

Revised Philosophy Department Promotion and Tenure Policies.

(2/07/05 Revisions approved by Department and Chair, in response to comments from Karen Blaisure and Jay Wood on the Revised 10/01/04 version of revisions to “Department Policy Statements,” originally approved by the Philosophy Department, March 1998).

Proposal 1: Replace the “Professional Competence Policy” on pages 8 and 9 of the current policy with the following:

Departmental Evaluative Criteria

Departmental committees on tenure, promotion, merit, reappointment, sabbatical requests, and requests for assigned time for research shall evaluate the areas of performance of departmental faculty eligible or applying for these personnel actions. These committees shall evaluate faculty members with respect to “Professional Competence,” “Professional Recognition,” and “Professional Service.”

I. Professional Competence

Effective teaching shall be understood to include the following:

- A. Demonstrated mastery of the subject matter.
- B. Ability to explain the subject matter rigorously yet clearly.
- C. Maintaining an understanding of recent developments in the field
- D. High but fair standards of grading.
- E. Ability to assist students in making further academic progress on their own.
- F. Development of new courses, new course materials, or new methods of instruction.
- G. Advising students, in the form of Directed Research courses and/or membership on Graduate Level Committees.

Teaching effectiveness is evaluated by examining some or all of the following:

- A. Syllabi, course materials, or other evidence of teaching effectiveness provided by the faculty member.
- B. Reports of any classroom visitations requested by the faculty member, or required of pre-tenure faculty.
- C. Numerical summaries of the campus-wide student rating instrument.

II. Professional Recognition

Professional Recognition shall be understood to include the following:

- A. Publication of scholarly books and articles.
- B. Preparing and receiving scholarly grants.
- C. Presentations of papers at scholarly conferences.
- D. Originality in thinking and continued familiarity with recent developments in

- one's field.
- E. Participation in philosophical discussions and correspondence with other philosophers both inside and outside the department.
- F. Participation in conferences, seminars, or workshops sponsored by professional organizations.
- G. Holding offices in national or regional professional organizations.
- H. Contributions to general intellectual life through publications or formal participation in conferences and meetings not specifically philosophical.
- I. Refereeing manuscripts and proposed journal articles.
- J. Editing professional books and journals.
- K. Having one's professional work cited and/or discussed.
- L. Continued scholarly activity, including substantial work in progress and works under review.

Without significant publications a candidate typically will not be given tenure.

Given that making assessments of one another's philosophical abilities and accomplishments requires first hand familiarity with their philosophical work, department members are strongly encouraged to read and comment upon one another's work. Department committees charged with assessing the Professional Recognition of other faculty members shall assess the merits of these activities based upon:

- A'. Their own philosophical assessments of the materials with which they are personally familiar.
- B'. Their assessment of the quality of the journal or press in which an article or book is published, or their familiarity with the high professional standards required by the professional organizations that have published the works in question or have invited the faculty member to make a public presentation of their work.
- C'. The assessment of outside experts in the field, in the form of written communications that are made part of a faculty member's personnel file, letters of recommendation for various awards or appointments, or commentary on their professional work in books, journals, or presentations.

III. Professional Service

Professional Service shall be understood to include the following:

- A. Membership on departmental committees, or assuming various on-going or rotating roles within the department, such as Graduate Advisor, or Editor of the Proceedings of the Heraclitean Society.
- B. Membership on University Councils, Committees, Faculty Senate, AAUP, or other campus organizations.
- C. Organization of conferences, seminars, or workshops sponsored by professional organizations.
- D. Contributions to general intellectual life through publications or formal participation in conferences and meetings not specifically philosophical.
- E. Reviewing manuscripts and potential journal articles.
- F. Use of one's expertise in service to the community

Proposal 2: Replace sections I and II, and amend section III, of the Department's Tenure Policy on page 12 of the current departmental policy statement, with the following:

Tenure Policy

I. Eligibility for tenure consideration, probationary period, and specifications of conditions of appointment are as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

II. Criteria for tenure evaluations:

All probationary faculty shall be evaluated in accordance with the Departmental Evaluative Criteria with respect to Professional Competence, Professional Recognition, and Professional Service, during their years of probation.

A. Professional Competence

Professional Competence shall be evaluated in terms of the criteria and definitions specified for Professional Competence in the Departmental Evaluative Criteria. In order to be recommended for tenure, candidates must demonstrate clear teaching competence and show signs that they will continue to be effective teachers in the future. Candidates for tenure shall supply to the departmental tenure committee course syllabi for all courses taught either since being hired, or since the last tenure review, whichever is more recent, as well as information from the campus-wide student ratings instrument, for each semester administered during this same period. Candidates remain free to submit other evidence of teaching effectiveness, and the tenure committee may likewise request additional information.

