

1 **California State University Long Beach**

2
3 **DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY**

4 **COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS**

5 **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY**

6
7 The purpose of this policy is to describe the process and standards that shall be used to
8 evaluate candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in the Department of
9 Philosophy at California State University, Long Beach. The standards set forth are intended
10 to affirm the principles expressed in both the University-level and College-level RTP
11 policies. By setting clear standards, the Department of Philosophy expects that each
12 candidate will realize the high promise that is characteristic of its faculty members.
13 It is expected that each candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will have a
14 unique profile regarding accomplishments in (a) Instructional Activities, (b) Research,
15 Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA), and (c) Service Activities. The standards in this
16 policy are intended to provide clear criteria for evaluation while maintaining some flexibility
17 for candidates to meet them. This policy is not intended to provide a simple checklist for
18 success. Rather, candidates are expected to demonstrate excellence in their materials with
19 appropriate evidence relative to the stated criteria. Members of the Department of
20 Philosophy RTP committee are expected to use their best professional judgment in
21 interpreting the standards and evaluating all candidates consistently.

22
23 **I. RESPONSIBILITIES**

24
25 A. The candidate is responsible for understanding RTP standards established in the
26 University-level, College-level, and Department-level RTP policies. The candidate also has
27 the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of accomplishments.
28 Candidates should take special care to prepare a succinct and clear narrative that presents
29 the case for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. In addition, candidates should
30 make every effort to seek guidance from a variety of sources, including the Department
31 Chair, Department RTP Committee, the College Dean, and the Associate Vice President for
32 Faculty Affairs to fully understand the process and standards. Candidates are directed to
33 Section 1.2 of the CLA RTP policy for guidance on the organization of RTP materials for
34 evaluation. See also Section 2.1.1.1 of the CLA RTP policy for additional detail on required
35 materials for documenting Instructional activities; Section 2.2.1.1 of the CLA RTP policy for
36 additional detail on required materials for documenting RSCA activities; and Section 2.3.1
37 of the CLA RTP policy for additional detail on required materials for documenting Service
38 activities.

39
40 B. The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring effective mentoring and support for
41 candidates in their efforts to develop as teachers, scholars, and members of the University
42 community. The Department Chair is encouraged to submit an independent evaluation of
43 each candidate except where prohibited by College or University RTP policies.

C. The Department RTP Committee has primary responsibility for evaluating the candidates' materials and makes the initial recommendation to the College and University regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. The Department RTP Committee must communicate the professional standards and practices within the Department of Philosophy to reviewers at other levels of the College and University.

1. *Formation of Department RTP Committee.* Normally, one committee composed of at least three voting members will be formed. Depending on the actions being considered, the committee may be broken into subcommittees of at least three voting members. The committee considering actions of (a) promotion to Professor, (b) reappointment or tenure of an Associate Professor, or (c) reappointment or tenure of a Professor shall be restricted to tenured faculty members with the rank of Professor. The committee considering actions of (a) reappointment of an Assistant Professor or (b) tenure and/or promotion of an Assistant Professor shall be restricted to tenured faculty with the rank of at least Associate Professor who are themselves not being evaluated in the RTP process that year. If it is not possible to obtain a three-member committee of Department of Philosophy faculty members, nominations shall be taken from the tenured and probationary faculty for candidates outside of the department to be voted on by the tenured and probationary faculty.

2. *Eligibility.* All eligible faculty members as described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and Senate policies are candidates for RTP committees.

3. *Election Procedure.* Election of a RTP committee shall be by majority vote of eligible faculty members as determined by the Collective Bargaining Agreement and Senate policies. The election procedure will be in two parts as follows: (1) Voters will vote for all those candidates whom they find acceptable for the committee. Those candidates receiving 50% or more of the vote on the first ballot will be listed on a second ballot. (2) Voting members will rank all of the acceptable candidates from the first ballot. The votes for each candidate will be summed by ranked position in the vote, and the three candidates with the lowest sum (i.e., the highest ranked) will be elected to the committee. If fewer than three nominees achieve a vote of acceptance on 50% or more of the ballots cast, then the Department Chair, in consultation with the faculty, shall identify qualified faculty members from outside the department to stand for election to the Philosophy RTP committee(s). Once the outside candidates have been identified, the standard election procedure shall occur.

D. The Department recognizes the important role of mentoring candidates in their efforts to develop as teachers, scholars, and members of the University community. To that end, we follow the mentoring guidelines set out in the College of Liberal Arts' RTP policy; viz., section 3.5 of the CLA RTP document. Faculty members are encouraged to voluntarily

share copies of their past Professional Data Sheet and Narrative with candidates for the express purpose of mentoring.

II. INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Faculty members are expected to provide effective instruction in their discipline. Consistent with University-level and College-level RTP policies, the Department of Philosophy recognizes that effective instruction occurs both inside and outside the traditional classroom setting.

