GOOD PRACTICES FOR IMPROVING REPRESENTATION IN PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENTS

In line with the [APA Strategic Plan's Objective](#) to make the discipline "more inclusive, welcoming, and accessible" and supporting their effort to regularly "review, update, promote, and add to existing guidance and best practices to support diversity, equity, and inclusion throughout the discipline" the Demographics in Philosophy project proposes the following guidelines in inclusion with influence to promote, within the philosophical community, practices that will, if adopted, create a more welcoming and inclusive environment for all - including women, people of color, disabled people, non-native English speakers, first-generation college students, those with serious economic needs or from developing countries, LBGTQ+ people, and people with political or religious views that are under-represented in the discipline, amongst others. We hope these suggestions will act as a starting point for improving the conditions for everyone in our discipline. The following guidelines promote equal opportunities for under-represented groups in philosophy and support and encourage academic excellence of all kinds.

Click here for the **ADOPTION OF GOOD PRACTICE POLICIES: PROCEDURE.**

GUIDELINES:
- **HIRING, RETENTION, AND PROMOTION**
- **TEACHING**
- **HARASSMENT AND ACADEMIC STAFF-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS**
- **CAREGIVERS**
- **RESEARCH PROJECTS 2**
- **LEARNED SOCIETIES**
- **JOURNALS**

ADOPTION OF GOOD PRACTICES: PROCEDURE[1]

Where a department or organization adopts a particular Good Practice, the Head of Department or chair of a learned society, lead journal editor, etc. is requested to:
(a) formally document the adoption in the minutes of the meeting at which the decision is taken
(b) inform the Good Practices Secretariat (GPS) via the form at this link **(https://forms.gle/pEaNSiWzfpQJDcpx5)**, so that a list of subscribing departments (learned societies, journals) is publicly available on the Good Practices's website.

We recognize that some of the recommended policies are impractical in some contexts and controversial among those who agree with the overall spirit of this document. **Being formally recognized as a signatory on the Good Practices website does not require agreeing with every point in the document, as long as disagreement is adequately explained** to the Good Practices Secretariat. We recognize that there is substantial legitimate diversity of opinion about policies of the sort described. We hope that the process of considering these guidelines will lead to fruitful discussion and progress toward better implementation of equity and diversity goals. Nothing in the document should be interpreted as taking precedence over applicable legal requirements.

WHAT COUNTS AS 'ADOPTING' A GOOD PRACTICE?

1. The recommendations vary in their degree of specificity and are open to different interpretations. In some cases, there is considerable flexibility in how the recommendation might be implemented. Where suggested courses of action are especially controversial or difficult to implement, the practice is only to *consider* a possible course of action. In such cases, adherence to this document requires only careful consideration of the advisability or feasibility of the practice.

2. Departments that *commit* to making a plan within a year will secure "commitment" status on the Good Practices Scheme. Departments will move to "adoption" status when the department alerts the Good Practices Secretariat that the plan has been created. Simply *deciding* to implement the recommendations does **not** constitute *adoption* of the relevant Good Practice. There must be a clear plan for actual implementation, including a timetable and specification of particular courses of action that will be taken (e.g., revising handbooks, adding training sessions, or assigning a particular role to a member of staff, etc. The department should deem itself to have 'adopted' the relevant practice only at the point where a clear plan has been drawn up. This must include a timetable for implementation (e.g., where information in student handbooks cannot be altered until the start of the next academic year).

---

[1] The passages of this section are taken from the BPA/SWIP Good Practice Policy General Guidance available at: https://bpa.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/General-guidance.pdf

3. We recommend that, where a department wishes to adopt a Good Practice in the sense described above, the department head takes the bullet-pointed list of recommendations and supplements each bullet point with a clear list of changes or activities that the department intends to carry out in order to implement the recommendation, together with a clear timetable for completion. (The Good Practice documents are also available as Word documents from the website and we include a checklist to help facilitate this.) They may, of course, wish to delegate this task to the chair of a sub-committee – perhaps involving student and TA representatives. The resulting document should be approved at a departmental meeting and made available to all relevant people (including administrative staff and teaching assistants where appropriate), so that it is easy to check whether the department has kept to its timetable and, thereafter, is continuing to adhere to its own policy.

4. Once everything on the timetable has been implemented, provisions should be made for an annual review to ensure that the implemented policies remain in place and have not intentionally or unintentionally lapsed. This could take the form of a standing item on a departmental meeting agenda once a year, for example.

5. We appreciate that not all groupings of philosophers have any formal status (as a 'department' or 'discipline area' etc.), and that departments are bound by their own institutions' existing policies and procedures. Hence there may be some recommendations that a particular department or group lacks the power either (a) to formally endorse or (b) to implement. In such cases, the group in question will be deemed to subscribe to the practice if (re (a)) it has ensured that the practice adopted is known and informally agreed upon by all members of the group, or (re (b)) it has adopted as many of the Good Practice recommendations as it reasonably can, given any impediments posed by its lack of formal status.

6. We recognize that larger interdisciplinary units sometimes contain groupings of philosophers. Either the grouping of the philosophers alone (in so far as this is possible for a non-departmental group; see (5) above) or the entire interdisciplinary unit can decide to adopt the policies. In either case, it should be made clear in all documentation.

7. In implementing these guidelines, special care should be taken not to overburden faculty, staff, or students from underrepresented groups, and they should not be compelled to speak as token representatives for the groups to which they are perceived as belonging.

8. The Good Practice Secretariat has no formal investigation or enforcement powers. Implementation is assumed to be a good-faith effort.

A NOTE ON DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

Many of the recommendations involve informing relevant people about policies, procedures, etc. Wherever possible, the information should be easily accessible, and the relevant people should be directly notified via an appropriate medium. We request that departments think carefully about how the relevant information is transmitted to colleagues, students, staff, and other stakeholders. In general, including information in staff, student and teaching assistant handbooks is desirable but not sufficient. In the case of learned societies, some information will need to be transmitted to applicants for conference funding and to conference organizers.

