

## **BY-LAWS**

### **I. MEMBERSHIP**

- A. All and only persons on a least half-time academic appointment, from Assistant Teaching Professor to Professor, and assigned by the Dean of Arts and Sciences to this Department, shall have full membership in the Department, unless they are currently on leave without pay and hold a half-time or more appointment elsewhere and have an offer to retain that appointment for more than one year.
- B. All members of the department have full voting rights, except where explicitly noted in these by-laws.
- C. Exchange faculty and visitors shall have no rights of decision and voting on Departmental matters.
- D. The following rule shall govern absentee voting: A member of the Department who is entitled to vote but is not present at a meeting at which a vote is taken is entitled to submit a written vote prior to the meeting, provided that the member either
  - (a) is not present because of illness, a medical appointment, temporary relocation during a sabbatical or research leave, a prior speaking engagement, or
  - (b) has other sufficiently good reasons for not being present.

The Department Chair will decide whether the reasons mentioned in (b) are sufficiently good. This rule applies to all departmental votes, including (i) the election of a chair, (ii) initial appointment, (iii) reappointment, (iv) tenure or promotion, and (v) by-laws revision.

### **II. ELECTION OF THE CHAIR**

- A. In order to be elected Chair, a candidate for the office shall have received at least a majority of the total number of votes cast.
- B. If, on the first ballot in the voting for a Chair, no candidate receives a majority of the votes cast, a second ballot shall be held from which the candidate receiving the smallest number of votes on the first ballot shall be excluded. This procedure shall be followed, as necessary, on successive ballots until one candidate receives a majority of the votes cast.
- C. The tenure of the office of Chair is three years. Appointment of an Acting Chair for the summer term or during other temporary absence of the Chair may be made by the Chair.

### **III. MEETINGS**

- A. The Department shall ordinarily meet at the call of the Chair. A quorum consists of a majority of resident faculty members. Meetings of the Department shall be conducted in

accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order*, with the Chair having full privileges of both debate and vote.

- B. In each semester, one representative of the lecturer-rank faculty will be appointed by the Chair and admitted to all regular meetings of the Department.
- C. At least one representative elected by the Department's graduate student body shall be admitted to all regular meetings of the Department.

#### IV. COMMITTEES

- A. The following standing committees support departmental functioning and self-governance:

Committees appointed by the Department Chair:

- 1. Climate Committee
- 2. Colloquium Committee
- 3. Fellowships and Awards Committee
- 4. Graduate Admissions Committee
- 5. Graduate Curriculum Committee
- 6. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Elected committees:

- 1. Executive Committee
- 2. Salary Committee

- B. Rules governing membership of the elected committees:

- 1. The members of the Executive and Salary Committees are elected by the department's faculty members. Each of these committees consists of four regular members, one from among the ranks of Teaching Professors and one from each of the tenure-track professorial ranks (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor). They serve—to the extent possible, staggered—two-year terms.
- 2. The Department Chair serves as an *ex officio* member on both committees.
- 3. Except for the Chair, no one shall serve twice before everyone else at their rank (where, for this purpose, the collective group of teaching faculty count as being at a single rank) has either served once or has explicitly declined to serve, no one shall serve thrice before everyone else at their rank who is eligible has served twice or has explicitly declined to serve, and so on.
- 4. Faculty members who are eligible for an equity adjustment, promotion, or retention offer are not eligible to serve on the Salary Committee. If a member of the Salary Committee becomes eligible for a raise of one of these kinds, they must either decline any such raise or recuse themselves from the committee, to be replaced with another department member of the same rank.

#### V. APPOINTED OFFICES

A. The Chair shall appoint the following:

1. Director of Graduate Studies (Assoc. Chair and Chair of the Graduate Curriculum Committee)
2. Director of Undergraduate Studies (Assoc. Chair and Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee)
3. An Honors Representative
4. Teaching Mentors for Graduate Part-time Instructors and for Lecturers
5. A Placement Director
7. A Library Representative

## VI. NEW APPOINTMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT

- A. All members of the Department may participate in deliberations concerning the search for and appointment of new faculty members. All and only members of the Department from Assistant Professor to Professor shall have a vote on decisions about the selection process and appointment of new tenured/tenure-track faculty members.
- B. All and only tenured faculty shall have a vote on the granting of tenure to a new faculty member to whom an offer is being made.
- C. All and only Professors shall have a vote on the granting of the title of Professor.
- D. If the Department contemplates spousal hires, each candidate must be treated as a distinct individual with full respect for that person's qualifications and credentials. This minimally includes a full dossier and an independent review.

