

**The Department of Philosophy
Northern Michigan University
Bylaws**

Final Draft (agreed upon by Bylaw Review Committee): August 8, 2011

MEMBERSHIP

1.1. The voting membership of the Department of Philosophy shall consist only of bargaining unit members with full-time appointments in the Philosophy Department with either tenure track or continuing appointment status. A member of the Department on leave retains all membership rights during his/her leave, consistent with the contract. A tenured person on reduced or limited appointment retains all membership rights. A member on continuing appointment status retains all membership rights. Anyone on continuing appointment status retains all membership rights. Non tenure-track and non-continuing appointees will be invited to department meetings as non-voting guests.

OFFICERS

2.1. Department Head

- 2.1.1. The Head shall serve as the chief administrative officer of the Department and shall officially represent its faculty in its relationships with others.
- 2.1.1.1. The Head will consult with the Department on the Department's budget at least once a year and discuss with the faculty the ways the discretionary funds of the department might be expended. For example, the head might discuss with the faculty what films might be purchased or what electronic equipment, e.g., printer, is needed by the department.
- 2.1.1.2. In the event that the Head of the Philosophy Department is a member of the History Department, the Chair of the Committee of the Whole shall act as the Philosophy Coordinator and shall be responsible for making recommendations to the Head on matters such as scheduling of classes, faculty assignments, curriculum proposals approved by the faculty, recommendations for new positions approved by the faculty, or hiring recommendations approved by the faculty, and attending the Director and Department Heads meetings.
- 2.1.2. The Department's recommendation for Head shall be arrived at by the following procedure:
 - 2.1.2.1. The Department shall follow procedures outlined in the Master Agreement.
 - 2.1.2.2. Relative to the process of the Department formulating its recommendations, as articulated in the Master Agreement: When a search for a new Department Head has been approved, an *ad hoc* committee of two members

of the History Department and two members of the Philosophy Department shall be convened to serve as a Search Committee. After the Search Committee reports to the departments, using paper ballots in the History Department, a majority vote by each department shall select one or more candidates as the nominee(s) for Department Head and the name(s) shall be forwarded to the Dean.

2.1.2.3. If no candidate obtains a majority of each department's vote, the Search Committee shall reconvene and the process shall repeat.

2.1.2.4. The name(s) of the person(s) recommended by the Departments of History and Philosophy shall be communicated to the Dean by the History Department Faculty Secretary.

2.2. Faculty Secretary

2.2.1. There shall be a Faculty Secretary elected by the Department, whose functions shall include the recording of the minutes of Department meetings as well as other duties specified in these bylaws.

2.3. Academic Senate Representative

2.3.1. In accordance with the bylaws of the Academic Senate, the Department, at a meeting held between the ninth and the tenth week of the second semester every two years, shall elect the Department representative to the Academic Senate for a two year term. The procedure for election shall be as follows.

2.3.2. The Department Faculty Secretary shall distribute nomination ballots to all members of the faculty present at the meeting. One nomination shall be made on each ballot. The Head may not vote.

2.3.3. The ballots shall be counted immediately by the Faculty Secretary. A person receiving a simple majority of the ballots shall be declared elected.

2.3.4. Should there be no majority, the Department members present shall immediately cast a second ballot indicating a choice between the two candidates with the most votes; the candidate receiving the most votes on the second ballot shall be declared elected. A tie vote shall be decided by a toss of the coin by the Head of the Department.

2.3.5. The Faculty Secretary shall communicate the name of the representative to the Secretary of the Academic Senate.

2.4. Bargaining Council Representative

2.4.1. The procedure indicated for the election of Academic Senator shall apply for the election of a representative to the A.A.U.P. Bargaining Council.

2.4.2. The faculty representative on the Bargaining Council shall be elected at the beginning of each new contract for a term of three years.

- 2.4.3. A Department member may be Academic Senator and representative on the Bargaining Council at the same time.
- 2.4.4. The Faculty Secretary shall communicate the name of the representative to the Secretary of the Bargaining Unit.