GOOD PRACTICE POLICY: HIRING, RETENTION, AND PROMOTION[2]

1. Departments should ensure that members of hiring panels
    a. are aware of the federal, state, and university-level laws and policies governing affirmative action and discrimination in hiring and promotion,
    b. abide by those laws and policies,
    c. know about the workings of bias.

2. Diversify hiring and tenure committees to include more people from under-represented groups. For example:
    a. Appoint a diversity officer who will be responsible for ensuring each applicant is reviewed equitably. This person should have a clearly defined role that empowers them to intervene and sets out a clear procedure for addressing any issues they identify. Where possible, this person should have expertise on these issues and should make use of available training.
    b. Ensure that hiring panels (at both shortlisting and interview stages) include at least one, and preferably more than one, member of an under-represented group, unless there are exceptional practical reasons why this is impossible. But they should be aware that the presence of under-represented groups on the panel on its own will not correct for bias.
    c. Commit to inclusion with influence - members of under-represented groups should not function merely as tokens but have due influence on decision-making, including in leadership positions. However, also be cautious about creating disproportionate burdens on members of under-represented groups and offer appropriate remuneration and recognition.
    d. Departments should strive to allow sufficient time for non-rushed consideration of job applications.
    e. Evaluate whether it is feasible and desirable to anonymize parts of their hiring process (e.g., by considering anonymized CVs, cover letters, and/or writing samples).

3. When evaluating department needs, consider what constitutes a "well-rounded" department, whether it might include topics, approaches, interests, and philosophical traditions that have been neglected but deserve representation.

---

[2] Passages on faculty recruitment, in this section, are adapted from the APA Blog on Diversity and Equity in Recruitment (available at:
https://blog.apaonline.org/2021/06/07/diversity-and-equity-in-recruitment/
as well as the Gender Bias section of the *BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme)*. Many passages on faculty tenure, in this section, are adapted from the *Good Tenure Evaluation in Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators: A Joint Project of The American Council on Education, The American Association of University Professors, and United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group* (available at:
https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/Good%20Practice%20in%20Tenure%20Evaluation.pdf).

     a. Recognize that references to specialized areas of philosophy that emphasize diversity (e.g., LGBTQ philosophy, philosophy of race, philosophy of disability) as "fringe/peripheral philosophy," "not real philosophy," and the like are stigmatizing to members of those groups. If your department is unfamiliar with a desired research area, reach out to experts in other philosophy departments, or in other disciplines, for feedback on assessing candidates. (the APA's <u>UP-Directory</u> can be a valuable resource in this regard.)

     b. Attend to your regional context as well as the overall global context (e.g., the importance of including adequate geographical and indigenous representation in your department).

4. Hire faculty using approaches and evaluation methods that encourage and appropriately value applicants who would contribute to your department's diversity.

     a. When feasible, advertise positions in areas likely to attract a wide diversity of applicants.

     b. When feasible, include language in the job description signaling interest in applicants who contribute to the department's diversity.

     c. Encourage applications from diverse candidates. This might include reaching out to people in diversity-relevant venues such as the <u>UP-Directory</u> and other diversity-focused blogs and associations.

     d. Use clear criteria of evaluation that minimize the likelihood of bias and favoritism.

     e. Do not assume that teaching and research conducted by people from an under-represented group will focus on areas related to their own group.

5. Agree in advance about what the department is looking for when hiring new faculty to avoid sources of bias.

     a. Evaluate whether your conception of "core philosophy" and/or the mission of your philosophy program needs updating and discuss what you are looking for in a "good candidate". These definitions should include expectations about, for example, the number and quality of publications to prevent holding different applicants to different standards.

     b. Consider the feasibility and desirability of developing clear and explicit guidelines in advance about, e.g., number and quantity of publications, the weighting of different items in the job description.

     c. Ensure that any non-anonymous parts of the review process do not omit, or unfairly disadvantage, applicants from under-represented groups.

     d. Consider the feasibility and desirability of requiring candidates to remove references to their degree-granting institution(s) to reduce prestige bias.

     e. Re-evaluate applications near the end of the process to determine whether bias has played a role in excluding or downgrading some applicants.

6. In evaluating scholars who work on under-represented topics or traditions, employ appropriate standards of prestige and impact.

a. Have a clear understanding of what counts as the top journals or conferences in the subfield relating to the applicant's specialty.

b. Remember that top specialty journals for some subfields, such as philosophy of disability and LGBTQ philosophy, tend to be newer and thus less 'prestigious' in terms of impact factor, circulation, etc., and that devaluing publications in those journals may further disadvantage and stigmatize people working in those subfields. Also bear in mind that, internationally, highly qualified philosophers often publish in journals that are not available internationally or in English. Publishing venue choices can be philosophically significant (for example, when South African philosophers publish in Xhosa rather than English to avoid using a colonial language).

c. Focus on the quality of the applicant's work, how interesting or relevant it is to their sub-specialty, and how it might broaden the department's research and curriculum.

d. Consider the extent to which uptake by policy-makers, the general public, and scholars in other academic departments are forms of impact that should be valued in hiring and promotion. Scholars in under-represented topics and traditions sometimes have impacts outside of mainstream academic philosophy that are inappropriately disregarded.

7. Consider giving diversity-related contributions significant weight when evaluating colleagues and applicants.

a. Remember that being a member of an under-represented group in philosophy can require additional labor, burdens, stressors, and expectations, which is often not recognized. Note also that philosophers might have cultural, political, or familial obligations at times and in ways unfamiliar to philosophers in mainstream Anglophone institutions; obligations like these should not be held against a candidate.

b. Remember that philosophers from under-represented groups are often expected to take on a disproportionate amount of service work in addition to their research.

c. Evaluate whether permitting or requiring diversity statements would be useful.

