

California State University Long Beach

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS**

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

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.

I. RESPONSIBILITIES

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.

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.

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

49

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

64

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

67

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

82

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

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

89

90 **II. INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES**

91 Faculty members are expected to provide effective instruction in their discipline.

92 Consistent with University-level and College-level RTP policies, the Department of
93 Philosophy recognizes that effective instruction occurs both inside and outside the
94 traditional classroom setting.

95

96 For All Levels of Evaluation:

97

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

102

103 1. *Effective instructional strategies as illustrated by:*

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

112

113 2. *Effective use of assessment techniques as evidenced by:*

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

117

118 3. *Active engagement in items such as:*

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

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

134
135 B. The following indicators are optional but may be particularly useful in determining: (1)
136 superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the
137 standard six-year timeline, which is the standard for early tenure and (2) a record of
138 distinction, necessary in all three areas of evaluation, that clearly exceeds in substantial
139 ways the requirements established in the department and college policies, which is the
140 standard for early promotion.

141
142 1. *Written comments on student course evaluations*
143 2. *Letters regarding instruction submitted during the “open period.” (Note: all signed
144 letters received during the open period shall be placed in the candidate’s file.)*
145 3. *Teaching awards*
146 4. *Innovations in teaching* (e.g., *service learning, team learning, novel use of
147 technology*)
148 5. *Creation of new courses, programs, or other substantial curriculum development*
149 6. *Student accomplishments* (e.g., *awards, presentations, graduate school
150 admissions*) *directly related to work supervised*
151 7. *Publications, such as articles or books that are primarily concerned with
152 pedagogy, or textbooks. (if not counting as RSCA; see CLA RTP section 1.1.12 on
153 counting activities in only one area)*

154
155 The Department also recognizes that some contributions that satisfy II.B.7 above might
156 overlap in various ways with the RSCA categories described in section III. In such cases,
157 candidates are expected to state and provide a rationale for what proportion of such
158 contributions should be counted toward each of Instructional Activities and RSCA.

159
160 C. The following may be used in evaluating the quality of the instructional and
161 instructionally-related activities listed above. The Department of Philosophy does not make
162 any a priori judgments about the value of each of the following. Candidates may address
163 any of the following that are helpful in making the best case for their file.

164
165 1. *Level of courses taught (100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600)*
166 2. *Size of classes taught*
167 3. *Intensity of writing in courses*
168 4. *Number of new preparations during period of review*
169 5. *Number of different courses taught during period of review*
170 6. *Peer-evaluations shall be conducted only at the request of the candidate*

171
172 **III. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA)**

173 Faculty members are expected to remain engaged in an ongoing program of scholarship
174 that demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the field of Philosophy over time.
175 All faculty members are expected to produce scholarly achievements that contribute to the
176 discipline, are disseminated to appropriate audiences, and receive favorable review from
177 professional peers prior to dissemination. While priority is given to disciplinary norms, the
178 Department recognizes that a candidate's RSCA may range across the continuum of
179 scholarship described in the University and College RTP policies.
180

181 For Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate:

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

184 A. *Peer-reviewed journal articles and book chapters*
185 *Peer-reviewed authored books or justified equivalent*

186 B. *Invited original contributions to prominent encyclopedias, scholarly*
187 *companions, handbooks*
188 *Peer-reviewed conference presentations or justified equivalent*

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

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

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

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

217 2. *Edited books*
218 3. *Textbooks which include original contributions to the scholarship of the discipline*
219 4. *Invited presentations of scholarship*
220 5. *Grants: external grants, internal grants, funded institutional grants, training grants*
221 6. *Scholarship-related awards*
222 7. *Prestigious visiting research appointments or affiliations*
223 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).*

227 **For Promotion to Professor:**

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

231 **Documenting peer-review:**

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

239 Other indicators of RSCA quality may be documented following the suggestions of Sections
240 2.2.3.1(b-g) in the CLA RSCA policy while subject to Section 2.2.6.2 of the CLA RTP policy.

242 **IV. SERVICE ACTIVITIES**

244 Minimum Service Expectations by Rank:

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

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

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

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

264

265 **Expectations for Department Service in the Department of Philosophy:**

266

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

271

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

291

292 **V. AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY RTP POLICY**

293

294 Amendments to this RTP Policy may be initiated by a petition signed by fifteen percent
295 (15%) of the tenured and probationary faculty of the Department. The petition shall be
296 submitted to the Department Chair.

297

298 Upon receiving the petition, The Chair shall communicate the proposed amendment(s) to
299 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