STANDING COMMITTEES

3.1. Committee of the Whole

- 3.1.1. The Committee of the Whole shall consist of all voting faculty members of the Philosophy Department (as specified in §1.1) currently represented by the Northern Michigan Unit of the American Association of University Professors, including tenured faculty on reduced appointment.
- 3.1.2. The Chair of the Committee of the Whole shall be elected by the Committee of the Whole at the first meeting of the academic year and serve for two academic years, and also serve as the Philosophy Coordinator under the conditions specified in §2.1.1.2.

3.2. Search Committee

- 3.2.1. For each hiring of faculty, the Search Committee shall consist of all voting faculty members of the Philosophy Department (as specified in §1.1) currently represented by the Northern Michigan University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, including tenured faculty on reduced appointment unless the Committee of the Whole determines that one of the members of the Search Committee should be a faculty member from another department.
- 3.2.2. The Search Committee shall be responsible for the evaluation of the candidate pool and recommending finalists for campus interviews.
- 3.2.3. The Search Committee shall elect a faculty member from the Philosophy Department to serve as Chair of the Search Committee.
- 3.3. All other departmental committees shall function in an advisory capacity, making recommendations to the Department Head and the Committee of the Whole and carrying out those functions assigned or delegated to them.

3.4. Evaluation of the Department Head

- 3.4.1. The Department Head shall be evaluated in accordance with §3.1.2 of the Master Agreement.
- 3.4.2. The evaluation report and any written responses shall be forwarded by the Chair of the Committee of the Whole to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

MEETINGS

- 4.1. The Department shall meet at the beginning of each semester and establish a timetable for future meetings during the semester.
- 4.2. The Head or Department Coordinator may call other meetings of the Department.
- 4.3. Upon request of two members of the Department, the Head shall convene a meeting of the Department within five days.
- 4.4. The agenda for a meeting shall be set by whoever calls for the meeting and shall be made available to members at least two days prior to the meeting.
- 4.5. All matters subject to voting require a majority vote of voting members of the department. A majority vote of the members of the department by email or telephone will be expressive of the faculty's decisions or recommendations.

FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES

- 5.1. For faculty appointments, upon completion of the interview process, the Committee of the Whole shall, in accordance with §5.3 of the Master Agreement, select from among finalists the candidate for appointment by a majority vote.
- 5.2. All Annual Evaluations and Recommendations to the Department Head for tenure, promotion, continuing appointment or termination shall be by the Committee of the Whole (which also shall constitute the Department Evaluation Committee) except for any faculty member who is the subject of the recommendation. For recommendations regarding tenure and/or promotion, in the event that there are only two Departmental Members serving on the Committee of the Whole, the Committee of the Whole may, if it chooses, invite a third member from the College to serve on the Committee, with the stipulation that the invited member is agreeable to both the Committee of the Whole and to the candidate.
- 5.3. All recommendations for promotions, tenure, and non-reappointment must be approved by the Committee of the Whole in regular or special sessions.
 - 5.3.1. All relevant materials for application for tenure and/or promotion shall be delivered by the applicant to the Department Evaluation Committee (Committee of the Whole) no later than October 1 of the year of application.
 - 5.3.2. The Chair of the Department Evaluation Committee shall notify the members of the Evaluation Committee in writing within three work days that application materials have been filed by an applicant with the Department and that those materials are available for review in the Department office.
 - 5.3.3. The Committee of the Whole shall convey its decision to the applicant regarding the applications for tenure and/or promotion, and provide these

written recommendations to the applicants, not later than October 15 of the year of application. After the applicant responds to the Committee of the Whole within one week from receiving the report, the committee will send its recommendations to the Department Head by October 24.