8. During the search process make efforts so that the process is as equitable as possible.

a. Advocate for a fully inclusive application process, including with online systems. For example, ensure the options for gender are more than 'male/female' or 'man/woman' as this excludes non-binary candidates and fails to distinguish transgender candidates from cisgender ones.

b. When arranging interviews and visits, ask all candidates about their accommodation needs.

c. Conducting interviews online can disadvantage candidates without access to good technical facilities. To the extent possible, try to support such

candidates without such access, e.g., by providing funding to use commercial facilities for the interview.

   d. During the campus visit, ensure that arrangements have been made to the extent possible for candidates with disabilities and other needs (e.g., that locations are accessible, printed material is in large print, child care and nursing accommodations are available, that the exercise of religious practices is possible, etc.).

   e. Promotions committees/Heads of Department should, where consistent with institutional policy, ask for CVs from all eligible department members, rather than inviting specific members of staff to apply or only considering those who put themselves forward.

9. Faculty should recognize that there is a big power asymmetry between non-tenure track faculty and other members of the faculty. In light of this, faculty need to treat non-academic staff with the utmost respect and keep in mind that things that may not be important to tenured faculty (e.g., saying something critical or not being compensated for extra-contractual work) can be very serious for non-tenured track faculty.

10. Generally, departments should make an effort to support non-tenure track faculty as researchers (e.g., invite NTT faculty to give talks to the department, offer them conference travel and research funding, assign NTT faculty to teach in their areas of expertise whenever possible.)

11. Develop formal policies for managing the needs of diverse groups.
   a. Work to make sure appropriate disability-related accommodations are in place and updated as needed.
   b. Support mentoring and provide support networks for people you hire from under-represented groups.
   c. Consider having a yearly diversity workshop or training available for faculty and make faculty aware of relevant resources.
   d. Learn about the issues that under-represented colleagues typically face so that you can advocate more effectively with colleagues for faculty retention and promotion.

12. Departments should ensure that those involved in the promotions and appraisal processes know about the workings of bias.

13. Student evaluations of teaching are frequently used to evaluate faculty teaching in US institutions. However, evidence suggests that their use is problematic in several ways - one of which is that students tend to offer lower evaluations to women and members of other under-represented groups. Therefore, relying on student evaluations as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness can systematically disadvantage faculty from under-represented groups. Given this:
   a. Departments should avoid using student evaluations to compare individual faculty members to each other or to a department average and might instead

consider them as a way to observe patterns in an instructor's feedback over time.

    b. Provide the interpretative context for any quantitative scores, such as distributions, sample sizes, and response rates for each question on the instrument.

    c. Interpret and use student evaluations as part of a holistic assessment of teaching effectiveness.[3]

    d. Consider other methods for evaluating teaching, such as: peer observations, reviews of teaching materials, instructor self-reflections, evaluations of student performance, enrollment figures, individual supervision and mentorship, involvement with study abroad or undergraduate research, organizing workshops, support of student events, and other contributions to the educational mission of the university.

14. Tenure-track faculty members should be clearly informed by designated members of faculty of all criteria for tenure and promotion, including any special requirements applicable within a department or a college.

    a. The designated member of the faculty should clearly explain to every tenure-track faculty member the standards for reappointment and tenure and the cycle for evaluations of their progress in meeting these requirements.

    b. New faculty members should meet the designated member of the faculty regularly — ideally at least once a year — to discuss progress and places where improvement is needed.

    c. Periodic evaluations should be candid and expressed in plain English. They should include specific examples illustrating the quality of performance, constructive criticism of any potential areas for improvement, and practical guidance for future efforts.

    d. The department's focus should be to evaluate the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The faculty's evaluations should address these questions clearly listing specific examples.

15. Institutions should adopt a consistent approach to handling private letters and conversations, outside the normal review process, concerning the merits of a tenure candidate.

16. Faculty and administrators must treat an unsuccessful tenure candidate with professionalism, decency and compassion, and colleagues should take care not to isolate the person socially. Active efforts to assist the candidate in relocating to another position redound to the mutual benefit of the individual and the institution.

---

[3] Material in this section has been adapted from the American Sociological Association Statement on Student Evaluations of Teaching available at:
https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa_statement_on_student_evaluations_of_teaching_feb132020.pdf

17. The faculty, administration, and governing board should strive for consistency in the operation of the institution's tenure and promotion evaluation processes.
    a. Tenure and promotion decisions must be consistent over time among candidates with different personal characteristics—such as race, gender, disability, and national origin.
    b. Institutional policies should list the types of discrimination that the institution prohibits.
    c. Reviewers at each level, from the department to the ultimate decision maker, should ask, "How does this candidate compare to others we have evaluated in the recent past?"

18. Officially adopt and implement these diversity-promoting practices to move from good intentions to good practice.
    a. Widely publicize your department's goals or targets and commitment to promoting diversity.
    b. Inform all department members and bind future department members to uphold these standards.
    c. Publicly and explicitly adopt diversity-promoting practices, helping to create a culture of concern that enhances the department's reputation for welcoming diversity, attracting more diverse applicants.
    d. Consider creating a committee to collect data on diversity-relevant hiring and promotion practices, e.g., applicant and hiring rates for members of under-represented groups, tenure and retention rates, hiring committee composition, etc., and track progress in increasing diversity in your department.
        i. If this is done, store this data in a way that will be available to the department over time, possibly with the help of the administrative offices supporting the department's academic unit.
    e. Evaluate progress at regular intervals and revise practices accordingly.
        i. Where possible, obtain the help of external reviewers in evaluating this progress.
        ii. Revise your practices until you adopt practices that work for your university and department context.
        iii. Where possible, work with researchers to isolate and implement evidence-based practices that increase diversity in academic philosophy departments.