The Department may consider a candidate's spouse or partner for a position that has not been advertised, but it may only do so if it judges that person's qualifications to be sufficiently strong that if the Department had conducted a national search for someone in this person's area of expertise, it might plausibly have chosen to include this person among those to be interviewed during the first round of interviews.

- E. When hiring for a teaching professor or tenure-track junior position for which more than one candidate is under consideration, the department will proceed in two stages. If, and only if, only one candidate is under consideration, only the first stage will be executed.

In stage one, the voting members will vote, for each candidate under consideration, on whether hiring that candidate would be preferable to closing the search for the year. Any candidate who receives fewer than twice as many 'yes' votes as 'no' votes will be removed from the pool.

In stage two, the department will vote to rank the remaining candidates. Vote shall be by simultaneous ballot, to be weighted (for example) 3, 2, 1 for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd preference, a vote for all candidates being required on each ballot. For each candidate, the numbers assigned to that candidate on all the ballots will be added up. Members are permitted to rank some candidates as tied (e.g., in a ballot with four candidates, it is permissible to write 1, 2, 2, 4). In such cases, the tied votes shall be weighted so that the total number of points allotted is the same on each ballot (e.g., in a ballot cast as 1, 2, 2, 4, the first candidate would receive 4 points, the next two would each receive 2.5 points, and

the fourth would receive 1 point). The candidate with the greatest total will be the department's first-place candidate, the one with the second greatest total second-place, and so on.

After this is done, the department should be understood to be committed to supporting an offer being made to the first-ranked candidate, to the second if the first declines, and so forth, until the position is filled or all candidates have declined. Upon the request of any member of the department, prior to the adjournment of the meeting, a final vote may be taken to confirm this commitment. If such a vote is called for, all remaining candidates must be voted on. Any candidate who receives fewer than twice as many 'yes' votes as 'no' votes will be removed from the pool.

- F. When hiring for a senior position, the department will proceed in the same manner as outlined in VI.E, with the following addition: after stage one, but before stage two, the tenured members of the department will vote on whether the candidate should be offered tenure. Any candidate who receives fewer than twice as many 'yes' votes as 'no' votes will be removed from the pool.
- G. In cases requiring a ranking of 2 or more candidates for a position that is open to both junior and senior applicants, the department shall proceed in the same manner as outlined in VI.E, with the following addition: after stage one, but before stage two, the tenured members of the department will take a vote with respect to granting tenure to any senior candidates in the applicant pool following the procedure outlined in VI.F.
- H. Searches for Teaching Professors of any rank (a) should be publicly advertised, (b) should consider both teaching excellence and scholarly excellence, and (c) should be conducted by a committee whose membership is roughly proportional to the distribution of faculty among the various ranks: Teaching Professors (considered collectively as one rank), Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor).

## **VII. REAPPOINTMENTS, COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW, PROMOTIONS, AND TENURE**

- A. The Department Chair shall, ideally, inform members to be considered for reappointment, comprehensive review, or tenure at the beginning of the semester before the semester in which the Departmental vote is to be taken.
- B. The Chair shall appoint a Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) in cases of tenure review, promotion, and comprehensive review. The PUEC shall consist of a Chair, chosen with input from the candidate, and two other members of the Department, chosen by the Department Chair in consultation with the PUEC Chair and the candidate. The function of the PUEC as such shall be to survey materials, to provide information at the relevant meeting, and to make available at least ten days in advance a dossier which will include anything deemed relevant to the enquiry by the PUEC or candidate. The PUEC will produce a written report to be forwarded with the rest of the candidate's file. The PUEC shall be appointed in the semester before the semester in which the Department's recommendation is to be made.

- C. In the case of comprehensive review, outside referees will not ordinarily be used. In exceptional cases outside referees may be used if the Department decides that it lacks the expertise needed to evaluate the candidate's research.