B. Professional Recognition

Professional Recognition shall be evaluated in terms of the criteria and definitions specified for Professional Recognition in the Departmental Evaluative Criteria. Thus in particular, in order to be recommended for tenure, a candidate must have reached at least a satisfactory level of recognition or achievement, which will normally include some significant work accepted for publication. At tenure reviews prior to the final review, a candidate must show evidence of being able to receive a positive evaluation upon final review.

C. Professional Service

Professional Service shall be evaluated according to the criteria and definitions specified for Professional Service in the Departmental Evaluative Criteria. A demonstrated willingness to participate in faculty governance is normally required in order to receive a positive evaluation with respect to Professional Service.

III. Tenure Review Procedures:

- A. Probationary faculty members shall be reviewed at the beginning of the second, fourth and sixth years of his/her Probationary period.
- B. The review shall be made by the Tenure Committee of the Department in accordance with the criteria specified in II above.
- C. The Tenure Committee shall be the Department's tenured faculty.
- D. The Tenure Committee shall elect its own chairperson and shall follow usual rules of informal parliamentary procedure.
- E. The Department Chairperson shall give timely notice, in accordance with the contract timetable, to probationary faculty members of the date by which it is to receive data. The probationary faculty member must submit to the Tenure Committee all evidence he/she thinks relevant by that date.
- F. Recommendations of the Tenure Committee shall be determined by majority vote of the Committee.
- G. The Tenure Committee chairperson shall inform the probationary faculty member of the Committee's recommendations at the conclusion of each of the three reviews. To allow time for appeal, this information should reach the probationary faculty member in advance of the contractually specified date on which it is to be presented to the Chair of the Department.
- H. The probationary faculty member may appeal to the Committee by the date designated in the current contract. He/she may submit comments and request changes. The Committee must consider such appeals.

Proposal 3: Replace sections I and II, and amend section III, of the Department's Promotion Policy on pages 15 and 16 of the current Departmental Policy Statement, with the following:

Promotion Policy

- I. Eligibility for promotion is as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- II. Criteria for Promotion Evaluations.
All faculty shall be evaluated in accordance with the Departmental Evaluative Criteria with respect to Professional Competence, Professional Recognition, and Professional

Service.

- A. Minimal Requirements for any Promotion:
All faculty wishing to be considered for promotion shall normally present to the departmental promotion committee course syllabi and numerical summaries of the campus-wide student rating instrument for each individual section where administered since last promoted, or since joining the faculty, whichever is more recent.

- B. Promotion to Associate Professor:
In order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor, a faculty member must be judged either to:
 - 1) have achieved satisfactory Professional Recognition and outstanding achievements as a teacher during time in rank, or
 - 2) be a competent faculty member whose major achievement is outstanding professional recognition during time in rank.

- C. Promotion to Full Professor:
In order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Full Professor, a faculty member must be judged to have either:
 - 1) achieved outstanding Professional Recognition and a satisfactory record of professional competence; or
 - 2) achieved outstanding success in professional competence and gained substantial professional recognition; or
 - 3) gained substantial professional recognition, a satisfactory record of professional competence, and rendered significant professional service.

III. Implementation

- A. The Department chairperson shall inform all those faculty eligible for promotion of that fact. An eligible faculty member may withdraw his or her name from consideration. A faculty member who intends to request an exception to the eligibility requirements must do so as provided for in the Contract.

- B. The Department Promotion Committee shall consist of all unit faculty members on campus at or above the rank in question who are ineligible for promotion and not requesting an exception to the eligibility requirements, or who are eligible but have withdrawn their names.

- C. The Department Promotion Committee shall notify in writing any faculty member whose request for an exception has been rejected, giving the reasons for its decisions.

- D. The Department Promotion Committee shall elect its own chairperson, and shall follow usual rules of informal parliamentary procedure.

- E. The Department Chairperson shall give timely notice to the faculty, in accordance with the contract timetable, of the date by which it is to receive data. The candidate for promotion must submit to the Department Promotion committee all evidence he or she thinks relevant by that date.
- F. Recommendations of the Department Promotion committee shall be determined by a majority vote of the Committee.
- G. Notification of recommendation: the candidate, Department Chair and College Promotion Committee shall be notified of the recommendation of the committee as specified in the Contract.
- H. The candidate may appeal to the Committee by the date designated in the current contract. He/she may submit comments and request changes. The Committee must consider such appeals.