I. INTRODUCTION

This document is designed in light of, and to be in accordance with, the University Policy Statement (UPS) 210.000 and with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

The Department of Philosophy's Faculty Personnel Standards are intended both (1) to assist faculty in meeting the high level of performance we expect from ourselves and (2) to provide a framework for evaluating probationary faculty for such personnel matters as retention, promotion and granting of tenure.

We intend this document to express standards (1) which satisfy the ideals of philosophy as an academic discipline while being consistent with the best personnel practices of this University and (2) which serve the educational objectives of the Department and the University.

Note: Throughout this document, the word 'shall' indicates mandatory action and the word 'may' indicates permissive action.

II. EVALUATION OF FACULTY ACTIVITIES

A. Areas of Evaluation:
The evaluation of faculty in the Department of Philosophy for retention, tenure and promotion shall be based upon performance in three areas:

1. Teaching
2. Scholarly and Creative Activity
3. Professional, University and Community Service

B. Relative Weights:
In all personnel decisions the Department recognizes that teaching is the most important faculty activity at CSUF and thus shall be the most important criterion for retention, tenure, and promotion.

The Department also recognizes that faculty involvement in scholarly/creative activity is also essential and is thus the second most important criterion for retention, tenure and promotion.

High quality performance in all three areas of evaluation shall be required for retention, tenure and promotion.

The Department expects that individual faculty will vary in the amount of effort invested and the quality of performance achieved in each of the three areas; in the end, it is the overall contribution of each faculty member in meeting the educational objectives of the Department and University which shall be assessed.
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III. THE REVIEW PROCESS

A. Review Cycle:
In accordance with UPS 210.000 and the MOU, all full-time faculty shall undergo professional reviews. Such reviews for all faculty except tenured faculty not seeking promotion are determined by a review cycle which is defined in UPS 210.000 and as specified annually by the President.

B. The Developmental Narrative:
Every new probationary faculty member shall write a Developmental Narrative during the initial year of probationary status. The Developmental Narrative shall describe the faculty member’s plans for meeting department and university standards for retention, tenure and promotion in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. The Developmental Narrative is described in detail in UPS 210.000.

Probationary faculty hired prior to August 17, 2001, who have approved Development Plans, will include the Development Plan in their Portfolios in lieu of a Development Narrative. For faculty who have approved Development Plans, progress towards retention, tenure and promotion will be measured against expectations in UPS 210.000 and the Department Standards.

Before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester, the department chair shall consult with the probationary faculty member concerning appropriate faculty mentors and shall designate one or more tenured faculty members as mentor(s). A primary responsibility of the mentor(s) is to provide guidance, advice, and support to the probationary faculty member during the preparation of the Developmental Narrative.

C. The Portfolio:
The sole basis for RTP evaluations, recommendations, and actions shall be the individual faculty member’s Portfolio.

The nature of the Portfolio and what it must include are described in UPS 210.000.
It is the responsibility of each faculty member to submit a complete Portfolio in a timely manner during each review cycle.

D. Responsibilities of the Department Chair and the Department Personnel Committee:
The responsibilities of the Department Chair in the RTP process are described in detail in UPS 210.000.
The responsibilities of the Department Personnel Committee in the RTP process are described in UPS 210.000.

IV. EVALUATION OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

A. General Guidelines:
In her/his teaching the CSUF faculty member shall establish an environment where
learning is central.

The Department of Philosophy expects that its faculty engage students in philosophical analysis and argumentation, especially on the central issues and problems which have traditionally defined philosophy.

The Department expects its faculty to develop in the student an understanding of the wide range of contributions philosophy has made and can make to human affairs.

A philosophy faculty member must be able to communicate, clearly and coherently, the content of the department's curriculum, in a manner that provides the student with a basis to pursue philosophical endeavors at the appropriate depth.

Good teaching is normally connected with on-going scholarly activity. The Department expects that at least some of an instructor's courses should expose students to the results of her/his own philosophical research.

