

PERSONNEL POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND CRITERIA
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
2023-24

**I. The Personnel Process for Tenure-track and Temporary Members of the Philosophy Department:
An Overview**

1. Candidates are subject to a “Periodic Evaluation,” a “Performance Review,” or a “RangeElevation” Review. A **Performance Review for Tenure-track faculty** contains a Recommendation for or against retention, tenure, or promotion. A **Periodic Evaluation** contains no recommendation. It is intended to help the candidate improve so that they may have a positive Performance Review when it is time for one. A **Range Elevation Review** contains a Recommendation for or against range elevation.
2. Within the department the reviews are conducted by the Department Personnel Committee and by the Department Chair, who has the option of serving as a member of the Personnel Committee and not having a separate level of review or writing a separate report. The levels of review beyond the department include, in order, the College Personnel Committee, the College Dean, and the University Provost. (The procedure followed by the department is set forth below.)

II. Department Procedure

1. Each spring the department shall select a **Personnel Committee** whose function is to make scheduled Periodic Evaluations, Performance Reviews, and Range Elevation Reviews. In the Philosophy Department, the Personnel Committee also ranks lecturers, where required by university policy. The committee shall consist of three eligible members of the faculty, preferably but not necessarily from within the department. The selection process is set by university policy and the department constitution. Eligibility requirements are set by university policy. The department chair can elect to serve as one of the three members of the committee, and if they do so, the department shall select only two other faculty members to complete the committee.
2. The committee shall select a committee chair, whose function shall be to coordinate committee business.
3. As early as possible in September, the committee and the candidate shall be furnished with a schedule of pertinent deadlines for reviews to be conducted during the academic year.
4. The committee shall help arrange for one or more members to observe a session of a face-to-face or online course taught by each candidate. The candidate, in consultation with the committee, shall determine which course they want to have evaluated, what counts as a "session" of an online course, and what materials to provide to the committee for evaluation. This observation should be done **well in advance** of the due date for the candidate’s file, and the candidate should be contacted as early in the

semester as possible to set up the observation. Each candidate shall have at least one class observed during the period of review. The observer shall write a report for inclusion in the candidate's RTP dossier (explained below in number nine). The report shall be both descriptive and evaluative.

5. The candidate has the option of arranging for other faculty members, in the department or outside of it, to observe and report on a class. The candidate may also request whom, from the department's Personnel committee, they prefer to do the observation. The person doing the observation should also make a reasonable effort to observe whichever particular class and section is preferred by the candidate. At their option, the department chair may also observe a class taught by a candidate, and write an observation report, following the same guidelines.
6. Within a couple weeks of the observation, the committee member who did the observation writes a report of the class and circulates it to the other members of the Personnel committee and the candidate. This circulation should be done well in advance of the due date for the candidate to turn in their file. Other Personnel committee members and the candidate may give feedback on the observation and may make changes for accuracy.
7. The final draft of the observation goes to the Personnel committee member writing the RTP report. To help correct for possible bias as well as to provide more information to the person being reviewed, if possible, the Personnel committee member writing the report should be a different committee member from the one who conducted the classroom observation.
8. The classroom observation report is circulated to all committee members for feedback before it is finalized and sent to the department ASC for formatting.
9. By the deadline in the schedule, the candidate shall submit an updated "**RTP dossier.**" The RTP dossier, also called the "**Working Personnel Action File**" (**WPAF**) is a binder provided by the college office that contains specific instructions about the documents required in the dossier. The candidate shall follow these instructions in completing the RTP dossier. However, the "Narrative" (section III of the RTP Dossier) shall be expanded to include a brief discussion of the candidate's record in the category of Other Contributions to the University and Community, designed to assist reviewers in evaluating their service record.
10. The candidate shall also submit a supplemental binder, to be kept in the department office during the period of review, with supplementary support material. Candidates may include whatever material they think will help reviewers appraise their record, but the evidentiary material that reviewers must consider is listed below, and candidates should include this material in the second binder.
11. Based on (a) the contents of the dossier and supplemental binders, (b) the class observation report mentioned above, and (c) other material in the candidate's "**Personal Action File**" (kept in the college office), and using criteria set forth below, the committee shall compose a draft **Periodic Evaluation Report**, draft **Performance**

Review Report/Recommendation, or draft Range Elevation Review Report/Recommendation.