For All Levels of Evaluation:

A. The following four indicators of teaching effectiveness are most highly valued by the Department of Philosophy in the RTP process. Candidates must address the four indicators in their narrative and provide convincing evidence of competence using the indicators listed in each of the following sections:

1. Effective instructional strategies as illustrated by:

- Statement of teaching philosophy. In particular, candidates should discuss instructional goals and how these goals are manifested in their instructional activities, materials, and outcomes.
- Course syllabi relative to Academic Senate guidelines and policies.
- Representative instructional materials (e.g., sample lectures, handouts).
- Student course evaluation statistical summaries. Student evaluations should be considered relative to (a) course level, (b) Department of Philosophy norms, (c) response rate and statistical significance of summaries.

2. Effective use of assessment techniques as evidenced by:

- Assessment materials (e.g., sample tests, paper assignments, reflection logs).
- Grade distributions. Grade distributions should be considered relative to (a) course level, (b) Department of Philosophy norms.

3. Active engagement in items such as:

- Supervision of undergraduate student honors and independent research projects.
- Supervision of undergraduate and/or graduate student research assistants.
- Serving on graduate student thesis, portfolio, and exam committees.
- Student mentoring (e.g., graduate school admissions, student organizations (if not counting as service; see CLA RTP policy section 1.1.12 on counting activities in only one area)).
- Advising students in an official, departmentally-recognized capacity if that advising is done without assigned time (if not counting as service; see CLA RTP policy section 1.1.12 on counting activities in only one area).

4. *Efforts to develop as a teacher* (e.g., course revision and updating, instructional workshop attendance, reading books and literature on teaching, consultations with instructional experts). See CLA RTP policy 2.1.3.1, 2.1.3.2, and 2.1.3.3 for further guidance.

B. The following indicators are optional but may be particularly useful in determining: (1) superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard six-year timeline, which is the standard for early tenure and (2) a record of distinction, necessary in all three areas of evaluation, that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements established in the department and college policies, which is the standard for early promotion.

1. *Written comments on student course evaluations*
2. *Letters regarding instruction submitted during the “open period.” (Note: all signed letters received during the open period shall be placed in the candidate’s file.)*
3. *Teaching awards*
4. *Innovations in teaching (e.g., service learning, team learning, novel use of technology)*
5. *Creation of new courses, programs, or other substantial curriculum development*
6. *Student accomplishments (e.g., awards, presentations, graduate school admissions) directly related to work supervised*
7. *Publications, such as articles or books that are primarily concerned with pedagogy, or textbooks. (if not counting as RSCA; see CLA RTP section 1.1.12 on counting activities in only one area)*

The Department also recognizes that some contributions that satisfy II.B.7 above might overlap in various ways with the RSCA categories described in section III. In such cases, candidates are expected to state and provide a rationale for what proportion of such contributions should be counted toward each of Instructional Activities and RSCA.

C. The following may be used in evaluating the quality of the instructional and instructionally-related activities listed above. The Department of Philosophy does not make any a priori judgments about the value of each of the following. Candidates may address any of the following that are helpful in making the best case for their file.

1. *Level of courses taught (100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600)*
2. *Size of classes taught*
3. *Intensity of writing in courses*
4. *Number of new preparations during period of review*
5. *Number of different courses taught during period of review*
6. *Peer-evaluations shall be conducted only at the request of the candidate*

III. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA)

Faculty members are expected to remain engaged in an ongoing program of scholarship that demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the field of Philosophy over time. All faculty members are expected to produce scholarly achievements that contribute to the discipline, are disseminated to appropriate audiences, and receive favorable review from professional peers prior to dissemination. While priority is given to disciplinary norms, the Department recognizes that a candidate's RSCA may range across the continuum of scholarship described in the University and College RTP policies.

For Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate:

1. The following indicators of scholarly activities are highly valued by the Department of Philosophy in the RTP process:

- A. *Peer-reviewed journal articles and book chapters*
Peer-reviewed authored books or justified equivalent
- B. *Invited original contributions to prominent encyclopedias, scholarly companions, handbooks*
Peer-reviewed conference presentations or justified equivalent

Nothing less than unconditionally accepted manuscripts will be accepted as satisfying A and B. For works not yet in print, a letter from the editor, conference organizers, publishing house, or similar will suffice for proof of acceptance. There shall be no double-counting within categories; e.g., a paper given at multiple peer-reviewed conferences counts only once towards satisfying B, or an article published in different venues or in different languages only counts once towards satisfying A. If two papers or talks differ in either their central thesis or in their lines of argument, then they are distinct. In the case of multiple-authored papers, the candidate must make clear the nature of their participation and contribution to the paper.