B. Colloquia Presentations and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Performance:

The primary means by which the Department conducts its peer evaluation of teaching performance is through colloquium presentations. Probationary faculty are required to make an annual formal public presentation of some recent work of hers/his in philosophy to the Department, its faculty and students and other members of the University community who wish to attend. Tenured faculty shall make a colloquium presentation every other year. As is normal in philosophy, the presentation will be followed by open discussion of the issues and merits of the presentation. Each faculty member in attendance shall provide a written evaluation of the presentation addressing issues both of philosophical substance and of pedagogical manner.

C. Student Perceptions of Teaching:

Student opinions of instruction contribute significantly to the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. Student opinion forms soliciting both gradable answers to specific questions and written comments shall be distributed and collected for each class taught within the Department.

D. Self-Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness:

The individual faculty member shall provide a self-assessment of her/his teaching performance. It shall examine all of the issues relevant to the individual's teaching, as well as provide a general indication of the person's teaching philosophy. It shall address any weaknesses in the individual's teaching performance which were discovered and commented upon during previous reviews. The purpose of the self-assessment shall be to provide a personal perspective on the evidence bearing upon one's teaching performance.

E. On-going Professional Development as a Teacher:

Each faculty member shall have an on-going program to maintain and improve her/his teaching, for instance, by participation in pedagogical seminars and workshops, by familiarity with pedagogical literature in philosophy, or by further learning and development in areas in which the individual teaches or intends to teach.

F. Types of Evidence:

The overall evaluation of teaching shall be based upon (but not limited to) the following
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types of evidence.

1. Written peer evaluations of colloquium presentations.
2. Student opinion data, including statistical summaries, derived from
   Departmental student opinion forms, from all classes taught at CSUF in the
   period under review, or from the date of appointment.
4. Statistical summaries of grade distributions from all classes taught at CSUF in
   the period under review.
5. Samples of course materials, including course syllabi, handouts, specially
   prepared teaching materials, paper topics, tests, computer aids, audio-visual
   devices, etc.
6. Letters by students, especially unsolicited letters.
7. Letters from professional colleagues.
8. Reports of class visitations by colleagues, or others.
9. Research related to teaching philosophy.
10. Materials related to curriculum development.
11. Materials related to educational development or research.
12. Documentation of advising and mentoring activities.
13. Documentation of independent study activities.

G. Interpreting Statistical Summaries of Student Opinions:

With respect to the results of student opinion forms, competence in teaching philosophy
shall be defined as having achieved a combined 90% A, B and C response, of which 40% are A
and B responses, to question #15 which relates to the student's overall assessment of the
instructor. Statistical summaries of student responses that exceed this level such that a combined
70% are A and B responses shall be an indication of a high level of competence in teaching
philosophy. The faculty member's self-assessment of teaching effectiveness is also an important
indicator and may be used to draw attention to particular circumstances that should be taken into
account in interpreting the summaries.

H. Peer Evaluation by the Department Chair and the Department Personnel Committee:

In producing an evaluation of a colleague's teaching effectiveness, her/his peers sitting as
chair and members of the department personnel committee shall address themselves to the
following issues:

1. Philosophical ability as displayed in the colloquium
   presentations.
2. Pedagogical approach and methods.
3. The appropriateness of the breadth and depth of course content to the level of
   each course taught; the currency of the topics and relevancy of the
   assignments; and the effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment,
   and grading procedures; the number of different courses taught, the number of
   new preparations assigned to the faculty member, and the characteristics of
   the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional
   pedagogy, etc.), as well as the faculty member's level of experience.
4. Student response to teaching.
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5. Academic standards displayed by the summaries of grades awarded.
6. On-going professional development as a teacher.

V. EVALUATION OF SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

A. General Guidelines:
The Department of Philosophy strongly believes that scholarship complements and enriches teaching, while also contributing to the advancement of the discipline. Philosophical research promotes currency in knowledge, in methodology, and in the spirit of inquiry and may advance the reputation of the University as well as stimulate creative endeavors by students and colleagues. Scholarly activities shall be evaluated in light of these objectives and the mission and goals of the University.

B. Research Program:
Each faculty member in Philosophy shall be committed to continued disciplinary growth and accomplishment, and shall have a well-defined and focused scholarly agenda, which for the probationary faculty member shall be initially described in the Developmental Narrative. This program shall be integrated with teaching and, when possible, shall actively involve students and attract external support.