12. The committee will interview the candidate, with the department chair present at their option, using the draft Report/Recommendation mentioned in the preceding item as the basis for the interview. The purpose of the interview shall be to enable the committee to revise the Report/Recommendation so that it will be completely accurate and fully reflect the candidate's record. The committee shall provide the candidate with a copy of the draft report/recommendation prior to the interview.
13. After the interview, the committee will issue a final report/recommendation to the department chair, unless they are functioning as a member of the committee. If the chair is functioning as a member of the committee, the report/recommendation will be sent to the College Committee; if the department chair has not chosen to be a member of the committee, they shall write a separate report/recommendation and forward both it and the committee's report/recommendation to the College Committee.
14. The candidate shall have whatever rights of review are set forth in university policy.

III. General Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

1. In Periodic Evaluations and Performance Reviews of Tenure-track faculty the candidate is considered in three areas:
 - (a) **Instruction** (also referred to in various documents as "Teaching Effectiveness"),
 - (b) **Professional Growth and Achievement**, and
 - (c) **Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plan and Goals of the Department, College, University, and to the Community.**

In a Performance Review, the candidate's record in each of these three areas is rated in the Report/Recommendation that accompanies the review as either "Exceeds expectations," "Meets expectations," or "Does not meet expectations." These terms are explained below. The ratings determine whether or not the candidate is recommended for retention, tenure, or promotion.

2. **Ratings are defined developmentally**, meaning that they are relative to the candidate's stage of employment and review. So for a candidate to receive a "Meets expectations" rating in a second year performance review does not require as high a level of accomplishment as would be required for a "Meets expectations" rating in a fourth year review. Ratings for the second and fourth year performance reviews will be determined by estimating a candidate's progress toward what would normally be expected for the candidate's tenure and promotion review.
3. To receive a recommendation for **retention**, a candidate normally must receive a "Meets expectations" rating in at least two of the three rated areas of evaluation.
4. To receive a recommendation for **promotion**, a candidate normally must receive a "Meets expectations" rating in all three of the rated areas of evaluation.
5. To receive a recommendation for **tenure**, a candidate normally must receive a "Meets

expectations” in all three of the rated areas of evaluation.

6. To be recommended for **early tenure or early promotion**, a candidate must be rated as “Exceeds expectations” in all three rated areas.

IV. General Criteria for Range Elevations

1. Elevation to the range of Lecturer B or above requires an M.A. or other relevant degree beyond a Bachelor's. Graduate work considered "ABD" may also be sufficient.
2. Candidates shall submit an application along with a Working Personnel Action File. The application shall consist of a written letter clearly stating the applicant’s request, a complete vita, and a description of the nature of their professional growth since the initial appointment or last range elevation, whichever is more recent.
3. Temporary faculty will be rated in the following two areas:
 - (i) Teaching excellence (“Instruction” below), and
 - (ii) Maintaining currency in the fieldIn each of these two areas the candidate's record is rated in the Report/Recommendation that accompanies the Range Elevation Review as “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory”. These terms are explained in V and VIII below. To receive a recommendation for range elevation, a candidate choosing this option must receive a "Satisfactory" rating in both rated areas of evaluation.

V. Specific criteria for ratings: Instruction

1. Ratings shall be based on evidence in the following categories: narrative from “RTP Dossier”; observation reports; student evaluations; course materials including syllabi, supplements, representative exams, papers, or other assessment instruments together with representative grade records and comments to students; documentation of teaching-related research or study; documentation of participation in seminars, conferences, institutes, or workshops on teaching; documentation of teaching-related prizes, awards, grants, or other forms of recognition; and other evidence the candidate thinks will be useful to the committee in evaluating the candidate’s record. In general, the candidate should provide evidence that makes their pedagogical objectives clear and demonstrates the extent to which they achieve these objectives, and offer plans for revising pedagogical strategies if the objectives are not met.
2. Items counted under “Instruction” shall not be counted under other areas of review.
3. Observation reports by members of the committee shall carry more weight than reports by others; observation reports by members of the department faculty shall carry more weight than reports by faculty members outside the department or by others, or by student evaluations.
4. The committee shall rate the candidate in the light of difficulty of course material, number of new preparations, number of students, and area of expertise.

5. An **“Exceeds expectations”** rating in this category shall reflect consummate professionalism and an unambiguous and consistent record of exceptional skill as an educator, for the relevant stage of review. To illustrate,
 - a) A candidate for tenure or promotion who was as effective as any other faculty in the department would receive “Exceeds expectations” for a tenure or promotion review.
 - b) A candidate in a fourth year review who would receive “Meets expectations” for tenure or promotion would receive “Exceeds expectations”.
 - c) A candidate in a second year review who would receive “Meets expectations” for a fourth year review or higher would receive “Exceeds expectations” for that second year review.