The department expects candidates to produce multiple accomplishments in Category A. Ordinarily, multiple accomplishments in Category B are also expected. Multiple accomplishments in both Category A and B is sufficient for tenure and/or promotion. It is typically understood that a single-authored peer-reviewed book will suffice to satisfy the requirements for Category A.

2. The following indicators are optional but may be particularly useful in determining: 1) superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard six-year timeline, which is the standard for early tenure and 2) a record of distinction, necessary in all three areas of evaluation, that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements established in the department and college policies, which is the standard for early promotion. These RSCA products are also inclusive of the continuum of scholarship described in the University and College RTP policies:

- 1. *Non-peer reviewed professional publications (e.g., book chapters, book reviews).*

2. *Edited books*
3. *Textbooks which include original contributions to the scholarship of the discipline*
4. *Invited presentations of scholarship*
5. *Grants: external grants, internal grants, funded institutional grants, training grants*
6. *Scholarship-related awards*
7. *Prestigious visiting research appointments or affiliations*
8. *Non-peer reviewed popular publications on philosophical issues (e.g., op-eds, podcasts and other media, articles/books published outside of traditional academic venues).*

For Promotion to Professor:

The Department of Philosophy expects tenured faculty to maintain an ongoing research program and recognizes the CLA and University policies for guidance.

Documenting peer-review:

The Department of Philosophy expects that most peer-reviewed publications presented in a candidate's file will be documented according to the standards of Section 2.2.3.1(a) of the CLA RTP policy. In addition to the indicators of quality identified in the 2.2.3.1(a), candidates should provide adequate evidence of peer-review. This may include letters from journal or publishing house editors and pursuant to the guidelines of Section 2.2.6.1 of the CLA RTP policy.

Other indicators of RSCA quality may be documented following the suggestions of Sections 2.2.3.1(b-g) in the CLA RSCA policy while subject to Section 2.2.6.2 of the CLA RTP policy.

IV. SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Minimum Service Expectations by Rank:

A. Probationary faculty members in the first three years of appointment typically are expected to focus service activities at the department level.

B. For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, probationary faculty members typically are required to make high-quality service contributions to their department, and to either the college or the university. The Department refers candidates to the CLA RTP document for guidance on valued college and university service, and provides explicit guidelines for departmental service.

C. For promotion to the rank of Professor, successful candidates are expected to have a substantive service record that includes: (1) service at department, college, and university levels; (2) a record of leadership at the University; and (3) a record of service in the community and/or the profession. University leadership may be demonstrated by a record of holding formal offices (e.g., committee chair) and/or of active engagement in faculty governance (e.g., active participation in accreditation or policy-writing processes).

Some Service Activities will overlap between Instructional Activities, and RSCA Activities, but in all cases see CLA RTP policy section 1.1.12 on counting activities in only one area for the purposes of evaluation.

Expectations for Department Service in the Department of Philosophy:

Service is a requirement for all tenured and probationary faculty in the Department of Philosophy. In the interests of an equitable distribution of these responsibilities, the Department of Philosophy hereby adopts the following policy regarding expectations for service in the Department.

1. Each tenured and probationary faculty member is expected to serve on department committees as required service.
2. First-year probationary faculty are required to serve on only one committee, but may volunteer to serve on more, if they wish.
3. Tenured faculty (both associates and full professors) are expected to serve on committees as appropriate to rank and in consultation with the Department Chair. They are expected to demonstrate significant contributions and leadership at both the department and college levels.
4. Probationary faculty in their second through sixth years are expected to serve on at least two department committees.
5. Department committees include (but are not limited to): Graduate, Curriculum, Scholarships and Awards, Advising, Department RTP, Lecturer Evaluations, Assessment, Events, directing the Applied Ethics Forum, SPA Liaison, Hiring, Internship supervision, and Webmaster. Comparable service assignments may also include ad hoc initiatives such as community outreach (including on-campus, and to community colleges and high schools), on-site conference organization, and program recruitment.
6. For faculty on FERP or sabbatical appointments, the obligations shall apply only for those semesters in which they are on active appointment.

V. AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY RTP POLICY

Amendments to this RTP Policy may be initiated by a petition signed by fifteen percent (15%) of the tenured and probationary faculty of the Department. The petition shall be submitted to the Department Chair.

Upon receiving the petition, The Chair shall communicate the proposed amendment(s) to the tenured and probationary faculty, the Faculty Council, and the Dean.

305

306 The Chair shall call for a meeting of the tenured and probationary faculty for discussion of
307 the proposed amendment(s) at least two weeks (14 calendar days) prior to voting.

308 Voting on the amendment(s) shall be by secret ballot by the tenured and probationary
309 faculty. To become effective, all proposed amendments shall require a majority of the
310 ballots cast by eligible voters and be approved by the Faculty Council, the Dean, and the
311 Provost.

312

313 The approved amendment(s) shall go into effect at the beginning of the following academic
314 year.

315