In the case of tenure and promotion review, the Evaluation Committee should seek at least six external letters of reference. The candidate will be asked to provide names of referees who should be considered in selecting external letters of reference. Two lists will be developed, one list from the candidate and one list from the Evaluation Committee. Some members of each list must be on the final list of referees. All letters of reference shall be solicited in the semester before the semester in which the decision on tenure is to be made by the Department. The candidate may provide the Committee with additional letters as he or she sees fit.

- D. In the case of reappointment, the Chair shall appoint a PUEC consisting of a Chair, chosen with input from the candidate, and at least one other member of the Department, chosen by the Department Chair in consultation with the PUEC Chair and the candidate. The function of the PUEC shall be to survey materials, to provide information at the relevant meeting, and to make available at least ten days in advance a dossier which will include anything deemed relevant to the enquiry by the PUEC or candidate. The PUEC will produce a written report to be forwarded with the rest of the candidate's file. The PUEC shall be appointed in the semester before the semester in which the Department's recommendation is to be made.
- E. Reappointment, comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion decisions shall be made by members of the department above the rank of the person being evaluated (the possible ranks being, in order, Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Teaching Professor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor).
- F. A two-thirds majority of those voting shall be required for the awarding of tenure, including those cases where tenure is given upon initial appointment.
- G. The guidelines in making recommendations for appointment, reappointment, comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion shall be:
  - 1. Scholarship, creative, and/or research work;
  - 2. Teaching performance;
  - 3. University, professional, and public service along with any other criteria that have rational bearing on the Department's recommendations.

The relative weight given to these considerations in a given case is determined by the faculty member's rank (and proposed rank, where applicable); the faculty member's contractual workload; system-wide, campus and College policies; and Departmental criteria (see appendix).

- H. Meetings of all committees concerned with appointment, reappointment, comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion shall be open only to those members of the Department who are entitled to vote at those meetings.

## VIII. RETENTION OFFERS

- A. In the case of recommendations to the Dean regarding retention offers, all and only tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the Department shall be eligible to vote. The voting of absent members of the Department shall be governed in keeping with the rules set down in I.D.

#### **IX. APPOINTMENT OF GRADUATE PART-TIME INSTRUCTORS AND TEACHING ASSISTANTS**

- A. Recommendations for appointments of Graduate Part-time Instructors and Teaching Assistants shall be made by the Director of Graduate Studies. The Chair of the Department has final authority on recommendations for Graduate appointments.

#### **X. APPOINTMENT OF OTHER TEACHERS**

- A. All teaching appointments shall require approval by the Department Chair. This includes all courses taught with a PHIL prefix (a) in Continuing Education, (b) as Extension Division courses taught away from the Campus, (c) as correspondence courses, and (d) in Residential Academic Programs.

#### **XI. THE CENTER**

- A. The Center for Values and Social Policy (henceforth “the Center”) is housed in the Department of Philosophy. Its central objective is to serve as a non-partisan, campus-wide resource for supporting research, teaching, and public outreach about normative issues that are closely connected to matters of social policy. This includes work in applied normative philosophy, broadly construed to include work in applied moral, social, political and legal philosophy as well as related philosophical work that takes place at a more theoretical level. It also includes some work that is carried out in other disciplines, such as law, political science, economics and sociology, when that work has a strongly normative component and a clear connection to matters of social policy. The Center has its own budget and is authorized to raise and spend funds in pursuit of this central objective. It is also authorized to act as an agent independent of the Department when entering into collaborative arrangements with other units on campus, including other departments, programs, centers, schools and colleges, as well as with other units beyond campus.
- B. The Center’s Director is selected and appointed by the Chair of the Department after consulting with all members of the Department who are faculty affiliates of the Center as well as with the members of the Center’s internal advisory board. The Director may be appointed to a term of service of no more than four years and may be reappointed to an unlimited number of terms.

#### **XII. BY-LAWS CHANGES**

- A. All changes in the By-Laws shall be made by a meeting of the Department for which there has been notice of at least seventy-two hours indicating the character of the proposals to

be made. The same stipulation applies to committee recommendations or other motions which affect degree requirements, procedures concerning personnel decisions, and other constitutional matters. Changes in the By-Laws require a two-thirds majority of those voting at the meeting.