GOOD PRACTICE: TEACHING[4]

The aim of these practices is to make teaching effective and inclusive. With this aim in mind, the following guidelines focus on classroom dynamics and management in order to foster a sense of community in the classroom conducive to learning and critical and creative thinking. Departments should encourage instructors to implement the following guidelines where feasible:

1. Aim to improve the diversity of class syllabi. Online resources, colleagues, and the students themselves may have valuable suggestions. Some resources include: the UPDirectory, the APA Diversity Syllabus Collection, https://thedeviantphilosopher.org, https://diversityreadinglist.org, https://projectvox.org/teaching.

2. Departments should ensure that those involved in teaching know about the workings of bias.

3. When feasible, permit students to introduce themselves. Try to remember their names (with correct pronunciation) and any personal pronouns they choose to disclose and expect their classmates to do the same.
   a. Do not require students to disclose their personal pronouns, disabilities, etc., as this unfairly 'outs' students and places them at risk of marginalization.

4. Treat students as individuals and not as representatives of a category, e.g., "LGBTQ", "African". Do not assume that the person's place of origin, for example, makes them an expert on that particular place.

5. Seek participation from everyone and encourage those who are more hesitant. Give everyone a chance to talk.
   a. If a student asks a question showing advanced knowledge, give other participants the background knowledge required to understand the discussion.
   b. Encourage questions of clarification.
   c. Try to ensure jokes, thought experiments, and examples are intelligible to the whole class, and not only a subgroup within the class, explaining as necessary.
   d. Try a variety of teaching techniques and classroom activities to stimulate class discussion and to encourage student participation in ways that

---

[4] Passages in this section have been adapted from the Oxford University Faculty of Law Good Practices Guide available at:
https://www.law.ox.ac.uk/research-and-subject-groups/jurisprudence-oxford/good-practices-guidelines as well as from the APA's Good Practices Guide available at:
https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.apaonline.org/resource/resmgr/docs/Good_Practices_Guide_2019.pdf

everyone is comfortable with (e.g., some students struggle with speaking in front of the entire class but do well in small groups).

    e. Consider how bias may affect your interaction with students and try to be as just and equitable as possible – this includes time given to the students to talk in class but also the distribution of negative and positive feedback.

    f. Remember that even mentions (as opposed to uses) of slurs and other degrading language can sometimes harm students whose identities are implicated in those slurs.

6. Encourage students to address each other thus fostering politeness and collaboration in class.
   a. Encourage students to listen carefully to their interlocutor.
   b. Encourage students to help each other in class to develop ideas, contribute their knowledge, and so on.
   c. Make sure that students are respectful and courteous.
   d. Quickly address language that is insensitive, dismissive, aggressive or rude.
   e. Aim to create an environment in which students can discuss their experiences and identities without being treated as though those experiences and identities solely define them.

7. Ensure that students are informed about available services for students (e.g., counseling, disabilities, studying support).

8. Try to ensure that all aspects of the class are accessible to everyone - for instance, that classrooms are big enough and accessible by wheelchair, that there are captions in videos, that extra time and private rooms are available for students who need them during exams.

9. Encourage feedback on the class and involve students in suggesting ways to improve it.

10. In graduate student mentoring, to the extent possible avoid creating the impression that departments or advisors have students who are "favorites" on any grounds other than objective merit, especially if such favoritism appears to disadvantage students from traditionally under-represented groups.

11. To the extent possible, aim to give dissertation students prompt feedback on chapters, prospectuses, and other work, so as not to unnecessarily delay their progress. Needless delays disproportionately disadvantage vulnerable and financially insecure students.

12. In graduate student placement, ensure that the placement officer is familiar with issues that candidates from under-represented groups, and especially candidates with disabilities, face.

a. Meet early and often with students and encourage students to talk about these issues while ensuring that everyone is aware of how to report problems in these areas.
b. Consider creating a team of placement mentors covering a range of sub-disciplines.
c. Maintain a collection of job search materials that are accessible to all graduate students.
d. Make available to students resources that can enable them to have effective electronic interviews (e.g., rooms for interviewing with high-speed internet connection).
e. When feasible, provide financial support to students who need resources to lessen the financial burden of the job market (traveling, dossier services, child-care etc.).

Sexual and gender-based harassment can be carried out by persons of any sex or gender, and persons of any gender may be victims. Although harassment of students by academic and non-academic staff is often the focus of discussions, departments need to be aware that power differentials of this sort are not essential to sexual or gender-based harassment. Departments should also be aware that such harassment may interact with and be modified by issues of race, ethnicity, religion, class and disability status.

There is good evidence that the proportion of incidents of sexual, gender-based, and other forms of harassment that get reported, even informally, in philosophy departments is very low. We therefore urge even those staff who do not believe that harassment is a problem in their own departments to give serious consideration to the recommendations below.

The US defines 'sexual harassment' as unwanted sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:[6]
1. Submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of a person's employment.
2. Submission to or rejection of such conduct by a person is used as a basis for employment decisions affecting that person.
3. Such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with a person's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

Institutional definitions of 'sexual harassment' differ greatly from one another. Some institutional definitions focus solely on sexual conduct, while others also include non-sexual harassment related to sex or gender.

While departments need to attend to their institution's definition of 'sexual harassment', and to make use of institutional procedures where appropriate, this is not the end of their responsibilities. Where sexist or inappropriate sexual behavior is taking place that contributes to an unwelcoming environment, departments should act on whether or not formal procedures are possible or appropriate.

