

GOOD PRACTICE POLICY: HIRING, RETENTION, AND PROMOTION¹

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.

¹ 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 UP-Directory 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 UP-Directory 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.²
- 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.

² 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.