

REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, & TENURE POLICIES

FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

IN THE
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

(Adopted 1 December 1989; Revised 1 December 1994; Revised 31 January 2002;
Revised 17 December 2015; Revised 25 July 2018; Revised 18 February 2022)

I. Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

This document is to be supplemented by the relevant articles (including especially Article 7) of the *Collective Bargaining Agreement* currently in force between the University of Cincinnati and the University Chapter of the AAUP and is intended to be fully compatible with the provisions of the *Agreement*, as well as with College and Provost RPT guidelines.

Faculty members may at any time request departmental review for reappointment, promotion or tenure. Deadlines for reappointment, promotion, and tenure are determined by the Agreement between the University administration and the AAUP. The RPT Committee includes all full-time faculty members, excluding the Head of the Department, with primary appointments in the Department of Philosophy who currently occupy the rank above that which the candidate is applying to be reappointed or at or above that to which the candidate is applying to be promoted. Per Article 7.5.6, “Reviewers are not permitted to serve on more than one level of review during the same review cycle, nor are they permitted to serve as a reviewer while also a candidate.”

For each candidate, the committee will elect a chair. The chair of the RPT committee will be responsible for calling and conducting meetings, for soliciting external evaluations if these are required, and for submitting the final reports and recommendations to the Head.

An RPT candidate's race, color, national or ethnic origin, ancestry, age, religion or religious creed, disability or handicap, sex or gender, sexual orientation, military or veteran status, or medical history may not be used in RPT assessments or decisions. Retaliation is also prohibited.

Promotion and Tenure: By March 1 of the year of review: (1) the candidate must submit to the RPT committee a list of at least eight proposed external referees; and (2) the RPT committee must submit to the candidate a list of at least eight additional proposed external referees. These two lists should be generated independently from one another. The RPT committee can reject referees proposed by the candidate, and the candidate can reject referees proposed by the RPT committee. The RPT committee chair will contact at least eight of the remaining proposed referees in a timely manner and ask them to agree to write a letter evaluating the candidate's scholarship to be submitted by September 1st. Names that appear on both lists should be prioritized and the remaining names drawn equally from the

two lists. Reviewers should be informed that their letters will not be confidential and will be included in the dossier.

The RPT committee chair will make every effort to secure at least six commitments to write letters, at least three from each list, and to see that at least five of the six committed external referees return letters by the requested deadline. If a sufficient number of agreements cannot be secured from the initial lists, the RPT committee chair may request additional names from the candidate or the RPT committee. Once again the candidate may reject names proposed by the RPT committee and vice versa. If fewer than five letters arrive, the RPT committee chair, in separate consultation with the RPT committee and the candidate, will agree upon a list of additional proposed external referees. The RPT committee chair will then make every effort to get commitments from these new referees, with the aim of a total of five letters by October 15th.

The candidate's curriculum vitae, examples of the candidate's scholarly work, and a description of the Department's RPT procedures and criteria will be sent to the outside referees for assessment. The candidate will be responsible for preparing these materials. Letters of evaluation should be returned to the chair of the RPT committee.

Preparation of the file for review by the RPT Committee is also the responsibility of the candidate. The candidate may include any materials they feel are relevant to promotion or tenure, but must include at least the following:

- Letters from all external reviewers (supplied by the RPT Committee Chair)
- Candidate's *vita* and self-evaluation
- All annual reviews to date
- Copies of published work
- Summary and assessment of publication and other scholarly activities
- Summary and assessment of teaching
- Summary and assessment of service
- Any additional items required by the Dean, Provost, or Bargaining Agreement

The file must be submitted to the chair of the RPT Committee no later than six weeks prior to the Dean's deadline. Members of the Committee are to be afforded ample time to review this material before it meets to discuss and vote upon the issue. Committee members unable to attend the meeting are permitted to vote in absentia. A simple majority of votes in favor of promotion in tenure suffices for committee approval. The results of the RPT meeting will be conveyed in a written report added to the RPT dossier by the chair of the RPT Committee. The Head shall then write an independent assessment of the candidate's achievements and potential and determine if the candidate has met the criteria. The candidate has the opportunity at any point in the process to append a response they might find appropriate in light of any evaluations. This material will be included in the file. All of the material reviewed by the RPT Committee, together with the recommendations of the RPT Committee and the Head, will be submitted to the College RPT Committee for the next level of review. Throughout the process, the candidate has the right of access to all documents in the file; the candidate is especially encouraged to review the contents of the file before it is sent to the Dean of the College.