6. A **“Meets expectations”** rating shall reflect substantial professionalism and competence as an educator, for the relevant stage of review. Only a minor degree of unevenness in the evidentiary record is consistent with a designation at this level. A candidate at any stage of review who was as effective as most other faculty at an equivalent stage of review would receive “Meets expectations”.

7. A **“Does not meet expectations”** rating is appropriate when the evidence does not demonstrate at least an adequate level of professionalism and competence.

8. A **“Satisfactory”** rating for lecturers shall reflect substantial professionalism and competence as an educator. Only a minor degree of unevenness in the evidentiary record is consistent with a designation at this level. A candidate who was as effective as most other faculty would receive a rating of “Satisfactory”.

9. An **“Unsatisfactory”** rating for lecturers is appropriate when the evidence does not demonstrate at least an adequate level of professionalism and competence for the relevant stage of review.

10. For the purposes of range elevation, teaching excellence will be evaluated using the same criteria as evaluating whether a tenure track faculty member receives “Exceeds expectations”.

VI. Specific Criteria for ratings: Professional Growth and Achievement for tenure-track faculty

1. Ratings shall be based on the following categories of evidence: Publications; citations in other scholarly work; documentation of scholarly presentations at academic gatherings or to the general public; documentation of editorial work; documentation of scholarship-related prizes, awards, and other honors, including grants and fellowships; documentation of activity in professional organizations and of membership on boards; documentation of participation in conferences, seminars, workshops, and institutes; documentation of service on committees of professional organizations; documentation of professional consultations, including commissioned book reviews;; and other evidence the candidate thinks will be useful to the committee in evaluating their professional record.

2. Items counted under “Professional Growth and Achievement” shall not be

counted under other areas of review.

3. Merit of each item shall be evaluated with respect to both quality and relative weight. For example, a presentation to a campus group would carry less weight than a paper published in a professional journal.
4. An “**Exceeds expectations**” rating reflects consummate professionalism and significant scholarly achievement, for the relevant stage of review. To illustrate,
 - a. A candidate for tenure or promotion who has written a scholarly book published by a university press, or two articles published in such premier journals as Mind, Synthese, or Ethics or the equivalent, would more than qualify.
 - b. A candidate in a fourth year of review who had already met the expectations for tenure and promotion below would qualify as exceeding expectations in the fourth year of review.
5. A “**Meets expectations**” rating reflects substantial significant scholarly achievement for the relevant stage of review. To illustrate,
 - a. A candidate for tenure or promotion would qualify if they have published two articles published in reputable, non-premier but refereed journals, and have presented at an APA conference or other outside scholarly venue. No record that does not include at least two refereed or invited publications in a philosophical venue can qualify as “Meets expectations” at the stage of tenure or promotion.
 - b. A candidate in the second year of review who has submitted one article to a refereed journal and is working on a second would qualify as “Meets expectations”.
6. A “**Does not meet expectations**” rating reflects insignificant or insubstantial scholarly achievement for the relevant stage of review. To illustrate,
 - a. A candidate for tenure or promotion who has only written publications in non-refereed, popular, or obscure journals would qualify as “insignificant” scholarly achievement for that stage of review, even if there are many such publications. Having only one refereed or invited publication in a philosophical venue would qualify as “insubstantial”.
 - b. A candidate in the fourth year of review who has not yet submitted an article for publication or presented at a refereed conference such as the APA conferences would qualify as “Does not meet expectations”, even if the candidate has a number of articles drafted.
4. In view of their prestigious nature, papers accepted for the main program at an APA division meeting will be accepted as equal in weight to articles published in a secondary refereed scholarly philosophy journal.
5. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide the committee with any additional information about professional accomplishments that they think the Committee should consider. For example, additional information might include published reviews, support letters from experts or from an anthology editor, and journal acceptance rates.