- 5.3.4. The Department Head's recommendations and all relevant forms regarding applications for tenure and/or promotion shall be forwarded to the applicant not later than November 1 of the year of application. The applicant should try to respond with comments or supplemental material within four days so as to meet the deadline in §5.3.5.
- 5.3.5. All materials being moved forward in the application process shall be moved forward to the next reviewing body by the Department Head not later than November 8 of the year of application.
- 5.4. The most important criterion for tenure and/or promotion is effectiveness in the area of assigned responsibilities (criterion 1). Continued effectiveness in the area of assigned responsibilities shall be evidenced by the satisfactory fulfillment of §7.2.1 or §7.3.1 below. The second most important criterion for tenure and promotion can be either scholarship and/or professional development (criterion 2) or service (criterion 3). The relative emphasis on scholarship and/or professional development (criterion 2) or service (criterion 3) must be specified in evaluation materials each year, including the year of application.
 - 5.4.1. The determination of emphasis must be the result of dialogue between the faculty member, the Department Head, and the Committee of the Whole. Concurrence with the faculty member's relative emphasis on scholarship and/or professional development or service will be provided by the departmental evaluation committee and be subject to the approval of the department head.
 - 5.4.2. For the judgmental areas of scholarship and/or professional development and Service, the applicant, the Committee of the Whole, and the Department Head must have discussed the relative emphasis between these two areas and have discussed the kinds of achievements needed to meet the requirements of that relative emphasis as outlined in these by laws. The relative emphasis is subject to the approval of the department head.
 - 5.4.3. For promotion and for tenure, it is not expected that all examples given below for the three judgmental areas need be demonstrated. The demonstration of achievements for promotion and/or tenure is understood to be cumulative since appointment at NMU or since application for promotion to the preceding rank at NMU (or since the beginning of the prior service period when prior service credit has been granted at the time of appointment). These bylaws indicate types of activities that can be cited as evidence for promotion to the various ranks; the faculty member is encouraged to cite comparable

other activities.

5.5. Judgmental Criteria for Tenure

5.5.1. The judgmental criteria for promotion to associate professor, as specified in 7.2. below, and for the granting of tenure are the same. However, faculty do not have to apply for both at the same time.

5.6. Eligibility criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor

5.6.1. Promotion to Associate Professor or to Professor may be accelerated if the candidate can demonstrate unusual scholarly and/or professional service achievements

5.7. Judgmental Criteria for Promotion

5.7.1. For promotion to each of the three ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, the candidate for promotion shall be evaluated in the three judgmental areas: of assigned responsibility, (e.g., teaching and advising), scholarship and/or professional development, and service--specified in the Master Agreement.

5.7.2. For each judgmental area, the bylaws are structured as follows:

(A) Activities. An extensive, though not exhaustive, list of activities which count as achievements for the area in question.

(B) Evidence. Examples of the sorts of evidence (again, not exhaustive) that will support the claims to the various achievements.

(C) Standards. The standards for promotion in each of the areas of achievement. The standards are stated in terms of the activities referred to below.

5.7.3. With regards to the lists in (A) and (B) below, the lists are not meant to exclude other relevant professional activities, but it is the obligation of the candidates to explain why an additional activity which is not on the lists is comparable to the items which are on the lists. It is expected that much if not most of the evidence cited in the promotion application, though not necessarily all, will already have been discussed in the prior annual evaluations. The aim would be to have demonstrated most of the needed achievements over the course of the periodic evaluations so that the promotion document would be mostly a summary of the earlier evaluations. It is the obligation of the departmental evaluation committee to use the periodic evaluation process to make clear to candidates the extent of their progress toward promotion.

