined in APS 1009)

Determination of “excellent” and “meritorious” levels of faculty teaching is based upon the components listed below in two sections, Category I and Category II:

Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II: RTP

CATEGORY I

1. Demonstration of accessibility, communication, approachability with students, e.g.,
 - Availability during office hours
 - Responsiveness to student questions
 - Supportive, accurate, and useful advising

2. Involvement in the Department's teaching mission, e.g.,
 - Development of new courses as permitted or requested
 - Formulation of standards and methods of assessment
 - Willingness and ability to teach courses relevant to curricular and programmatic needs
 - Participation in department discussions regarding teaching and learning outcomes

3. Professional development related to teaching and learning, including
 - Attendance at or leadership of workshops on pedagogy and at least one of the following:
 - Presentations on teaching and learning or
 - Scholarship of teaching and learning

4. Numbers of students and types of courses taught, (helping to meet department and university needs) e.g.,
 - Core and non-core courses
 - Undergraduate and Graduate courses
 - Numbers of majors, non-majors, undergraduates, and graduates at various levels

CATEGORY II

5. Quality of teaching materials; for example, e.g.,
 - Incorporation of new material into existing courses to keep up with current issues in the fields covered in the course
 - Creation of clear and substantive syllabi
 - Following the Department's Policies on Syllabi and Course Content (Appendix IV)

6. Participation in individualized instruction, e.g.,
 - Overseeing independent studies
 - Supervising undergraduate honors projects
 - Advising graduate students on comprehensive exams or theses

7. Demonstration of teaching effectiveness: FCQs. FCQ Course Evaluations consistent with a teacher who is effectively conveying knowledge in the classroom and is teaching rigorously

Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II: RTP

courses. The evaluation should take into account factors which may affect FCQ ratings, such as class size, teaching core or required courses, and heavy workloads.

8. Demonstration of teaching effectiveness: Student letters on effectiveness and evidence of student achievement. This may be shown by (a) solicited and unsolicited communications (email, course evaluation comments, cards or notes) praising his or her abilities as a teacher, and/or (b) by instances of exceptional student achievement, as found in student work such as portfolios, awards, competitions, etc.

9. Demonstration of teaching effectiveness: Peer evaluation. Peer evaluation of courses, including classroom observation, syllabi review, examination of student portfolios if available, etc.

10. Demonstration of teaching effectiveness: Teaching awards. Winning competitive teaching awards, both within and without CU Denver will be considered. Both a CLAS Teaching Award or CU Denver University Teaching Award is considered in itself a strong sign of teaching accomplishment.

11. Diversity in Department Curriculum, Advising, Pedagogy, Student Outreach, e.g.,

- Development of pedagogically sound curricula which expand the Department's offerings to serve populations who are underrepresented in Philosophy, either in our department or in the profession more generally especially as regards subject matter, perspectives, and approaches.
- Leadership and Service in support of underrepresented students that advances student academic success; such Leadership and Service could include the development of new initiatives or events (at the individual or student club level); it may also include Leadership and Service that advances implementation of existing initiatives.
- Engagement in Departmental public relations outreach (written and in-person) regarding initiatives and opportunities about Philosophy that include underrepresented individuals and groups as described above.

III. LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE

There are many different ways in which a faculty member can serve the department, the College, the University, and the profession. The key to a just evaluation of a faculty member's Leadership and Service is to determine a member's particular form or forms of Leadership and Service and then consider the scope both of the demands and of the contribution entailed. For example, the editorship of a journal is very time-consuming and very useful to the national and international reputation of a department. Such editorships do much to advance the name recognition of a department, campus, and university. Collaborative work with other scholars, the creation or dissemination of research or pedagogy, are additional examples of significant and worthwhile professional Leadership and Service. Unless there are mitigating

Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II: RTP

circumstances, it is assumed that Leadership and Service leadership duties increase as faculty are promoted and/or accrue seniority within the institution. For example, an Associate or Full Professor might Chair the Department, serve on College or University-wide committees with heavier responsibilities (such as the Dean's Advisory Committee, the Vice Chancellors Advisory Committee, etc.) or perhaps chair such committees.

