

Department of Philosophy Personnel Policy and Procedures

Revised February 2017

Revised Dec. 2020

Approved by A&S Personnel Committee, Dec. 2020

Approved by A&S Dean's Office, Jan. 2021 *Susan M Ryan*

**1. Faculty Appointments and Tenure**

There are three general types of full-time faculty appointments: (1) nontenurable; (2) probationary; and (3) tenure. For descriptions of these classifications, see Redbook, Sections 4.1.2-4.1.4, and Personnel Policy and Procedures: College of Arts and Sciences, Sections 1.2-1.4. In addition, faculty may be part-time. For a description of this classification, see Redbook, Section 4.1.1.B and A&S Personnel Policy and Procedures, Section 1.1.

**2. Faculty Personnel Reviews**

Personnel reviews shall be based upon peer evaluation of a documentary record that includes qualitative and quantitative evidence of performance. Proficiency in the areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service shall normally be required of all faculty members, unless responsibility for some area or areas is excepted in this document or specified in writing at the time of the initial appointment. See Redbook, Section 4.2, and A&S Personnel Policy and Procedures, Article 2.

**2.1 Annual Reviews**

**A. Areas of Activity**

The personnel reviews of the Department shall consider evidence in the areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service (hereafter the area of "research and creative activity" will be referred to simply as "research"). The reviews will recognize performance in the short term and seek to reinforce desirable patterns of career advancement and to foster the development of excellence in the Department. Performance evaluations shall be based on merit, including contributions to the missions of the Department, Division, College, and University. Evaluations must consider those areas of activity for which the approved annual work plan indicates a faculty member's responsibility, and no faculty member may be penalized for non-performance in any area of activity for which the faculty member has no assigned responsibility. Faculty members may be rewarded for activities that are not represented on their Annual Work Plan.

**B. Annual Work Plan**

1. Before the beginning of each academic year, each full-time faculty member shall sign an Annual Work Plan that describes the allocation of work planned for the academic year, in the categories of teaching, research, and service.
2. Annual Work Plans must be consistent with the needs of the Department, Division, and College, and must fall within the limitations imposed by the budget.
3. The allocation of work shall be expressed in terms of percentage of effort represented by each activity. The standard, in comparison to which the effort represented by each activity shall be estimated, is that normally a three credit hour course requires ten percent of the academic year work load of a faculty member. To allocate effort to courses using some standard other than this one shall require justification acceptable to the Dean's Office.

4. Each full-time faculty member, including faculty on sabbatical leave, must account for 100 percent of a workload on the Annual Work Plan, by listing specific teaching responsibilities, research projects, and service activities.
5. We recognize that on occasion it is unclear which of the three categories (teaching, research, and service) an activity falls under, and that an activity may fall under more than one category. A decision on such matters may require consultation between the reviewee and the Personnel Committee. We have, for example, typically included critical book reviews, translations, and some kinds of editing under the category of research.
6. The Annual Work Plans of probationary faculty should in general include service, but should also exempt them from involvement in decisions or activities that may threaten their review process, and should protect them from service that is likely to impede their successful progress toward tenure.
7. Alterations in the Annual Work Plan may be made during the academic year, subject to the approval of the Chair and the Dean's Office.

#### C. Procedures

1. Each full-time faculty member shall be reviewed annually. The annual reviews shall become part of the record for all subsequent personnel reviews and the basis for salary increases. Annual reviews shall take into consideration achievement for the year under review and the two years preceding it. Individual faculty members will be responsible for maintaining the documentation supporting each annual review through the next tenure, promotion, or periodic career review.
2. Extramural review is optional for annual review.
3. Annual review may take into account career patterns of accomplishments as reflected in the curriculum vitae and in any submitted statement of progress.
4. Materials to be submitted for annual review:
  - a. Unless otherwise requested (see 4.b), each faculty member must submit to the Personnel Committee (1) a summary of activity for the review period; (2) a curriculum vitae; (3) Annual Work Plans for the three years relevant to the review; (4) documentation of the research activities mentioned in the summary (such as reprints of publications and copies of conference papers); and (5) information relevant to quality of instruction for the review period, including copies of results of student evaluations for all courses taught at the University of Louisville during the review period. The Personnel Committee may also request further documentation of performance. The Personnel Committee will inform the faculty of the deadline for submitting these materials to the Committee, in light of the Annual Calendar of Deadlines from the Dean's Office. The Personnel Committee shall submit a performance evaluation of each faculty member, based on the submitted materials, to the Chair.
  - b. In years that the Department Chair and Personnel Committee Chair declare to be "exceptional" due to circumstances outside the Department's control, each faculty member may omit items (1) and (4) from the list of requested material in 4.a, and instead submit a CV in

which they clearly indicate all activities and achievements that fall in the three-year window for review.