5.8. Activities that Fall Under Assigned Responsibilities

- 5.8.1. Being professionally prepared and competent as evidenced by the faculty narrative in the annual evaluations.
- 5.8.2. Creating well designed courses through:
 - 5.8.2.1. Syllabus construction.
 - 5.8.2.2. Choice of texts.
 - 5.8.2.3. Structure of assignments, e.g., assigned readings.
 - 5.8.2.4. Test construction.
 - 5.8.2.5. Paper assignments.
 - 5.8.2.6. Preparation of supplementary materials, e.g., class notes, study questions, guides to readings, power point presentations, etc.
- 5.8.3. Effectively implementing courses through:
 - 5.8.3.1. Giving presentations which are accurate, clear, informative, interesting, and relevant to the aims of the course.
 - 5.8.3.2. Interacting with students in ways which are respectful, encouraging, stimulating, challenging, and helpful.
 - 5.8.3.3. Legitimately evaluating students by, e.g., designing grading standards that are clear and fair, and applying the grading standards conscientiously.
 - 5.8.3.4. Effectively communicating with students by, e.g., maintaining office hours which are sufficient in number (through both scheduled and by appoint) and extent.
- 5.8.4. Critically evaluating and adjusting teaching where it seems beneficial.
- 5.8.5. Other meritorious teaching activities:
 - 5.8.5.1. Developing new philosophy courses. Especially meritorious is the development of courses which require the faculty member to develop a new area of expertise.
 - 5.8.5.2. Teaching existing courses which lie outside the range of one's areas of specialization and training.
 - 5.8.5.3. Revising the content, requirements, or structure of an existing course to keep it current and incorporate new developments from the literature.
 - 5.8.5.4. Developing courses for the web or other new learning platforms.
 - 5.8.5.5. Giving directed studies to increase the probability that students will gain admission to a good graduate school or to help students graduate in a timely manner.
 - 5.8.5.6. Provide additional instruction to philosophy majors and minors when they are enrolled in philosophy courses which receive liberal study credit and hence are populated by mostly non-philosophy students.

- 5.8.5.7. Creating an online minor or major.
- 5.8.5.8. Evaluating (e.g., by outcomes assessment) and/or redesigning the curriculum for the major or minor, the liberal studies requirement, or the university graduation requirement.

5.9. Evidence of Assigned Responsibilities

- 5.9.1. Examples of evidence for Assigned Responsibility Activities include, but are not limited to:
- 5.9.2. A summary of student evaluations with the evaluations themselves as backup materials kept in the departmental files.
- 5.9.3. Letters or reports from colleagues describing peer evaluations of classroom visits, test construction, or other teaching materials or activities.
- 5.9.4. Copies of classroom materials which the candidate created.
- 5.9.5. Summaries of student evaluations for courses taught since the last promotion.
- 5.9.6. Copies of the faculty member's self evaluation of his teaching.
- 5.9.7. Descriptions of what the faculty members consider the most interesting ideas they discovered by attending teaching workshops and conferences or by reading articles on teaching.
- 5.9.8. Copies of exams and paper assignments, and copies of graded exams and papers.
- 5.9.9. Continued effectiveness in the area of assigned responsibilities shall be evidenced by the achievement of goals identified in this area in prior evaluations.

5.10. Activities that Count as Scholarship

- 5.10.1. Scholarship involves one or more of the four (4) forms of scholarship: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; the scholarship of teaching. All forms of scholarship must involve the production of a tangible artifact or outcome. For most forms of scholarship, peer review is expected. In the references to scholarship below, it is important to note that the four forms of scholarship: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, the scholarship of teaching count equally and faculty can choose to work in either one or more of these four areas.
- 5.10.2. **The scholarship of discovery** involves original production or testing of a theory, principle, knowledge, or artistic creation. Artifacts or outcomes include:
 - 5.10.2.1. A traditional experimental, survey, quantitative and/or qualitative study and

research.