Note that while "sexual harassment" is clearly codified, some aspects of gender-based harassment, which tends to involve the inferiorization or humiliation of another person based on that person's gender, are less well discussed but are nonetheless important to eliminate when they arise. The same holds for other forms of harassment based on race,

---

[5] For the passages on sexual harassment we relied heavily on the BPA/SWIP Good Practice Policy General Guidance available at: https://bpa.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/General-guidance.pdf

[6] See the definition of Sexual Harassment by the US Department of the Interior on which the definitions in this section draw: https://www.doi.gov/pmb/eeo/Sexual-Harassment#:~:text=submission%20to%20such%20conduct%20is,condition%20of%20an%20individual's%20employment%3B&text=such%20conduct%20has%20the%20purpose,or%20sexually%20offensive%20work%20environment.

culture, disability, or other features that might single a person out for inferiorization or humiliation.

More broadly defined, sexual or gender-based harassment involves conduct of a sexual nature, or conduct related to sex, sexual orientation, or gender identity, with the purpose or effect of violating the dignity of a person, or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating, or offensive environment. Sexual and gender-based harassment are not limited to one-to-one interactions but can include generally inappropriate behavior directed towards a group of people. Political or ideological disagreements alone do not constitute sexual or gender-based harassment.

GENERAL POLICIES ON SEXUAL AND GENDER-BASED HARASSMENT[7]

1. All members of the department—undergraduates, graduate students, academic and non-academic staff—should be made aware of the regulations that govern sexual harassment in their university including requirements for mandated reporters.
   a. In particular, they should know the university's definition of 'sexual harassment' and whom to contact in possible cases of sexual harassment.
   b. They should also know who has standing to file a complaint (in general, and contrary to widespread belief, the complainant need not be the victim).
   c. They should be made aware of both formal and informal measures available at their university.
   d. Departments should include this information in induction sessions for both students and staff and in training for teaching assistants.

2. Where the University or Faculty has a list of Harassment Contacts, all staff and students should be made aware of it and this information should be both online and posted in a public space. If no such list exists, the department should consider suggesting this approach to the university. It is very important for department members to be able to seek advice outside their department.

3. All members of staff should be familiar with how to deal with individuals who approach them to discuss a particular incident.

4. All of the information listed above should be made permanently available to staff and students, e.g., through a stable URL on the department website and/or staff and student handbooks, rather than only in the form of a one-off email communication.

5. The department head and others with managerial responsibilities (e.g., Directors

---

[7] For the following suggestions (through page 7) see the BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme: Sexual Harassment at https://bpa.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Sexual-harassment.pdf

of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies) should ensure that they have full knowledge of university procedures regarding sexual harassment.

DEPARTMENTAL CULTURE

1. Seriously consider the harms of an atmosphere rife with derogatory or sexualizing, racializing, etc., comments and behavior, and address these should they arise.

2. Cultivate — from the top down — an atmosphere in which maintaining a healthy climate for all department members, especially those from under-represented groups and including non-academic staff, is considered everyone's responsibility. At a minimum, this includes a responsibility to reflect on the consequences, intended or otherwise, of one's own behavior towards people from under-represented groups. It may also include a responsibility to intervene, either formally or informally.

3. Ensure that those raising concerns about sexual and other forms of harassment are, as far as possible, protected against retaliation and that all those who are accused receive due process.
   a. Report concerns about retaliation to the Department Chair, the Title IX Office

4. Offer bystander training either to faculty, staff, and graduate students, if this is available or can be made available by the institution. This can help bystanders to feel comfortable intervening when they witness harassing behavior.

STAFF-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS[8]

Romantic or sexual relationships that occur in the student-teacher context, or in the context of supervision and evaluation, present special problems. The difference in power, respect, and trust typically present between a teacher and student, supervisor and subordinate, or senior and junior colleague in the same department or unit makes these relationships especially vulnerable to exploitation. They can also have unfortunate unintentional consequences.

Such relationships can also generate perceived, and sometimes real, inequalities that affect other members of the department, whether students or staff. For example, a relationship between a senior and junior member of staff may raise issues concerning promotion, granting of sabbatical leave, allocation of teaching. This may happen even if no preferential treatment actually occurs, and even if the senior staff member in question is not directly responsible for such decisions. In the case of staff-student relationships,

---

[8] This section has been taken by the BPA Good Practice scheme on staff-student relationships https://bpa.ac.uk/diversity/good-practice-scheme/guidance-and-resources/staff-student-relationships-3/

questions may arise concerning preferential treatment in seminar discussions, marking, decisions concerning graduate student funding, and so on. Again, these questions may well emerge and be of serious concern to other students even if no preferential treatment actually occurs.

At the same time, we recognize that such relationships do indeed occur, that they need not be damaging, and may be both significant and long-lasting.

We suggest that departments adopt the following policy with respect to the behavior of members of staff at all levels, including graduate student instructors.

Please note that the recommendations below are not intended to be read legalistically. Individual institutions may have their own policies, and these will constitute formal requirements on staff and student behavior. The recommendations below are intended merely as departmental norms, and to be adopted only where not in conflict with institutional regulations.

GENERAL POLICIES ON STAFF-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

The department's policy on relationships between staff and students (and between staff) should be clearly advertised to all staff and students in a permanent form, e.g., websites or staff/student handbooks. The policy should include clear guidance about whom students or staff might consult if problems (real or perceived) arise.

STAFF-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

1. Staff and graduate student teaching assistants should be informed that relationships between teaching staff and undergraduates or between faculty and graduate students are strongly discouraged, for the reasons given above. Some institutions might regard a zero-tolerance policy as reasonable, at least for certain types of relationships, and the language below is not meant to undercut that.

2. If such a relationship does occur, the member of staff in question should:
   a. inform a senior member of the department – where possible, the department head, as soon as possible;
   b. withdraw from all supervision and small-group teaching involving that student (in the case of teaching assistants, this may involve swapping tutorial groups with another TA), unless practically impossible;
   c. withdraw from the assessment of that student, even if anonymous marking is used.
   d. withdraw from writing references and recommendations for the student in question.
   e. withdraw from making any decisions (e.g., distribution of funding) where preferential treatment of the student could in principle occur.