## APPENDIX A: SALARY EQUITY EVALUATION SYSTEM

### I. DETERMINATION OF MERIT

The Department Chair is ultimately responsible for the evaluation of academic personnel within the Department and—in consultation with other faculty members—makes merit evaluations and recommendations for salary increases. Section IX of the Department By-Laws establishes an elected Salary Committee as the consultative body. The Chair, working together with the Salary Committee, will prepare in the Spring of each year a merit evaluation and salary recommendation for each faculty member.

The Department Chair's annual merit is assessed by the Salary Committee (excluding the Department Chair). A written evaluation is forwarded to the Dean.

As part of salary deliberations during the Spring of each year, the Chair and Salary Committee will review salaries, relevant statistical data, and the career merit of faculty members to assure that the salaries of all faculty are in an equitable relation to career merit and to each other. Merit evaluations should be based on teaching, research, and service. Merit is a comparative concept, and philosophy faculty at American universities are the comparison class.

### II. SALARY GRIEVANCE PROCESS

Complaints about annual merit evaluations or about career merit and salary must be submitted formally as grievances. The Department Chair will receive these complaints on behalf of the Salary Committee. The Salary Committee will hear all merit and salary grievances, and will be a simple majority vote determine the validity of and appropriate remedies for all grievances. The Department Chair will not vote, but may break ties. In the event that a sitting member of the Salary Committee files a grievance, or that an untenured member of the Salary Committee wishes to avoid dealing with a grievance, a replacement will be appointed by the remaining members of the Committee to hear the case. Grievances may be submitted under two headings--annual merit and career merit.

A. **Annual merit:** If a faculty member believes that his or her annual merit evaluation has been unfairly or inaccurately made, s/he may submit a written grievance to the Salary Committee. Grievances concerning annual salary raises are not permitted. Apart from exceptional circumstances, a grievance pertaining to an annual merit evaluation should be filed prior to the announcement of that year's salary raises.

- *Basis of grievance:* A grievance concerning annual merit must be based on errors of fact, evaluation, or procedure in the annual evaluation. The Salary Committee may request additional information and documentation from the grievant.



- *Procedure:* The grievant must submit a narrative statement, not to exceed 400 words, explaining and documenting the errors in the evaluation.
  - *Deadlines:* A grievance must be submitted by the faculty member to the Department Chair within 15 days of receipt of the merit evaluation.
  - *Response:* The Salary Committee must provide a written response to the grievant within 30 days after filing, although exceptions may be made for grievances filed during the semester break or summer months.
  - *Appeal:* The grievant has the right to appeal decisions of the Salary Committee on his or her grievance to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in accordance with procedures established by the Dean's office. Appeals on the basis of annual merit are not subject to the appeal procedure in the Salary Equity Evaluation System; they may not be appealed to the campus grievance committee established under the campus Salary Equity policy.
- B. **Career merit:** If a faculty member believes that his or her career merit has been unfairly or inaccurately evaluated, or that his or her salary is inequitable, she may submit a written grievance to the Salary Committee at any time during the academic year. The Salary Committee may request additional information and documentation from the grievant. If a grievance is ruled valid, the Salary Committee will recommend a remedy to be implemented at the next pay cycle.

Like annual merit, career merit is based on the quality of one's teaching, research, and service. Career merit is cumulative annual merit during one's years of college or university teaching since one received the Ph.D. Criteria for the evaluation of teaching, research, and service are available in the document "Policies for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure" (this document is appended).

- *Basis of grievance:* A valid grievance concerning career merit must satisfy the following criteria:
  1. Grievances must be based on total salary, not annual raises.
  2. The grievances must be based on a comparison between the salary of the grievant and the salaries of other faculty members in the Department whose salaries are determined by the Department.
  3. If one faculty member is paid less than another with roughly equal career merit, this alone does not necessarily form the basis of a grievance. It must be considered whether the grievant is equitably paid in comparison to most other faculty in the Department with roughly equal career merit. Nothing in this paragraph, however, should be understood as barring a grievance based on evidence of racial or gender bias within the unit.
  4. A difference in salaries between two faculty members in the Department may not, in itself, form the basis for a grievance even if the two faculty members have been teaching for the same number of years since receiving the Ph.D. Merit and achievement must be considered.