- 5.10.2.2. An essay, article, or book chapter that express an original contribution to philosophical understanding.
- 5.10.2.3. A book, monograph, or book review that articulates an original contribution to philosophical understanding.
- 5.10.2.4. A literary work for example fiction or non-fiction writing that expresses an original contribution to philosophical understanding.
- 5.10.2.5. A presentation (e.g., paper, commentary) at a professional conference, Agency, or Society that expresses an original contribution to philosophical understanding.
- 5.10.2.6. A public presentation to faculty and/or students that expresses an original contribution to philosophical understanding.
- 5.10.2.7. An article submitted for review to a journal of the profession.
- 5.10.3. **The scholarship of integration** involves using knowledge found within and across disciplines to create an original understanding or insight that reveals larger intellectual patterns. Artifacts or outcomes include:
 - 5.10.3.1. A textbook or synthesis that summarizes what is known about a topic or process.
 - 5.10.3.2. An edited anthology.
 - 5.10.3.3. Integrating knowledge of/research into other disciplines (e.g., psychology, physics, law, or environmental science) into an existing course or into development of a new interdisciplinary course.
 - 5.10.3.4. An essay, presentation, article, or other text that integrates traditional philosophical knowledge with other forms of related thinking or activities (e.g., a philosophical analysis of eastern medical practices or spiritual healing activities).
 - 5.10.3.5. A theoretical analysis.
 - 5.10.3.6. A professional presentation.
- 5.10.4. **The scholarship of application** involves bringing knowledge to bear in addressing a significant issue or problem by using existing research or creative activities to address or influence current or future conditions. Artifacts or outcomes include:
 - 5.10.4.1. Providing expert testimony.
 - 5.10.4.2. Production of a technical report.
 - 5.10.4.3. A substantive grant proposal.
 - 5.10.4.4. White paper associated with consultancies or grants.

- 5.10.4.5. Public policy analysis.
- 5.10.4.6. A professional presentation.
- 5.10.4.7. A scholarly review of a professionally related publication or manuscript.
- 5.10.4.8. Service on a committee where one's expert philosophical knowledge is relevant.
- 5.10.5. **The scholarship of teaching** involves proposing and empirically testing a pedagogical procedure that transforms or improves teaching practices. Artifacts or outcomes include:
 - 5.10.5.1. A systematic comparison of learning environments,
 - 5.10.5.2. An impact analysis for learning activities beyond the classroom (such as academic service learning),
 - 5.10.5.3. A systematic assessment of teaching methodologies,
 - 5.10.5.4. Writing/preparing peer reviewed pedagogical material that draws on the professional training and scholarly capability of the faculty member and are evaluated for their effectiveness.
 - 5.10.5.5. A review of a textbook for publisher
 - 5.10.5.6. A written report analyzing student outcomes
 - 5.10.5.7. The creation of extensive materials for a web-based course.
 - 5.10.5.8. A professional presentation.
- 5.11. Peer Review**
 - 5.11.1. Common types of peer review include, but are not limited to:
 - 5.11.2. Publication in a peer reviewed journal,
 - 5.11.3. A presentation of scholarly work as a result of a competitive selection process.
 - 5.11.4. A written review of one's research (e.g., from a colleague),
 - 5.11.5. An evaluation of a grant proposal.
 - 5.11.6. A peer letter acknowledging scholarly accomplishments.
 - 5.11.7. An invitation to present scholarly work, or review the work of other(s) (e.g., at a meeting, or for a publisher).
 - 5.11.8. Receiving a professional award.
 - 5.11.9. Obtaining a grant.
- 5.12. Activities That Count as Professional Development**
 - 5.12.1. Professional development includes activities intended to maintain currency in

one's discipline, developing new professionally related expertise, or participation in other professionally related activities that don't necessarily result in a scholarly outcome. Examples of professional development are:

- 5.12.2. Attending professional conferences.
- 5.12.3. Attending professional workshops.
- 5.12.4. Developing a new, or maintaining a current, certification.
- 5.12.5. Obtaining an additional degree or training related to one's field and/or research or other relevant professional development interests.
- 5.12.6. Engaging in post-doctoral work designed to expand one's professional competence.
- 5.12.7. Other appropriate professional activities, when confirmed by the departmental evaluation committee.