3. It should be made clear to staff and students that if a student has entered into a

relationship with a member of staff (including a TA), while the responsibility for taking the above steps lies with the member of staff concerned, the student is equally entitled to report their relationship to another member of staff (e.g., Head of Department, if appropriate), and to request that the above steps be taken.

4. As much as possible, the department should encourage a practice of full disclosure in the case of such relationships' continuance. This avoids real or perceived conflicts of interest, as well as embarrassment for others.

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG ACADEMIC STAFF

Between members of academic staff where there is a large disparity in seniority (e.g., Associate Professor/Lecturer; Head of Department/Assistant Professor):

1. Disclosure of any such relationship should be strongly encouraged, in order to avoid real or perceived conflicts of interest.

2. Any potential for real or perceived conflicts of interest should be removed by, e.g., removal of the senior member of staff from relevant decision-making (e.g., promotions, appointment to permanent positions).

Staff members and students with caregiving responsibilities—whether parental or other care obligations—face constraints on their time that others often do not. Such constraints often impose significant difficulties on the caregiver and requests for accommodation should be taken seriously; this should include accommodations allowing staff members to fulfill culturally necessitated caregiving duties. There are simple measures that departments can take to minimize the extent to which caregivers are disadvantaged.

GENERAL POLICIES

Departments should adopt an explicit policy concerning caregivers, which covers as many of the following points as is practically possible:

1. Schedule important events, as far as possible, between 9 and 5 (the hours when childcare is more available). When an event must be scheduled outside of these hours, give plenty of advance notice so that caregivers can make the necessary arrangements. Consider using online scheduling polls to find times that work for as many of those with caregiving obligations and provide the option of virtual attendance.

2. Consider requests from staff of any background for part-time and flexible working. (This is largely, but not exclusively, an issue for caregivers—requests from non-caregivers should also be considered.) Also be receptive, as far as possible, to requests for leave.

3. As far as possible, account for caregiving commitments when scheduling teaching responsibilities.

4. Be aware that students, not just staff, may have caregiving responsibilities. Have a staff contact person for students who are caregivers.

5. Ensure that students and staff are made fully aware of any university services for caregivers.

6. Ensure that staff have an adequate understanding of what caregiving involves (e.g., do not expect a PhD student to make progress on dissertating while on parental leave).

7. Ensure that parental leave funds provided by the university are actually used to cover for parental leave, rather than being absorbed into department or faculty budgets.

8. Those involved in performance evaluations should be fully informed about

---

[9] See section on Caregivers of the BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme at https://bpa.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Caregivers.pdf

current policies regarding reduced teaching, research, and service expectations for caregivers, and take caregiving responsibilities into account where possible.

GOOD PRACTICE: CONFERENCES AND EVENTS[10]

1. As a session chair, ensure that the discussion is welcoming and inclusive. Consider implementing the following policies:
    a. Keep a question queue and stick to it.
    b. Step in where needed to help avoid, e.g., interruptions of those speaking, lines of discussion that are stretching on for too long, or dialogue that has become aggressive and/or rude.
    c. Allow for a break between talks and Q&A sessions in order for participants to gather their thoughts and/or to have time to attend to their different needs.
    d. Carefully select the order in which you call on questioners. Beginning the Q&A session with student questions or a question from a member of an under-represented group can lead to a more inclusive discussion.
    e. Encourage the participation of those who might be slower to raise their hand or less assertive about getting to the front of the queue.
    f. Do not allow questioners to ask multiple questions or extensive follow-up questions if others have not been given a chance to speak.

2. As an audience member, be respectful of the speaker and the other people in the room in some of the following ways:
    a. Keep questions short. Avoid asking multiple questions or long follow-up questions if this risks crowding others out of the conversation.
    b. Try to ask constructive questions that will help the presenter. Set a respectful tone.
    c. Try to read the room and assess whether your question will benefit the discussion.

3. As an organizer, take every reasonable step to make the conference as inclusive as possible.
    a. Organizers of recurring conferences should annually, or biennially, monitor the demographics of conference participants, and, if significant imbalances emerge in demographic representation, take steps to address the imbalance.

---

[10] Points in this section have been adapted from the APA's Good Practices Guide (available at: https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.apaonline.org/resource/resmgr/docs/Good_Practices_Guide_2019.pdf),
the Oxford university faculty of law Good Practices Guide (available at: https://www.law.ox.ac.uk/research-and-subject-groups/jurisprudence-oxford/good-practices-guidelines),
the Canadian Society for Women in Philosophy Guidelines for Conference Hosting (available at: http://cswip.ca/images/uploads/CSWIP_Accessibility_Working_Group_Document.pdf) and the BPA/SWIP Good Practice Policy General guidance (available at: https://bpa.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/All-GP-docs.pdf)