At a minimum, all members of the Department are expected to attend department meetings and serve on a CLAS or university committee. Leadership and Service on college, campus, or university-wide committees is a typical way to fulfill the Leadership and Service requirement. In this regard, consideration needs to be given to the amount of time involved as well as the importance of the activity. For example, a once-a-week two-hour meeting that requires a full day of preparation for the meeting is worth much more than the every-other-month one-hour meeting requiring no preparation. Leadership and Service to the field of philosophy can be demonstrated, for example, by serving as an officer in a professional organization or coordinating professional meetings. Leadership and Service in a professional capacity for the local, state, national, or international communities should also be factored into the total evaluation of a faculty member's Leadership and Service activities.

III.A. Leadership and Service: the Ratings Scheme

These guidelines are not exhaustive. But they provide a pattern for the reasoned arguments that support a proposed evaluation. Modification of the suggested evaluations will need to be made in light of the uniqueness of each individual case. In the process of making such arguments, alternative criteria or weightings, in addition to those suggested here, may emerge as appropriate, and the Department endorses this discretion in the evaluation of a faculty member's Leadership and Service.

III.A.1. TTF: Comprehensive/4th Year Review: The recognition of activity in one or more of these categories is our baseline in evaluating faculty for the purposes of pre-tenure review. The faculty member who diligently performs routine department and university Leadership and Service should be viewed as *on track for meritorious*. But if, for example, the same faculty member has also been active on the national level in professional organizations, his or her work may be deemed *on track for excellent*.

III.A.2. TTF: Tenure Review: For tenure and promotion to associate, the listed criteria will apply, but will be measured across the faculty member's career at CU Denver.

III.A. 3. TTF: Promotion to Full: In utilizing the listed criteria, accomplishments will be judged in relationship to a faculty member's career at CU Denver.

Faculty Leadership and Service will be evaluated based on the components and activities such as the following:

Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II: RTP

Leadership and Service Category 1.

- Department Chair
- Graduate Advisor
- Undergraduate Advisor
- Director of a college or department program
- College or university Leadership and Service award
- Editor of a peer-reviewed research journal
- President of national or international professional organization

Leadership and Service Category 2.

- Committee Chair, system, university or college-wide committee
- Chair of a department search committee doing a national search
- Member of college or university RTP committee
- President of regional society or another significant position in an international or national professional society
- Chair or Director of national or international professional society committee

Leadership and Service Category 3.

- Committee member of an ongoing system, university or college-wide committee
- Member of executive board of a professional society

Leadership and Service Category 4.

- Chair of a department committee
- Committee member of ad hoc or one-time system, university or college committee
- Referee for journals
- External grant-review activities
- Community talks in local venues

Leadership and Service Category 5.

- Member of a department committee
- Session Chair/organizer at professional meetings
- Internal grant-review activities

Comment: Committee membership implies attendance at committee meetings. Membership without attendance does not constitute a Leadership and Service activity. While some Leadership and Service work is accompanied with compensation either in the form of stipends or course releases, the Department understands that the work involved in Category 1 and 2 Leadership and Service usually requires more effort than is recognized by Leadership and Service compensation.

Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II: RTP

IV. PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

IV.A. Tenure Track Faculty. Comprehensive and tenure reviews will take place as follows:

IV.A.1. Selection of external reviewers and minimum number of letters: The Chair asks the candidate to submit a list of several names who would be appropriate as external reviewers. At the same time, the candidate informs the Chair about any potential evaluators who should *not* be asked to evaluate his or her work, and provides reasons why they would be inappropriate. The Chair compiles a separate list of names of possible external reviewers. The possible reviewers on both the candidate's and the Chair's list should not be individuals who are identified with the candidate.

A minimum of three external letters of evaluation are required for comprehensive reviews. At most, one reviewer can be selected from the candidate's list; at least two additional letters must come from outside the candidate's list.

A minimum of six external letters of evaluation are required for promotion and tenure reviews. At most two can be selected from the candidate's list; at least four additional letters much come from outside the candidate's list.

IV.A.2. The Chair prepares the letter for the external reviewers and has it approved by the associate dean for faculty and staff affairs.

IV.A.3. The candidate submits to the Chair an updated *vita*, the sample research that will be submitted to the reviewers (e.g., books, articles, and conference papers), and a research statement. The candidate is encouraged to ask any faculty members to read drafts of the research, teaching, and Leadership and Service statements prior to their distribution to the departmental review committees and the external reviewers.