5.13. Evidence of Scholarship and/or Professional Development

- 5.13.1. Evidence for scholarship and/or professional development include, but are not limited to the following:
- 5.13.2. Draft of article(s).
- 5.13.3. Copy of article(s) submitted for publication.
- 5.13.4. Copy of article(s) accepted for publication.
- 5.13.5. Letter(s) of acceptance for publication.
- 5.13.6. Copy of book(s) published or accepted for publication.
- 5.13.7. Copy of book contract(s).
- 5.13.8. Letter(s) of rejection for publication that speak to the quality of the proposed article or the revisions necessary for publication.
- 5.13.9. Consulting report(s) submitted.
- 5.13.10. Copy of review(s) of manuscripts or books.
- 5.13.11. Acknowledgement of receipt of review or referee report.
- 5.13.12. Letter(s) of support from organization(s) for which one has consulted.
- 5.13.13. Grant proposal(s) submitted or accepted.
- 5.13.14. Copy of registration forms for conference(s) attended.
- 5.13.15. Copy of paper(s) or commentaries delivered at a conference(s).

SERVICE

6.1. Activities that Count as Service

6.1.1. The list below is not meant to be exhaustive. However, if the candidate wishes other sorts of activities to count, he/she must provide reasons for thinking such activities are comparable to the following.

6.1.2. The department recognizes the following three levels of service:

6.2. Support

6.2.1. Support refers to support for the functions of the department, college, university, or profession by

6.2.2. Serving as a member on NMU committees at the level of: (1) the Department, and (2) the College, or (3) the University, or

6.2.3. Serving in a mentoring capacity with new faculty, or

6.2.4. Serving as the official advisor to philosophy students, or

6.2.5. Participating in programs with elementary or secondary schools or teachers,

6.2.6. Engaging in student recruitment events and campus visits, or

6.2.7. Contributing time and expertise to further the work of a professional society or organization, or

6.2.8. Participating in collaborative endeavors with schools, human service agencies, or civic groups, or

6.2.9. Communicating in popular and non-academic media including newsletters, radio, television, and magazines.

6.3. Significant

6.3.1. Professionally related service to the community, such as serving on review panels for human or animal research or serving on ethics committees associated with health care, or

6.3.2. Serving as the official advisor of a student organization, or student activity projects or other comparable service to the student body, or

6.3.3. Serving as the adviser to the philosophy club, or

6.3.4. Serving professionally related associations at the local, state or national levels by:

6.3.4.1. (1) Serving on committees, or

6.3.4.2. (2) Chairing sessions at professional meetings, or

6.3.4.3. (3) Making other contributions to a professional association comparable to those mentioned in §§6.3.4.1 and 6.3.4.2, or

6.3.4.4. Serving as a referee for a professional journal.

6.4. Exceptional

- 6.4.1. Serving as an officer, e.g. chairperson, of a college or university committee or professional association, or
- 6.4.2. Directing, chairing, or organizing divisions, conferences, workshops, symposia, or seminars related to one's professional interests, or
- 6.4.3. Serving as an Editor or reviewer for a professional organization publication, grant agency, journal, or university press, or
- 6.4.4. Writing significant committee reports, or
- 6.4.5. Leading a study abroad experience for students, or
- 6.4.6. Accompanying majors at philosophy conferences.

6.5. Evidence of Service

- 6.5.1. It is expected that some of the evidence of service work during the probation period will have been discussed in the periodic evaluations of the promotion period. While evidence for all service activities need not be described in each periodic evaluation, it is reasonable to expect that some evidence will be described in each periodic evaluation. For example, if the candidate serves on three committees during the promotion period, it would be proper to list all three in three consecutive periodic evaluations but provide evidence of some detail on only the service to one of the committees in the first evaluation, on service to a second committee in the next evaluation, etc. Examples of appropriate evidence include, but are not limited to:
 - 6.5.2. A description of the work of the committee to which the candidate contributed and the nature of that contribution, or
 - 6.5.3. Letters from committee member(s), especially the chairperson, attesting to the candidate's service to the committee, or
 - 6.5.4. Copies of reports, etc., to which the candidate was a major contributor (candidates should indicate the nature of their contribution to the reports, etc.), or
 - 6.5.5. Copies of conference programs indicating chair or director, or
 - 6.5.6. Copies of membership lists for the committee in question, or
 - 6.5.7. Peer or colleague letters attesting to the candidates service.

STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

7.1. To Assistant Professor

- 7.1.1. An earned doctorate from an accredited institution. Exceptions may be made because of unusual scholarly and/or professional achievements.
- 7.1.2. Assigned Responsibilities

- 7.1.2.1. Excellence in teaching as evidenced by: (1) satisfactory student evaluations on the student evaluation question evaluating the faculty member's overall performance, and colleague evaluations (as described in 5.9.3.), and (2) effective performance in the other activities described in §§ 5.8.1. through 5.8.4.
- 7.1.3. Scholarship and/or Professional Development
 - 7.1.3.1. When this is *not* the area of emphasis, it must include: The adoption of a research agenda.
 - 7.1.3.2. When this *is* the area of emphasis, it must include: The adoption of a research agenda, and one example of peer reviewed scholarship or one example of professional development.
- 7.1.4. Service
 - 7.1.4.1.** When this is *not* the area of emphasis, it must include: at least two instances of service at the Support Level described in §6.2.
 - 7.1.4.2.** When this *is* the area of emphasis, it must include at least two instances of service at the Support Level described in §6.2 and at least one contribution at the Significant Level described in §6.3.
- 7.2. To Associate Professor**
 - 7.2.1. Assigned Responsibilities
 - 7.2.1.1. Satisfactory evaluations on the student evaluation question evaluating the faculty member's overall performance. This is a cumulative average not to be construed as a one course event, e.g., as in a case where trying out a new teaching technique did not turn out as expected.
 - 7.2.1.2. Effective performance in the activities described in §§ 5.8.1. – 5.8.4. and at least one of the activities described in §5.8.5. Effective performance of other activities in §5.8.5 can provide significant additional support for promotion.
 - 7.2.2. Scholarship and/or Professional Development**
 - 7.2.2.1. When this is *not* the area of emphasis, it is sufficient for meeting the scholarship and/or professional development standard for promotion to associate professor that the following conditions are met: the adoption of a research agenda, at least one example of peer reviewed scholarship, and two examples of professional development.
 - 7.2.2.2. When this is the area of emphasis, it is sufficient for meeting the scholarship and/or professional development standard for promotion to associate professor to meet the conditions in §7.2.2.1 and have *either* the publication of a peer reviewed book or monograph, *or* at least two additional achievements in peer reviewed scholarship and one additional achievement in professional development.

7.2.3. Service

7.2.3.1. When this is *not* area of emphasis, it is a necessary condition of all applicants for this rank to have at least two instances at the Support Level described in §6.2 (apart from membership on the Committee of the Whole) and at least one contribution at the Significant Level described in §6.3.

7.2.3.2. When this *is* area of emphasis, it is both necessary and sufficient that there be at least two instances at the Support Level described in §6.2 (apart from membership on the Committee of the Whole), at least one instance at the Significant Level described in §6.3, and at least one instance the Exceptional Level described in §6.4. It is possible that some of these achievements could be concentrated in one of the categories, or spread over a number of categories

7.3. To Professor

7.3.1. Assigned Responsibilities

7.3.1.1. The primary basis for meeting this standard is essentially the same as that for the standard for promotion to associate professor: effective performance in the activities described in §§5.8.1–5.8.4 and at least some of the activities described in §5.8.5. At the same time, measures should be taken to improve one's teaching, where possible. Below are some achievements which would show that this is the case:

Below are some achievements that would show this is the case:

- (a) Increased student satisfaction with courses, as evidenced, where possible, by student evaluations.
- (b) Efforts at improving pedagogy. For example, by improving the curriculum by creating and teaching new courses or significantly transforming existing courses.