5. A grievance may not be based on individual salaries, salary ranges, or salary averages of other campuses or institutions or on AAUP statistics about other campuses and institution.
  6. Remedies for valid grievances will typically have to wait until funds for salary increases are next available to the unit. Backpay or retroactive salary increases may not be requested or awarded as part of this process.
- *Procedure:* A grievant must submit a narrative statement, not to exceed 1,500 words, explaining and documenting the grounds for the grievance.
  - *Response:* The Salary Committee must provide a written response to the grievant within 30 days after filing, although exceptions may be made for grievances filed during the semester break or summer months.
  - *Appeal:* A grievant has the right to appeal decisions of the Salary Committee on his or her grievance to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in accordance with procedures established by the Dean's office. Further, appeals on the basis of career merit may be appealed to the campus grievance committee established under the campus Salary Equity policy.

## **APPENDIX B: POLICIES for COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW, TENURE, and PROMOTION**

The Department of Philosophy explains by means of this policy statement the procedures and standards that it will use in evaluating tenure-track personnel for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This statement complies with policies of the Board of Regents as described in its Standards, Processes, and procedures (SSP) document, and is consistent with the University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement entitled, "Procedures for Written Standards and Criteria for Pre-Tenure Faculty."

### **I. THE RULES OF THE REGENTS**

The Rules of the Regents define the basic requirements for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These basic requirements cannot be overridden or superseded by departmental rules or interpretations.

The University requires comprehensive review at the end of the last appointment before a mandatory tenure decision. According to the Rules of the Regents, the comprehensive review involves full consideration of all credentials and can, if negative, result in the rejection of a faculty member for renewal of appointment. The question to be considered by the Department and by administrative review committees for the comprehensive review is whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure.

The award of tenure, which is typically concurrent with promotion to associate professor, requires that a faculty member demonstrate "excellence" in either teaching or research and meritorious achievement in the other category, and meritorious service.

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires that candidates have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent and demonstrate (a) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (c) a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.

The purpose of the departmental evaluation is to apply the general standards of performance in teaching, scholarship or creative work, and leadership and service to the disciplines represented within the Department of Philosophy.

### **II. ALLOCATION OF EFFORT**

Each faculty member has a specific allocation of effort to teaching, research, and service. The standard allocation for the Department is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. This

allocation will be assumed to apply unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary; any such agreements must be reported to the Dean and must be in accord with the Department's Differentiated Workload Policy Statement. The allocation of effort will be considered to apply as an average over the months of any given academic year.

### III. EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Before being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, faculty should create a teaching portfolio that will contain all written records pertaining to teaching. The portfolio will be used as evidence in the evaluation of teaching. The Department may obtain evidence from other sources to the extent that the information contained in the portfolio is incomplete with respect to any of the criteria identified below.

The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of teaching is as follows: Is the faculty member's demonstrated performance in teaching consistent with the general standard for tenure-track reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

A. *Undergraduate Teaching:* Undergraduate instruction is important in the evaluation of teaching credentials. However, no single measure of effectiveness in undergraduate teaching will be the sole basis of judgement by the Department. In particular, FCQ scores are not to be given disproportionate weight and must be interpreted in light of other evidence. Criteria to be used in the evaluation of achievement in undergraduate teaching include:

1. Statements of teaching philosophy or self-evaluation of teaching;
2. Faculty course questionnaire scores from all classes;
3. Student comments from FCQ's from all classes;
4. Peer evaluation (by class visitation or other mechanisms);
5. Examples of course outlines, syllabi, examinations and other items that indicate the nature of instruction;
6. Descriptions of the development or improvement of coursework;
7. Written statements that may have come from the Chair or others concerning willingness to teach, rapport with students, important contributions to curriculum development, or other related matters.

Beyond formal classroom instruction, the following criteria will be included by the Department in its evaluation of teaching: advising services to undergraduate students, independent study or independent research projects involving undergraduate students, and activities promoting faculty-student interaction. In addition, a faculty member may submit, or the Department may consider at its own initiative, other evidence of teaching performance that seems appropriate for a particular individual.