5. The Chair will take the Personnel Committee's review into consideration and will write an independent performance evaluation. If the Chair disagrees with the Committee's review, the Chair shall clarify the points of disagreement and explain the differing evaluation. When the annual review identifies problems, the Chair's evaluation must include specific recommendations for improvement or for possible adjustments in workload concentration. The reviews of both the Personnel Committee and the Chair shall be forwarded to the Dean.
6. Each faculty member will be informed of the performance evaluation in writing and shall be given the opportunity to respond to the Personnel Committee's and the Chair's evaluations and to any recommendations for improvement or for salary adjustment. The reviewee will also have the opportunity to correct factual errors in the Committee's and Chair's reports. If any such corrections appear relevant to the outcome of the review, the reviewee may also request that the Committee or Chair consider revising reports in light of the corrections.<sup>8</sup>In cases where a faculty member has a joint appointment, the annual review will be conducted in accordance with procedures established in the Dean's Guidelines.
7. A minimum of three faculty members will serve as the Department's Personnel Committee. An alternate will be chosen to serve on the reviews of members of the Committee. If possible, probationary faculty will be discouraged from serving more than once on the Personnel Committee during the probationary period. No person may participate during deliberation of his or her own case. If it is impossible to form a qualified committee of three faculty members in a given department, that committee will be augmented. The chair of the Personnel Committee shall submit to the Dean a list of proposed members from the College and the Dean will make the selection. The reviewee has the right of peremptory challenge up to the number of three before this list is submitted to the Dean.
8. Department committees, Chairs or the Dean may request to see evidence of performance at any stage of the review process.

#### D. Evaluation of Performance

1. Each faculty member will receive an overall performance evaluation, in which performance is evaluated as
  - (1) not proficient,
  - (2) proficient,
  - (3) highly proficient, or
  - (4) exceptional. These terms are defined as follows:
    1. "Not proficient": not contributing significantly to the mission of the Department, or in the worst case, actually impeding the mission of the Department.

2. “Proficient”: contributing significantly to the mission of the Department, in proportion to the allocation of work on the Annual Work Plan.
3. “Highly proficient”: meeting the criteria for Proficient performance, but also exceeding departmental expectations in areas representing between 25 and 49 percent of Annual Work Plan allocations.
4. “Exceptional”: meeting the criteria for Proficient performance, but also exceeding departmental expectations in areas representing at least 50 percent of Annual Work Plan allocations.

## 2. General Assumptions

1. The Annual Evaluation is an evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in the year under review and the prior two years. While made annually, this evaluation judges the performance of the faculty member through a three-year moving time frame.
2. The faculty member’s AWP average in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service, shall be taken into account in the DPC’s evaluation.
3. It is not feasible to quantify the relative performance of faculty members. The DPC shall use the following as a set of guidelines, while recognizing that there are innumerable considerations for deviating from the guidelines. The DPC shall be especially concerned to make the reasons for its judgment clear when deviation from these guidelines is warranted. Ultimately, the DPC shall begin from these guidelines in conducting a holistic review of the performance of the faculty member.
4. Annual reviews of faculty who have not been with us for the full three years of the review period shall not require quantitatively the same amount of contribution as it does of those who have been with us for the full period. Such faculty are to meet expectations appropriate to the number of their years here.
5. Members of the Department are to be reminded that according to College practice simply meeting departmental expectations on an annual basis offers no guarantee of a favorable tenure review.

## 3. Teaching

1. The DPC shall consider all evidence of effective teaching provided by the faculty member. Such evidence will consist of, but not be limited to, directing M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations, serving as a member of M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertation committees, serving as a director of Honors papers or as a member of Honors Committees, conducting independent studies, revision of current courses and initiation of new courses, and student load. Student evaluations are also to be considered as evidence of the effectiveness of teaching, while the DPC recognizes the problems associated with these, such as reliability, validity, and bias.

### i. Student evaluations

Far exceeds expectations = 4.5 or higher

Exceeds expectations = 4.0-4.4

Meets expectations = 3.0-3.9

Fails to meet expectations = 2.9 or lower

#### 4. Service

1. Assuming the average AWP% dedicated to service across all Full-time non-administrative faculty in the Philosophy Department, the following are the Service Rankings:
  - i. **Far exceeds expectations** = Significant achievements in the area of service that clearly go beyond those outlined for exceeds expectations.
  - ii. **Exceeds expectations** = Either adequately perform at least four of the service commitments from the list provided below in 3.2, or be judged to be performing exceptionally as chair. For each 5% above departmental AWP average for service, the minimum number for a ranking of exceeds expectations shall increase by one. Except in extraordinary circumstances, no one shall be judged to exceed expectations in service unless at least *two* of their service functions are service to the department.
  - iii. **Meets expectations** = either adequately perform two of the service commitments in 3.2, or perform adequately as chair.
  - iv. **Fails to meet expectations** = failure to adequately perform two of the service commitments in 3.2 or failure to perform adequately as chair.
2. Possible Service Commitments:

Vice Chair

Undergraduate Advisor

Graduate advisor

Recording Secretary

Personnel Committee

Speaker's Program

BETH program core faculty/ethics committee/IRB

College Committee/college governance

University Committee/university governance

Professional governance and/or service

Community boards

Ad Hoc Committees

#### 5. Research and Creative Activity

1. The DPC shall consider all evidence of productivity in the area of research and creative activity. Listed below are general RCA categories. The first three involve publications (includes works 'in press' that are accepted with no further revisions) and the last two involve additional achievements. These categories are not absolute, and the DPC may choose to place a particular achievement in a higher category for specific reasons.
  - i. Category 1  
Single authored books; Co-authored books (1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> author); Editions of Medieval and Classical Works; Translations that make an independent contribution to the scholarly literature, e.g. Medieval and Classical Works.

ii. Category 2

Coauthored books (3<sup>rd</sup> author or later); Refereed journal articles; Chapters in scholarly anthologies (including introductions in edited anthologies); Introductions in critical editions; Edited book; Major external grant application; Major encyclopedia articles; Edited special issues of journals.

iii. Category 3

Notes and commentaries in journals; Book reviews; Brief encyclopedia entries; miscellaneous publications or non-refereed articles.

iv. Category 4

Paper presentations in scholarly settings, including conferences and external departments, whether invited or refereed (however, the same paper shall not be counted twice even if presented twice).

v. Category 5

Popular op-ed-style articles grounded in one's expertise; responses to/comments on others' work in scholarly settings; and all other presentations of one's own research/expertise – including papers and brown bags in this department or other departments in the Louisville area or where one is resident at the time of presentation, Grand Rounds, and Public talks where one publicizes one's own expertise

2. Research and Creative Activity Rankings (assuming departmental average AWP percentage)

**Far exceeds expectations** = One Category 1 publication or seven Category 2 publications

**Exceeds expectations** = Three to six Category 2 publications

**Meets expectations** = Two Category 2 publications; OR one Category 2 publication plus two additional RCA achievements (Category 4 or 5); OR four additional RCA achievements at least two of which are Category 4.

**Fails to meet expectations** = Less achievements than outlined above in meets expectations.

## 6. Overall Merit Evaluations

1. The overall merit evaluation is determined in part by the following rubric

**Far exceeds expectations** = Far exceeds in two of the major areas (Teaching, Service, and Research and Creative Activity) and at least exceeds in the third.

**Exceeds Expectations** = At least exceeds in two of the major areas and at least meets expectations in the third

**Meets expectations** = At least meets expectations in the three major areas or at least exceeds in one major area and meets expectations in another

**Fails to meet expectations** = Less than meets expectations

7. The annual review of the department Chair shall be conducted by the Personnel Committee according to the standards defined above, except that the Chair shall in addition be reviewed for her or his administrative services. To this end, the Personnel Committee may solicit assessments of the Chair's administrative performance from individuals in the University who have worked with the Chair as an administrator, as identified by the Chair together with the Personnel Committee. In addition to the criteria listed above (S. 2.1.D.1-7), "Proficient" performance as Chair shall entail: (1) open and timely communication with all members of the Department; (2) efficient, effective handling of routine Department responsibilities concerning students, staff, and faculty; (3) fair and democratically supported resolution of problems within the Department; (4) effective advocacy of the Department within the college and University; and (5) helpful support and leadership in departmental planning.
8. The annual review serves as the basis for merit salary increases, but it is also intended to serve several other, less tangible purposes: it allows the Department to stay informed about the activities of its faculty; it allows the Department to recognize and take pride in the effort, achievements, and career developments of its faculty.

### E. Distribution of funds

1. The evaluation of a faculty member's performance as not proficient, proficient, highly proficient, or exceptional shall be the basis for distribution of salary increases, when money for such increases is available.
2. When money for salary increases is available to the Department, funds permitting, an initial pool will be set aside for a Cost of Living Adjustment (CLA) equal to the total percentage change in Cost of Living for Urban Consumers (CPI-U) since the previous raise, as calculated by the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics. The CLA pool shall be calculated by multiplying the CPI-U since the previous salary increase by the total of full-time faculty salaries. Each faculty member who has been evaluated as Proficient or higher at least once since the previous increase will receive an equal share of this CLA pool.

3. Any additional monies available once the Cost of Living Adjustment has been fully funded shall be available for merit increases. The following system shall determine how such monies are distributed. Each evaluation will be associated with a numerical point value:
  - a. Not Proficient: 0 Points.
  - b. Proficient: 1 Point.
  - c. Highly Proficient: 1.1 Points.
  - d. Exceptional: 1.25 Points.
  - e. The point values for all the faculty members will be added together, and available merit funds will be divided by that sum of points, to determine the value of a single “share.” Each faculty member will then receive the result of multiplying that share by the point value associated with their ranking.
4. We note that our policy attempts to follow the spirit of Redbook Section 4.2.1, which states that “Administrative officers and appropriate faculty bodies shall protect faculty members from inequities in salary.”

## **2.2. Pretenure, Tenure, Promotion, and Periodic Career Reviews**

All reviews in these categories are governed by the Redbook, Sections 4.2.2-4.2.4 and the A&S Personnel Policy and Procedures, Sections 2.2-2.4.