7.3.2. Scholarship and/or Professional Development

7.3.2.1. When this is *not* the area of emphasis, it is sufficient for meeting the scholarship and/ or professional development standard for promotion to professor to do the following: adopt a research agenda, and have at least two examples of peer reviewed scholarship *and* two examples of professional development.

7.3.2.2. When this *is* the area of emphasis, it is necessary to meet the standards in §7.3.2.1. In addition to these, it will be sufficient for meeting the scholarship and/or professional development standard for promotion to professor to have either a publication of a peer reviewed book or monograph, or four additional examples from a combination of scholarship and/or professional

development. At least two of these examples must be instances of peer reviewed scholarship.

7.3.3. Service

7.3.3.1. When not area of emphasis, it is both necessary and sufficient for meeting the service standard for promotion to professor that all applicants for this rank have at least two instances at the Support Level described in §6.2 (apart from membership on the Committee of the Whole) and one instance at the Exceptional Level described in §6.4.

7.3.3.2. When service *is* the area of emphasis, it is sufficient for meeting the service standard for promotion to professor that all applicants for this have at least two instances at the Support Level described in §6.2 (apart from membership on the Committee of the Whole) and four additional instances of service, at least two of which must be at the Exceptional Level described in §6.4.

MISCELLANEOUS

8.1. Professional Development Money

8.1.1. The Department shall distribute professional development money in accordance with §§6.5.2.4 and 6.5.2.4.1 of the Master Agreement.

8.2. Spring Session, Summer Session, Overload, and Off-Campus Courses

8.2.1. Additional assignments shall be made in accordance with the Master Agreement and a departmental rotation list.

8.2.2. Directed studies are not a matter of assignment but shall be guided by the Master Agreement. They adhere to the program and person and are voluntary. No rotation list shall apply.

8.3. Sabbatical Leave

8.3.1. The department enthusiastically supports sabbatical leaves on a regular basis for maintaining a high level of professional competence and enthusiasm among the faculty. The Committee of the whole, in conjunction with the department head, will evaluate and vote on sabbatical applications. The Department has established the following criteria for granting support to application for sabbatical leaves.

8.3.2. The Department supports both types of sabbaticals (i.e. professional development and research/scholarship/creative works) recognized in §8.1.3 of the Master Agreement, and therefore recognizes as eligible for support applications for sabbatical leave which have as their primary purpose any or all of the following objectives:

8.3.2.1. Travel which would enrich the faculty member's critical appreciation of other

cultures.

- 8.3.2.2. Extensive reading and study in order to develop greater depth-of knowledge in an area of expertise or competence, or to explore new areas of knowledge.
- 8.3.2.3. The pursuit of any of the four forms of scholarship or professional development.
- 8.3.3. Sabbatical leaves shall be evaluated according to criteria specified in and consistent with the Master Agreement. In evaluating sabbatical applications, the department will consider the following criteria:
 - 8.3.3.1. A proposal must qualify under §§8.1.3.1 or 8.1.3.2 of the Master Agreement
 - 8.3.3.2. Proposals will be judged as worthy of support and ranked on the basis or the following considerations:
 - 8.3.3.2.1. Length of time since initial or end of last sabbatical.
 - 8.3.3.2.2. Intellectual quality of proposal. The department will take into consideration the following factors: is the goal of the leave clearly articulated? Does the plan of the sabbatical make it likely that the goal can be achieved? Does the proposal show an awareness of the relevant literature and issues?
 - 8.3.3.2.3. Professional qualifications of faculty member such as prior publications or other indications of scholarly ability to carry out the plan of the sabbatical.
 - 8.3.3.2.4. The value of the proposal to: the discipline of philosophy, the faculty member's professional development, the Department, the University, and Society.

AMENDMENTS

- 9.1. Proposed amendments to these bylaws shall be circulated in writing to all members of the Department at least one week prior to the meeting at which they are to be introduced and discussed.
- 9.2. Adoption of bylaw amendments shall be governed by the procedures specified in Article 3 of the Agreement.