VII. Specific Criteria for ratings: Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plan and Goals of the Department, College, University, and to the Community

1. Ratings shall be based on the following categories of evidence, if documented: participation in a university, college, or department committee; administrative assignment including department chair, directing the Humanities Center; coordinating the critical thinking program or an upper division pathway or similar entity; advising students, student organizations, honors projects, and internships; and mentoring faculty.
2. Relevant evidence shall also include, if documented, participation in conferences, workshops, forums, panels, and debates; community service; and other evidence the candidate thinks will be useful to the committee in evaluating their record.
3. Items counted under “Other Contributions to the University or Community” shall not be counted under other areas of review
4. A rating of “**Exceeds expectations**” reflects a continuous and consistently high level of involvement in categories listed above, for the relevant stage of review. High level is demonstrated by leadership roles, creation of new programs, and other high profile and labor intensive activities.
5. A rating of “**Meets expectations**” reflects continuous and consistent involvement, for the relevant stage of review. For instance,
 - A candidate for tenure and promotion would be expected to have served in a significant capacity in more than one of the areas or activities listed above, with identifiable roles and contributions. Such activities should be evident in most of the years under review, though not necessarily every year.
 - Further, the department regards faculty involvement in department affairs as essential to the vitality of the department. A minimum threshold for a “Meets expectations” rating in this category is regular attendance at department meetings and functions, including visits and presentations by guests of the department and student clubs and by candidates for positions, as well as student club meetings where appropriate; and participating in department discussions.
6. A rating of “**Does not meet expectations**” reflects a service record that is insubstantial and/or sporadic.

VIII. Specific Criteria for ratings: Currency in the field for range elevations of temporary faculty.

1. Currency in the field ratings must be appropriate to the instructional assignment, including likely future assignments. Significantly more weight will be given if there is evidence that the currency has been incorporated into instruction in ways that have

improved it.

2. Evidence of currency can be through syllabi from courses taught in the last 2-5 years, exams, paper assignments, lecture notes, student work, peer evaluations, summaries of student evaluations for the last five years, student letters, or other means.
3. Merit of each item shall be evaluated with respect to both quality and relative weight. For example, including a more recent edition of a textbook would carry less weight than including a recently published scholarly article in a syllabus, or using instructional techniques discussed in recent journals or conferences (including local CSUC trainings).
4. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide the committee with any additional information and documentation about currency in the field that they think the Committee should consider

IX. Search Policies and Procedures - Tenure Track Searches

1. All tenured and probationary faculty in the Department shall constitute the Search Committee for a tenure-track hire.
2. The AOS and AOC for a tenure-track hire must be approved by a majority of the Search Committee.
3. The Search Committee shall elect a Search Subcommittee consisting of three members of the department, plus the Department Chair. The Search Subcommittee is tasked with completing the position description, selecting and interviewing first-round candidates, and the basic operations of the search.
4. The Search Subcommittee shall recommend to the Department Search Committee a list of candidates for on-campus visits, which the Search Committee may approve or reject. The Search Subcommittee shall also recommend to the Department Search Committee a ranking of finalists for the Authorization to Extend an Offer, which the Search Committee may approve or reject.
5. The recommendations for on-campus visits and the ranking of finalists for the Authorization to Extend an Offer must be approved by a majority of the members of the Search Committee.
6. The Search Subcommittee shall elect a chair by majority vote. The Subcommittee chair will call meetings, and work with the Department Chair to ensure the Subcommittee follows administrative policy and law.
7. The Search Subcommittee shall elect a secretary to take notes. The secretary shall distribute the notes to all Subcommittee members, and deliver a copy to the department's Administrative Support Coordinator to put in a permanent file. Notes shall only include the date, attendance, agenda, and any votes or decisions, not discussion.

8. Decisions of the Search Subcommittee shall be determined by a majority vote. Ties shall be decided by the Department Chair.



Department/Program Standards Approval Sheet

Process:


- a) Department or program votes; if approved, Department Chair/Director submits to College Dean for review.
- b) College Dean reviews, consults with Department Chair/Director regarding questions/ issues, then forwards Dean reviewed Word document to Faculty Affairs and Success via email for review.
- c) Faculty Affairs and Success reviews for compliance with CBA/FPPP, consults with the Dean and Department Chair/Director as needed, then forwards Department/Program Standards to Provost for review and approval;
- d) Provost reviews and approves, recommending changes if necessary, then returns document to Faculty Affairs and Success.
- e) If not approved, Faculty Affairs and Success forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission to Dean and Department Chair/Director.
- f) If approved, Faculty Affairs and Success adds *Provost Designee Approved Date* footer to the document and:
 - a. Routes this approval sheet with approved Department/Program Standards for signatures via Adobe Sign,
 - b. Uploads document to Faculty Affairs and Success Standards website, and
 - c. Informs Dean and Department Chair/Director of approval with link to Faculty Affairs and Success website location.

Chair/Director Approval: 
Zanja Yudell (Apr 16, 2024 14:23 PDT)

Date: Apr 16, 2024

Dean Review: 

Date: May 2, 2024

Provost/Designee Approval: 

Date: May 6, 2024