C. Scholarly Accomplishments:
A successful member of the philosophy department shall establish a record of scholarly endeavor that generates, integrates and/or disseminates knowledge. Such accomplishment is not limited to peer-reviewed publications, but must include peer-reviewed works in recognized philosophical venues (journals, etc.)

D. Self-Assessment of Scholarly Endeavors:
Each faculty member shall place in perspective their scholarly program and productions by means of a self-assessment.

E. On-going Professional Development in the Discipline:
Each faculty member is expected to maintain currency in philosophy by conference participation and/or other interaction with philosophers outside CSUF.

F. Types of Evidence:
The overall evaluation of scholarly activity shall be based upon the following types of evidence:
1. Peer-reviewed publications.
2. Non-peer-reviewed publications in philosophical books and journals.
3. Philosophical publications in non-philosophical venues.
5. Published reviews and commentaries.
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7. Grant applications and funded research.
8. Evidence of presentations at professional conferences.
9. Comments from philosophers and other academics evaluating scholarly contributions.
10. Evidence that scholarly work is being incorporated into teaching.
11. Participation in scholarly activities, such as NEH summer seminars.
12. Awards and honors for scholarship.
13. Citations of published work.

G. Documentation:
Documentation of published work shall be in accordance with UPS 210.000.

H. Departmental Evaluation:
Evaluation shall consider the importance of each achievement - e.g. the status of a journal, press or venue; whether a publication is an article or a note; whether the (expected) audience is regional, national, or international; and the faculty member's contribution in the case of co-authored or other collaborative work. Quantity does not substitute for quality.

VI. PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

A. General Guidelines:
Professional activities generate benefits such as maintenance or advancement of the discipline, the professional development of the faculty member, and improving the on-campus resources available to students. Professional activities shall be evaluated in light of these objectives, and the mission and goals of the University. There may be some overlap between scholarly contributions and professional activities, insofar as professional activities include the entire range of involvement in the scholarly community.

Quality service to the University and the community enables the Department to succeed in its various missions by making it possible for the University to do its work, by contributing to the improvement of the University and, by these and other means, making a contribution to the larger community of which the University is a part.

B. Professional Activities:
All philosophy faculty are expected to take a continuous and active role in addressing the needs of the profession. This shall include participation in professional or academic organizations.

C. Types of Evidence of Professional Activities:
The overall assessment of professional activities, as part of the larger service category, shall be based upon the following types of evidence:
1. Self-assessment of professional activities.
2. Involvement in professional organizations.
3. Presentations at professional conferences or other forums.
4. Organizing meetings or other professional forums, such as the annual
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Department of Philosophy Symposium.
5. Attendance at local, regional, or national meetings.
6. Offices held in professional associations.
7. Honors and awards.
8. Service on an editorial board or as an editor.
9. Service as a referee or reviewer for professional publications, textbook
    publishers, or granting agencies.
10. Consulting activities in one's field of expertise.
11. Professional development or continued education, such as post-doctoral
    activities.

D. Service to the University and Community:
All CSUF philosophy faculty are expected to take a continuous and active role in the
governance of the University, which shall include the Department of Philosophy, the School of
Humanities and Social Science, and the University generally.
While encouraged to do so, philosophy faculty may or may not be directly involved in
forms of professional service to the larger community depending upon the nature of their
intellectual expertise and occasions for its utilization.

E. Types of Evidence of Service to University and Community.
The overall evaluation of service to the University and to the community shall be based
upon the following types of evidence:
1. Self-assessment of service to the University and community.
2. Participation in governance and committee responsibilities for the department,
school, or University.
3. Service in organizing or conducting department, school, or University
    functions and activities, such as the department's Annual Symposium.
4. Sponsoring or advising student organizations, such as the Philosophy Club.
5. Serving on systemwide committees.
6. Serving the faculty bargaining unit.
7. Participating in educational equity and outreach efforts.
8. Lectures to community groups.
9. Participation in community activities and functions.
10. Other types of community service not mentioned above.
11. Being interviewed by the media.
12. Authoring publications pertinent to the university's objectives.

