

## **Philosophy Department RPT Elaborations** (updated fall 2012)

Introductory Comment. The following elaborations are submitted to you in behalf of the faculty in our department, for use in your committee's review of Philosophy faculty seeking retention, promotion or tenure. While we have outlined separate criteria for each of the three complex areas of review (teaching, scholarship, and service), it is important to emphasize up front that we see each of these areas as significant elements of an integrated package.

Within this package, we consider teaching the highest priority. We value scholarship for its contribution to teaching as much as for its impact on a professional field of study, and we value service for its positive contribution to the educational mission of the department, to the resource base of the University, and to the community's perceptions of the University as an intellectual resource or partner in learning.

Faculty who are accomplished in their scholarly work must also exhibit serious engagement with the learning-centered priorities of the department. On the other hand, the stronger the evidence for teaching excellence (above and beyond proficiency), the less importance we place on published scholarship, though we still expect to see evidence of consistent scholarly engagement.

With this background, we offer the following elaboration on teaching, scholarship and service.

A. Teaching Proficiency. Our fundamental criteria regarding the evaluation of teaching are as follows:

1. Course preparation (suitability of the readings, assignments, and student learning goals & objectives; understanding of how course fits into curriculum and how it fits student needs; developmental focus of feedback on student work; capacity to adjust pedagogy to meet student needs)

2. Classroom teaching (depth of classroom analysis; evidence of student engagement in philosophical activity, through questioning, thinking for themselves, developing, defending, critiquing positions, drawing out implications, and improving their capacity to navigate a philosophical text; evidence of sufficient student satisfaction, using our department form (see Attachment 1) to provide a developmental focus and applying the IDEA form as a summative measure)

3. Program support (evidence of an instructional commitment to the program and to promoting intellectual and personal growth in our students)

4. Developmental and evaluative assessment of student work (constructive, timely feedback on student work)

5. Fulfillment of responsibilities to students (with emphasis on preparation, punctuality, accessibility to students, responsible coverage of class plan and assigned material, and efforts to promote viable learning experiences for students)

Elements of teaching proficiency should be documented in a teaching portfolio that includes such things as: representative samples of student work (w/faculty comments), student satisfaction ratings (with summative comments from faculty member regarding developmental feedback from the department form and summative feedback from the IDEA form); personal reports from students; classroom observation reports from colleagues; course materials (syllabi, assignments); and a statement articulating teaching goals (including general and specific student learning objectives, the purpose and focus of their courses), with an emphasis on why they are teaching what they teach and what they are trying to accomplish in the process.

B. Scholarship. Our most important criteria for evaluating evidence of consistent scholarly engagement are as follows:

1. We expect our faculty to be engaged in scholarship for the purpose of remaining current in the field, engaged in philosophical activity, and committed to intellectual growth. We recognize three important types of scholarly engagement: written work exhibiting the traditional forms of philosophical analysis and discovery; contributions to the intellectual growth of department colleagues; and professional development or scholarly work with respect to new or existing courses in the curriculum.

2. We value scholarly research and published work that draws on historical and contemporary philosophical traditions.

3. We value creative work developing out of scholarly research.

4. We value evidence of a broad range of scholarly activity: professional development (professional reading, active conference participation); contributions on the department level (contributions to department colloquia and faculty reading seminars, organizing community contacts or service learning opportunities); scholarly activities generating excitement in the classroom; contributions to cross-disciplinary programs and research projects; constructive feedback to colleagues in the profession; and evidence of the integration of scholarly work with teaching and student learning (exhibited through contributions to student learning, and through new approaches, expanded scope or greater vitality in teaching).

5. Evidence of scholarly work is by definition open to review and evaluation by others and shaped by an intention to advance or apply knowledge in the field.

6. In most cases, the department requires a minimum of one published article for every two years of service at CSUS in order to receive tenure and promotion. A candidate applying for tenure during the fifth year would, in this case, typically be required to have two published articles; so would a candidate applying for tenure in the sixth year, since it is possible that an article be published later that year after the review process; a candidate applying for tenure in the seventh year would typically be required to have published three articles. The department reserves the right to judge cases not meeting these criteria, and to take care to assess a candidate's other scholarly activity. If there is evidence of a book nearing publication, for example, this would serve as an adequate substitute for the above requirements.

Articles should be published in either refereed journals or invited collections published in special journal editions or edited volumes on noted academic presses.

7. For promotion from Associate to Professor, the same criteria elaborated in #6 above should typically hold. In addition, the department looks for evidence of intellectual growth or development during this period, either deepening previous areas of research or pursuing new paths of inquiry.

### C. Professional Preparation

The candidate will not be recommended for tenure or promotion without a Ph.D.

D. Service. Our most important criteria for the evaluation of faculty service are as follows:

1. Department support. In this area, we expect and value collegial interaction, contributions in support of the academic program, contributions to curricular development or curricular assessment initiatives, contributions to the growth and vitality of department faculty, and quality student interaction, advising and mentoring.

2. University support. In this area, we expect and value activities that represent our department's interests, contribute to the work of committees and task forces, expand our contacts across disciplines, and otherwise contribute positively to the internal development of the University.

3. Community resource. In this area, we value activities that provide a professional service to constituents in our service area, make the university more visible and respected in the community, and expand our contacts with prospective partners in learning.

4. Professional roles. In this area, we value activities that contribute to professional societies, including service on boards, organizing conference sessions, serving as a referee or guest editor, assisting in the production of professional journal, and establishing and preserving professional contacts that increase the visibility and reputation of the program and enhance opportunities for qualified students desiring advanced philosophical study.