b. When drawing up a list of potential invited speakers, take reasonable steps to ensure sufficient representation of speakers from under-represented groups.
c. Where possible, consult invited speakers before fixing the date of the conference, to increase the likelihood that they are not just invited but will actually be able to accept the invitations.
d. Organizers should ensure that members of all groups are treated equally as speakers on publicity material and the conference program (e.g., to avoid the situation where a White speaker is described as 'Professor in philosophy at ...' but a Black speaker, also a Professor, is described as 'teaches philosophy at ...'; or where the male speaker's title (Dr, Prof.) is included by the female speaker's is not).
e. Where possible try to include local and junior scholars.
f. Signal willingness to accommodate scholars with disabilities or other particularized needs.
    i. Make an effort to provide information about the kinds of accommodations you can provide, in order to enable and encourage scholars to attend, in the invitations, call for papers, or conference announcement.
    ii. Whenever possible, do not require participants to disclose their needs as that can make them feel that they are a burden on the conference organizers, but be prepared to offer commonly required accommodations.
    iii. Ensure that participants are made to feel at ease to ask questions about specific accommodations.
g. Ensure that the venue of the conference is accessible and that there are staff to assist people with disabilities (for guidance see: https://bpa.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/BPA_SWIP-Guidelines-for-Accessible-Conferences.pdf and for public lectures, in particular, see: https://bpa.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/BPA_SWIP-Guidelines-for-Accessible-Public-Lectures.pdf).
    i. Consider offering opportunities for virtual participation, including opportunities for presenting and attending virtually. For suggestions on how to accomplish this see, for example, Helen Beebee's post on Running Hybrid Events (http://www.projects.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/lewis/running-hybrid-events/).
h. Ensure that all participants know whom to contact to address any questions or needs that may arise.
i. Ensure that there are sufficient breaks within the day, and stick to the announced schedule for these breaks.
j. Be aware of biases when identifying whom to invite.
    i. Chances are that the first people that come to mind will be people without historical disadvantage.
    ii. Consider invitations to junior and less well-established philosophers from under-represented groups to avoid holding these

philosophers to higher standards (e.g., disabled scholars must be famous to be included, but not so for non-disabled scholars). Remember that the familiar criteria for identifying a well-established scholar might not be applicable to all geographical locations. See the UPDirectory for possibilities.

k. When possible, offer funding to people with additional needs (e.g., financial, accessibility or care-related needs). If you cannot fund all speakers, consider checking whether more renowned speakers can fund their own travel, freeing up resources for less well-resourced speakers.

l. Offer free registration for companions assisting an attendee with a disability and abide by all other ADA policies.

m. When possible, have a quiet room for rest. This is important for a range of disabilities and for participants who have medical needs or are breastfeeding, etc. It is furthermore important to make available facilities for the exercise of religious or other cultural practices.

n. Be mindful of who is, and who is not, asked to care for children. Investigate whether the provision of childcare facilities for the duration of the conference is possible.

   i. Many universities have day-care facilities on or near campus, which may be able to offer a day rate for conference delegates.

   ii. For larger conferences, if campus facilities are not available consider hosting the conference at a hotel that offers childcare and babysitting services.

   iii. Consider setting aside funding to subsidize the use of childcare facilities by delegates.

   iv. Be mindful of who is and who is not asked to care for children.

o. Encourage speakers to make their material accessible to all participants and make sure you know how to operate equipment in order to help speakers (again see the BPA Accessibility Guidelines).

p. If there is food served, be mindful of dietary restrictions of conference participants, collecting information in advance if feasible. Food to meet these dietary requirements should either be plentiful or clearly marked as reserved for the relevant people, to avoid it running out.

q. Consider including, at the event opening, an indigenous land statement or acknowledgment, which acknowledges indigenous peoples as the traditional stewards of the land as well as the relationships these people have to the land on which the event is occurring.

4. Department heads should ensure that conference policies are available to staff and students who are organizing events in a permanent format (e.g., intranet, handbooks) and that they are aware of it.

GOOD PRACTICE: RESEARCH PROJECTS[11]

Large-scale (and normally externally funded) research projects often engage in activities that fall within the scope of the Good Practice policy – hiring staff, running conferences, and so on. We recognize that some such projects may wish to sign up to the Good Practices independently of (or in addition to) the departments of the project's investigators; this document allows this by, in effect, pulling together the relevant recommendations from the other Good Practice documents. The term 'management team' below is used to refer to whoever takes overall responsibility for the project. This might be the PI, the PI together with co-investigators, so some larger group.

HIRING PANELS AND EVENTS

Management teams should adhere to all of the policies listed in the 'Hiring, Promotion, and Retention' document.

CONFERENCES AND SEMINAR SERIES

Management teams should implement all of the recommendations in the 'Conferences and Events' document.

CAREGIVERS

The management team should implement all of the relevant recommendations in the 'Caregivers' document.

PUBLICATION OF EDITED COLLECTIONS

Large research projects often produce edited collections as outputs. The editorial team should take steps to ensure that people from under-represented groups are well represented amongst the contributors to any such collection. The UPDirectory is one resource.

ADVISORY BOARDS, RESEARCH STUDENTS, AND OTHER ASSOCIATED PEOPLE

Where the research project involves the formation of an advisory board, visiting fellowships, PhD studentships, etc., the management team should take concrete steps towards ensuring that people from under-represented groups are well represented amongst the members and applicants.

---

[11] This section has been taken from the BPA Good Practice Scheme on research projects available at: https://bpa.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Research-projects.pdf

GOOD PRACTICE: LEARNED SOCIETIES[12]

As national bodies with some influence, especially when it comes to philosophy conferences and journals, learned societies are well placed to make a concrete difference to the representation of under-represented groups in philosophy. We suggest that learned societies adopt the following policy.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND OFFICERS

Learned societies should ensure that a reasonable proportion of people from under-represented groups are nominated for positions on their executive committees and for official positions (President, Secretary, etc.).

CONFERENCES

1. Where learned societies organize their own conferences and seminar series, they should follow the relevant Good Practice recommendations on Conferences and Events (see above).

2. Where learned societies distribute funding to others to organize conferences and seminar series, they should make it a requirement of funding that the conference organizers follow the relevant Good Practice recommendations on Conferences and Events (see above).

3. Learned societies should consider adopting a formal policy on chairing seminars/conference sessions for their own events and/or for those that they fund. See again the Good Practice recommendations on Conferences and Events, for some specific proposals you might consider implementing.