Reappointment: Procedures for reappointment are the same as those for promotion and tenure except that no external reviews are required for reappointment.

II. Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

It is necessary and sufficient for tenure or promotion that the candidate display (1) demonstrated proficiency in teaching and service; and (2) excellence in research.

To demonstrate ability warranting an earlier promotion or granting of tenure, it is necessary and sufficient that the candidate meet the departmental criteria for tenure or promotion sooner than the contractual timeline.

Faculty who stopped their tenure clock shall be held to the same standards and evaluated in the same way as faculty who do not.

Research: In evaluating candidates for promotion or tenure, excellence in research shall be assessed relative to scholars in similar areas of research *and* at similar stages of their careers. It is common practice in the discipline of philosophy to balance the quality against the quantity of publications in assessing research excellence. In general, it is the responsibility of the departmental RPT Committee to evaluate the quality of the candidate's research. The assessments of the external referees shall be given strong consideration when evaluating research excellence.

Of primary consideration in evaluating the candidate's research are: (a) the number and quality of the candidate's journal articles, book chapters, books, and monographs, and the general quality of the venues in which these works appear; (b) refereed or invited presentations at professional meetings, conferences, workshops, other universities, and events for the public. Rates vary widely depending on the type of research the candidate is engaged in, and other considerations (e.g. quality, length, and venue) are relevant to establishing whether the publication record meets the requirement of research excellence. Additional factors that may be relevant include but are not limited to: (c) publications in popular venues, professional online publications, book reviews, anthologies, and textbooks; (d) presentations that do not qualify under (b) above; (e) membership on editorial boards, journal refereeing; (f) honors or awards for research, external grants or fellowships for research activities; (g) discussion of the candidate's work in popular media. The weight to be accorded to each factor is not equal, and depends critically on the quality and philosophical contribution of the work.

Candidates for reappointment at the rank of assistant professor need only demonstrate a potential for high quality research. For tenure or promotion, it is necessary that the candidate demonstrate a strong record of publication as specified under (a) above. For tenure, the emphasis should be on establishing a body of research primarily in the form of products listed under (a). It is expected that promotion to Professor requires a demonstrated

and substantial body of work beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor; this body of work may in part comprise forms of public engagement.

Teaching: Activities that will be considered in evaluating the candidate's teaching include (a) courses; (b) advising and mentoring; and (c) activities aimed at improving teaching effectiveness. Additional factors that may be relevant to evaluating the candidate's teaching include but are not limited to: (d) innovative methods; (e) pedagogical research. Original pedagogical research may also qualify as a research contribution.

The candidate is encouraged to provide as many sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness as possible. Types of evidence may include but are not limited to:

For courses:

- A description of courses taught, with course number, name, topic, quarter/semester, level, enrollment, and any special features (e.g., cross-listed, team-taught, honors, online, new to curriculum, etc.).
- Syllabi, writing assignments, exams, handouts, etc.
- Student evaluations.
- Peer evaluations of teaching.

For advising and mentoring:

- A description of advising and mentoring activities, such as: independent studies, mentorships, qualifying exams, dissertation committees, supervision of graduate TAs or RAs, summer teaching mentorships, etc., with topics and outcomes where applicable.
- Letters from advisees or mentees.
- Graduation and placement record of advisees or mentees.

For activities aimed at improving teaching:

- Description of efforts to design new courses, redesign or refresh existing courses, or improve the department's curriculum.
- Attendance at pedagogical training, workshops, or conferences.

For innovative methods or pedagogical research:

- Leading pedagogical workshops for colleagues or graduate students.
- Published articles or handbooks on teaching.
- Description of effective use of technology or other innovations for pedagogical purposes.
- Description of initiatives to support student retention and success.

Service: Service to the profession, the campus community, the department, and the community-at-large are considered important aspects of a faculty member's overall professional commitment. How and in what ways one serves are understood to be broad categories. The candidate is encouraged to provide as many sources of evidence of service activities as possible. Types of evidence may include but are not limited to:

For departmental service:

- Organizing speaker series and colloquia.
- Coordinating social events for faculty and students.
- Initiatives that create funds for departmental use, e.g., certain fellowships, teaching honors courses.

For campus community and community-at-large service:

- Publicizing philosophy in venues beyond our department.
- Engaging in UC or broader community development initiatives.

For service to the profession:

- Editorial work for philosophy journals and presses.
- Leadership positions in professional organizations.
- Engaging in development initiatives in the field of philosophy.