F. Peer Evaluation of Service Activities by the Department Chair and the Department
Personnel Committee:
Peer evaluation of an individual faculty member's service to the profession, the
University and the community shall assess the quality and the significance of the service
activities engaged in by the individual.
There shall be documentation by the faculty member of her/his participation in service
activities.
VII. IMPLEMENTATION STANDARDS

A. Retention:
   During probationary years, retention is contingent upon a record of acceptable
   performance, particularly in the areas of teaching and scholarly and creative activities. Areas of
   weakness previously identified should be adequately resolved. In the end, the faculty member's
   potential for tenure shall be considered.
   
   For more on requirements for retention, see UPS 210.000.

B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
   An earned doctorate, or its equivalent, from an accredited institution is required for
   tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.
   
   The granting of tenure (and promotion to Associate Professor) requires a more rigorous
   application of the criteria than retention because tenure is the single most important personnel
   decision made at the University. For the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate
   Professor, it is expected that the faculty member's teaching and scholarly performance shall be at
   or exceed the Departmental standard of a high level of level of competence, and that one's
   performance in the area of Professional Activity and University Service demonstrate active and
   sustained involvement as demonstrated by the types of evidence listed above.
   
   For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, performance during the time at the
   present rank shall be weighed more heavily than earlier performance.
   
   For more on requirements for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, see UPS
   210.000.

C. Requirements for Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:
   Early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires evidence in all areas
   commensurate with the normal requirements for full-term tenure. In addition, early tenure and
   promotion requires evidence of at least one of the following:
   1. Superior teaching performance;
   2. Superior scholarly and creative activities; or
   3. Performance in both teaching and scholarship that exceeds the requirements
      for full-term tenure.
   
   For more on requirements for early tenure and promotion, see UPS 210.000.

D. Promotion to Full Professor:
   Promotion to Full Professor shall require evidence of continuing acceptable performance
   in all areas and shall require evidence of continuing scholarly and creative activity that meets the
   Departmental standard of a high level of competence and professional qualifications.
   
   For more on requirements for promotion to Full Professor, see UPS 210.000.

E. Early Promotion to Full Professor:
   Early promotion to Full Professor requires evidence in all areas commensurate with the
   normal requirements for full-term promotion. In addition, early promotion to Full Professor
   requires evidence of at least one of the following:
   1. Superior teaching performance;
   2. Superior scholarly and creative activities; or
3. Performance in both teaching and scholarship that exceeds the requirements for full-term promotion. For more on requirements for early promotion to Full Professor, see UPS 210.000.

VIII. EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

A. General Guidelines:
   In accordance with UPS 210.020 and the MOU, every tenured faculty shall submit a file for post-tenure review according to the timelines established by the Department and University policy. The purpose of the review shall be to encourage and maintain a high level of competence in University assignments, and to provide consultation with colleagues on how to maintain currency and professional performance. Currency in the field shall be assessed in terms of teaching, scholarship, and profession activities. Tenured faculty members shall not be reviewed while on sabbatical or leave-of-absence.

B. Types of Evidence:
   (a) Evidence of teaching and professional performance, and currency in the field for post-tenure review shall include:
      1. Self-assessment of teaching performance, scholarly and creative activities and professional, university and community service.
      2. Student opinion data.
      3. Statistical summaries of all student opinion forms.
      4. Statistical summaries of grade distributions since last review.
      5. When available, written colloquia evaluations.
   (b) When available, the following types of evidence may also be submitted:
      6. Research related to teaching the discipline.
      7. Documentation of advising and mentoring activities.
      8. Peer-reviewed publications.
      9. Non-peer-reviewed professional publications.
      11. Published reviews and commentaries.
      12. Grant applications and funded research.
      13. Evidence of presentations at professional meetings.
      14. Evidence of continued scholarly and professional development.
      15. Evidence of involvement in professional organizations.
      16. Attendance at local, regional, and national meetings.
      17. Offices held in professional associations.
      18. Honors and awards.
      19. Consulting and other professional activities.