4. Learned societies should monitor the proportion of people from under-represented groups speaking at conferences and seminar series that they fund. Where a conference or seminar series manifests an obvious imbalance, the learned society should make enquiries about the steps taken to promote representation, in order to satisfy themselves that appropriate steps were taken by the organizers.

---

[12] This section has been taken from the BPA Good Practice Scheme on Learned Societies available at: https://bpa.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Learned-societies.pdf

Publication in philosophy journals plays a major role in the reputation and career progression of their authors, as – to a lesser extent – does participation in the selection process through membership of editorial boards, refereeing, etc. The recommendations below aim to ensure that, as far as possible, members of under-represented groups are not disadvantaged in either capacity.

1. Diversify representatives – editors, editorial board members, referees, trustees, staff, etc. – to include more people from under-represented groups (including philosophers residing in non-Anglophone majority countries) and on important but neglected topics of interest to a diverse range of philosophers, utilizing a diverse range of methods.
   a. Commit to inclusion with influence (see Hiring, Retention and Promotion for definition).
   b. Ensure that member contributions are recognized and, where possible, appropriately compensated and rewarded.

2. Set specific, achievable goals or targets to make progress in increasing diversity in authorship and content in your journal.
   a. Consider publishing and promoting work by people from under-represented groups at least in proportion to their presence in the part of the discipline that your journal covers.
   b. Consider including at least one special issue or symposium engaging with works by under-represented philosophers or in under-represented areas of philosophy in your journal.
   c. Collect data on diversity-relevant publishing practices, e.g., submission and publication rates for members of under-represented groups, referee, and editorial board composition, etc. and track progress in increasing diversity in your journal.
   d. Issue regular reports on new commitments to diversity in the journals and report on progress towards achieving goals or targets.
      i. Consider including data on the journal's demographics, makeup of editorial board, referee pool, authorships, and submissions.

3. Implement promising practices to meet these goals or targets and increase diversity in your journal, such as:
   a. Solicit submissions of promising work by members of under-represented groups or working in under-represented linguistic traditions. (PhilPeople

---

might be a useful resource. See also the <u>Barcelona Principles for a Globally Inclusive Philosophy</u>).

b. Aim to include a fair representation of relevant work by members of under-represented groups. <u>Diversity Reading List</u> and <u>UPDirectory</u> might be useful resources.

c. Consider publishing more papers on important but neglected topics of interest to a diverse range of philosophers. This might include increasing the proportions of articles published in value theory, history, feminism, race, disability, and philosophical work in less commonly studied philosophical traditions.

d. Weigh the value of anonymity and non-anonymous editorial discretion, bearing in mind that evidence is mixed regarding the effectiveness of anonymous review in increasing diversity. Take special care to ensure that any non-anonymous parts of the review process do not omit or unfairly disadvantage authors from under-represented groups.

e. Attend to your regional context as well as the overall global context (e.g., the importance of including adequate geographical and indigenous representation in your journal).

4. Implement diversity-supporting referee practices, such as:

a. Be alert for possible patterns of bias in editorial desk rejections.

b. Encourage referees and authors to avoid using language or examples that are insensitive to cultural differences or that inappropriately excludes or offends any group of people based on their ability/disability, age, ethnicity and race, gender identity, sexual orientation, class, nationality, etc.

c. Encourage referees and authors to check that papers cite and discuss related work and that work by people from under-represented groups have not been overlooked.

d. Request referees not to google paper titles or request that they alert the editor prior to refereeing the paper if they know or have a strong suspicion about who wrote it.

e. Encourage referees to not reject promising papers on grounds of writing quality, if the concerns are merely stylistic, can be repaired to an adequate level, and the philosophical content is good. This helps ensure fair consideration of work by philosophers who are not native speakers of English.

f. Encourage referees to consider accepting papers on topics of interest to under-represented groups in philosophy and on important but neglected topics of interest to a diverse range of philosophers.

g. Encourage timely and developmental reviews, since members of vulnerable groups are especially disadvantaged by long delays before publication.

h. The editorial board should consider providing referees with an explicit editorial policy on refereeing.
   i. See, for example, the *Journal of Cognition* <u>Referee Guidelines</u>.

5. Implement promising practices to increase accessibility in journals, such as:
    a. Create structurally tagged content, which includes clearly marked headings, image descriptions, and scroll over text to assist screen readers parsing the page structure. (For example, see https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG20-TECHS/PDF3.html)
    b. Utilize text-to-speech capability for print-impaired users in the absence of an audio book.
    c. Include a navigable table of contents within your publications, and provide a defined reading order (including, for example, appropriate links between the main flow of the text and any sidebar or box out text) to help those reading through audio to navigate their way through the article.
    d. Include Alt-text descriptions to explain illustrations for readers with reduced access to graphic information.
    e. Give readers control over the font (size, style, and color), background color, and line spacing for online publications, and/or make them available in html.
    f. Consider trying to make your journal more accessible for those in locations or at institutions that lack sufficient funding e.g., by making your journal open access in those regions.
    g. Employ W3C web accessibility standards where feasible, and check for web accessibility.

6. Evaluate progress at regular intervals and revise practices accordingly.
    a. Where possible, work with researchers to identify particular areas to improve for achieving better representation of authors and marginalized philosophies.
    b. Isolate and implement evidence-based practices that increase diversity in the identified areas.
    c. Identify barriers to making progress on achieving diversity goals.
    d. Communicate, collaborate, and advocate to overcome identified barriers. Certain academic publishers have policies that hinder progress. Assertively engage with the issue where possible.

7. Officially adopt these diversity-promoting practices and widely publicize your journal's goals or targets and commitment to promoting diversity.
    a. Inform all representatives and bind future representatives to uphold these standards.
    b. Publicly and explicitly adopt diversity-promoting practices, helping to create a culture of concern that enhances the journal's reputation for welcoming diversity, attracting more diverse submissions.