IV.A.4. The Chair contacts the selected external reviewers and asks if they are willing to serve as reviewers for the candidate's research. The candidates' materials are sent out to the reviewers.

IV.A.5. The Chair appoints three Departmental review committees—teaching, research, and Leadership and Service. A minimum of two faculty members is appointed to each committee, with the Chair of the committee a tenured faculty member. Other members of this committee need to be tenured; in the event that the department does not have enough eligible tenured faculty to serve, the department will enlist additional tenured faculty from CU Denver to participate in internal committees. The Chair is not a member of any of these three review committees.

IV.A.6. The review committees review the candidate's record and write a report evaluating it in terms of its assigned area—teaching, Leadership and Service, and research. The Leadership and Service and teaching committees rely largely on the material submitted by the candidate for data, although members of the teaching committee are encouraged to observe the candidate's

Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II: RTP

teaching. The research committee uses as primary data for its review the external letters assessing the quality and quantity of the research by reviewers outside the CU System.

IV.A.7. To arrive at an overall recommendation regarding tenure and/or promotion, three separate Department votes are taken on the candidate's teaching, research, and leadership/service components. All vote totals are recorded and reported. Only tenured faculty vote on comprehensive reviews, and reviews for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Only full professors vote on reviews for promotion to full professor. In the case of promotion to full professor, full professors from cognate departments may be involved in the review. The Chair orally notifies the candidate of the vote.

IV.A.8. The Chair writes a letter summarizing the discussion and recommendation of the faculty. This letter also includes a report of the vote of the faculty. If the Chair disagrees with the vote and recommendation of the Department, the Chair states that and explains his or her decision.

IV.A.9. The candidate, with the assistance of the Chair, prepares the dossier to be submitted to the dean's office.

V. PROCEDURES FOR POST TENURE REVIEW

V.A. Post-tenure review (PTR) will take place every five years after tenure. Evaluation standards currently in use for annual performance review will be employed for PTR.

V.A.1. In accordance with the CU System's and the CLAS Post Tenure Review policies, an annual evaluation resulting in a summary rating of "below expectations" in any of the evaluative areas, according to Departmental Unit Criteria, will serve as a trigger for consultation with the Department Chair, and the creation of a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA). Two annual evaluations resulting in a summary rating of "below expectations," or failure of a PIA to result in an annual evaluation rating of "meeting expectations" or better will trigger an Extensive Review. Otherwise, faculty will undergo regular PTR each five years.

V.A. 2. Faculty who receive ratings of "below expectations" have the opportunity to appeal this rating, to the Departmental Review Committee, the Chair, the CLAS PTR Committee, and the Dean, in serial order. No action to begin a PIA can commence before an appeal process (if invoked) has been completed.

V.A. 3. The normal PTR process will include an examination by the primary unit of the five previous annual performance evaluation reports, including FCQs, peer-review of teaching, and other methods of teaching evaluation, as well as the faculty member's Professional Plan(s) from the current PTR cycle. Additionally, the faculty member will provide the primary unit with an updated Professional Plan.

Philosophy Bylaws Appendix II: RTP

V.A. 4. The primary unit will write a brief report summarizing the unit's findings regarding the faculty member's adherence to the previous Professional Plan(s) (taking into account the differentiated workload, where present) and conclusions about his/her productivity and contributions to the University in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service. Included in the report will be a rating of meeting expectations or not meeting expectations. A rating of not meeting expectations in any of the evaluative areas will call for a performance improvement agreement (PIA, see below). These reports will be forwarded to the dean, who will report to the academic vice chancellor on the results of all the post-tenure reviews in the college/school. A copy of the PTR report will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. Incentives for excellence in performance at PTR will be based upon available resources.

V.A. 5. In the event that a triggered review has resulted in a PIA, the faculty member, working with the Department Chair, will specify goals, timelines, and benchmarks that will be used to measure progress. The annual merit evaluation following implementation of the PIA will determine whether stated goals have been met.

V.A. 6. In the event that PIA goals are not met, an Extensive Review by the Departmental Review Committee will ensue, in accordance with CLAS and CU Denver policies. This review will result in a Development Plan. While the faculty member is ultimately responsible for the successful outcome of the Development Plan, the Philosophy Department has an obligation to assist the faculty member who seeks guidance in developing a realistic plan to remedy identified areas of deficiency.

END BYLAWS APPENDIX II: RTP