B. *Graduate Instruction:* Graduate instruction is an important component of teaching evaluation. Graduate instruction is normally an important part of the teaching

responsibilities of Department members. Instructional activities at the graduate level normally include sponsorship of graduate students, service on committees of students sponsored by other faculty members, and formal instruction of graduate students through regular courses or seminars. Faculty members should maintain, as part of the teaching portfolio, records on their activities with graduate students. This should include names of students worked with or supervised and the time period of this activity, records of completion and placement of individual students, and information about other contributions to the graduate program. These records are considered part of the evidence pertaining to achievement in teaching.

#### **IV. EVALUATION OF RESEARCH**

Achievement in research is an important component of the Department's evaluation of faculty members who are undergoing comprehensive review or are being reviewed for promotion or tenure. As a means of facilitating the evaluation, faculty members should maintain records of their research activities.

Publication is an important criterion for departmental evaluation of research. Publication in peer-reviewed books, journals, and collections will be considered especially significant. Published work should show evidence of competency, originality, and importance. Evaluation of research will focus mainly on work published or completed during the tenure-probationary period. Some consideration will be given, however, to work published prior to the probationary period, for the purpose of, for example, assessing the overall impact of the candidate's body of work, their stature in the profession, or the consistency of their research productivity.

A second important criterion for evaluation of research is the candidate's national or international reputation for achievement in research. The Department will gather evidence of reputation from authoritative reviewers external to the University; these will include some individuals from a list provided by the candidate for evaluation and some individuals who are selected independently by the departmental evaluation committee rather than by the candidate.

A third criterion for evaluation of research is extramural support. It is recognized that the availability of extramural funding for philosophical work is limited, and no particular quantity of research support is specifically required for tenure-track reappointment, promotion, or tenure.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit, or the Department may consider, other evidence of achievement in research that seems appropriate to a individual's case for tenure-track reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of research is as follows: Is the faculty member's performance in research consistent with the general standard for tenure-track reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

#### **V. EVALUATION OF SERVICE**

A candidate's record of support of academic programs in the Department is an important criterion for evaluation of service. However, evaluation of service can also extend well beyond the Department to include the candidate's work on campus committees, college committees, or in professional societies. Criteria related to service also include the extent of editorial work, review for professional journals, professional societies, and publishers, as well as professional services to the nation, the state, or the public. All service is evaluated with regard to its importance and its success, as well as the faculty member's dedication to it.

Evidence related to service will consist of a description of the service and of its duration and significance. This information should be compiled on a continuous basis by candidates for promotion, tenure-track reappointment, or tenure. At the time of evaluation, evidence of service may be obtained from the candidate, from the Department, or from external sources. The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of service is as follows: Is the faculty member's performance in service consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

## **APPENDIX C: POLICIES for REAPPOINTMENT and PROMOTION of TEACHING PROFESSORS**

This document explains the Philosophy Department's standards for reappointment and promotion of Teaching Professors.

### **I. UNIVERSITY POLICY**

All policies and procedures of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Offices of the Provost and Chancellor, and the Regents shall apply. Teaching Professor reappointments and promotions in the Department will proceed according to Arts and Sciences policy, as described in the web page currently at <https://www.colorado.edu/asfacultystaff/personnel/policies-procedures/faculty-regular-non-tenure-track/reappointments-promotions>.

Per A&S policy, reappointment requires an excellent record in teaching, and an at least meritorious record in service/leadership, where primary unit criteria are to define what constitutes "excellent" and "meritorious" performance. Section 3 below discusses how the Philosophy Department evaluates meritoriousness of service, while section 4 discusses how the department evaluates excellence of teaching. Section 5 discusses how criteria for promotion go beyond those for reappointment.

### **II. ALLOCATION OF EFFORT**

Each faculty member has a specific allocation of effort to teaching, research, and service. The standard allocation for Teaching Professors is one of the following:

- Option A: 100% Non-Tenure Track Appointment with workload of 85% teaching, 15% service; 4+4 teaching;
- Option B: 75% Non-Tenure Track Appointment with workload of 85/15; 3+3 teaching.

The allocation of effort will be considered to apply as an average over the months of any given academic year.

### **III. EVALUATION OF SERVICE**

A candidate's record of support of academic programs in the Department is an important criterion for evaluation of service. However, evaluation of service can also extend well beyond the Department to include the candidate's work on campus committees, college committees, or in professional societies. Criteria related to service also include the extent of editorial work, review for professional journals, professional societies, and publishers, as well as professional services to the nation, the state, or the public. All service is evaluated with regard to its importance and its success, as well as the faculty member's dedication to it.

Evidence related to service will consist of a description of the service and of its duration and significance. This information should be compiled on a continuous basis by candidates for promotion or reappointment. At the time of evaluation, evidence of service may be obtained from the candidate, from the Department, or from external sources. The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of service is as follows: Is the faculty member's performance in service consistent with the general standard for reappointment or promotion as described by the Rules of the Regents?

#### IV. EVALUATION OF TEACHING

To be rated excellent in teaching, the candidate must first meet baseline standards of satisfactory teaching, including:

- Maintaining competence in their discipline;
- Interpreting knowledge in a manner and level accessible to students;
- Fostering a climate that promotes inquiry, learning, and inclusivity;
- Preparing adequately for classes;
- Meeting classes as scheduled, and keeping posted office hours;
- Knowing and following campus policies regarding course requirements, grading standards, student conduct, and other administrative procedures;
- Evaluating students fairly and equitably, in a timely manner;
- Other basic teaching responsibilities.

Before reappointment, faculty should create a teaching portfolio that will contain written records sufficient to assess the faculty member's teaching (see criteria below). The department may obtain evidence from other sources to the extent that the information contained in the portfolio is incomplete with respect to any of the criteria identified below.

The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of teaching is as follows: Is the faculty member's demonstrated performance in teaching consistent with the general standard for reappointment or promotion, as described by the Rules of the Regents?

Teaching is evaluated based on a wide variety of criteria reflecting the many types of instruction that take place in the College of Arts and Sciences. The factors considered in determining whether or not a candidate has demonstrated excellent teaching include: the record of the candidate in classroom instruction, the quality and quantity of individualized instruction and mentoring the candidate has performed, contributions to the curriculum of the College, thoughtful preparation of course materials and syllabi, conscientious grading, involvement of students in research activities (for example, through the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program), work with the Faculty Teaching Excellence Program, and participation in professional pedagogical activities or organizations.

Undergraduate instruction is the focus for the evaluation of Teaching Professors' teaching. However, no single measure of effectiveness in undergraduate teaching will be the sole basis of judgement by the Department. In particular, faculty course questionnaire (FCQ) scores are



not to be given disproportionate weight and must be interpreted in light of other evidence. Criteria to be used in the evaluation of achievement in undergraduate teaching include:

1. Statements of teaching philosophy or self-evaluation of teaching;
2. Numerical FCQ scores from all classes;
3. Student comments from FCQ's from all classes;
4. Peer evaluations (by class visitation or other mechanisms);
5. Examples of course outlines, syllabi, examinations and other items that indicate the nature of instruction;
6. Descriptions of the development or improvement of coursework;
7. Written statements that may have come from the Chair or others concerning willingness to teach, rapport with students, important contributions to curriculum development, or other related matters.

Beyond formal classroom instruction, the following criteria will be included by the Department in its evaluation of teaching: advising services to undergraduate students, independent study or independent research projects involving undergraduate students, and activities promoting faculty-student interaction. In addition, a faculty member may submit, or the Department may consider at its own initiative, other evidence of teaching performance that seems appropriate for a particular individual.

## **V. PROMOTION**

Candidates for promotion should go beyond excellent classroom teaching and other standard activities that support classroom teaching. Relevant factors may include the following: evidence of exceptionally strong performance in individualized instruction of undergraduate students, substantial contributions to curriculum development (such as creating new certification or interdisciplinary programs, or developing an unusual number of innovative new courses), effective integration of service-learning and community-based activities into coursework, important visiting professorships or artist-in-residence appointments emphasizing teaching activities, effective teaching in residential academic programs or Honors Program, significant participation in professional pedagogical organizations, the publication of noteworthy pedagogical papers or textbooks. Receipt of college-wide or campus-wide teaching awards may be an indicator of an excellent teaching case but is not a prerequisite. Additional factors that are clearly documented will also be considered.

The dossier for a candidate for promotion to Full Teaching Professor should evince a "record of distinction," which carries the expectation that, in the areas of teaching and pedagogy, the individual has (a) made a major impact on the disciplinary unit(s) and on University of Colorado Boulder students, and/or (b) has participated in, and contributed to, national or international discussions.