

: 1-11 # 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

Department of Philosophy Policy Statements

#

#

Contents

Workload Policy.....	2
Policy on Scheduling of Classes	5
Spring – Summer Rotation Policy	6
Policy on Program Requirements and Degree Requirements	7
Budget Policy	8
Policy on Grading	9
Policy on Evaluation of Chairperson	10
Departmental Evaluative Criteria	11
Appointment Policy	13
Reappointment Policy.....	14
Tenure Policy	15
Promotion Policy	17
Policy on Sabbatical Leaves	19
Policy on Merit Pay	20
Policy on Revision, Addition, or Amendment.....	22
Policy on Graduate Faculty.....	23

Department of Philosophy

Workload Policy

The department recommends that in assigning and calculating workload, the chair be guided by the following principles:

In the Department of Philosophy, a 12-hour workload will be considered normal. Each member of the faculty should account for 12 hours per semester from the sources detailed below. The chief goals of this policy are to ensure compliance with relevant university policy, to ensure compliance with the faculty contract, and to provide equitable workloads for all faculty members. Faculty members will track their own workload each semester, and should submit a short report on their workload to the department at the beginning of each semester. These records will be kept on file in the department office, and will be available for all faculty members. All workload credits detailed below are credits for work done in one semester. In any case where a variable number of credits are specified by this policy, the department will recommend to the department chair how such credits shall be assigned, and the chair should report to the department how such credits were actually assigned.

Lecturing/Teaching:

Each credit hour of an undergraduate course for which a faculty member is the primary instructor should count one hour towards the faculty member's workload. If several faculty members are team-teaching a course (each instructor attends every class meeting and all instructors are jointly responsible for the entire course), they should all receive full credit for the course. If two or more faculty members are sharing a course (each instructor attends and is responsible for only some of the class meetings, possibly under the coordination of a single faculty member), they shall jointly decide how the hours for that course should be allocated between them in consultation with the department chair. If the course is a standard course, the maximum number of students should be 45, except by agreement of the instructor. If the course is at the 4000-level or is a writing-intensive course, the maximum number of students should be 25, except by agreement of the instructor. If the course is at the 5000-level or above, the maximum number of students should be 15, except by the agreement of the instructor.

Large Classes:

If a faculty member is teaching a standard course with more than 45 students, or a 4000-level or writing-intensive course with more than 25 students, he or she should receive additional workload credit over and above the amount described in the paragraph immediately above. For enrollments not significantly lower than two times the above numbers, the faculty member should be credited with two workload credit hours per credit hour of the course. For enrollments not significantly lower than three times the above numbers, the faculty member should be credited with three workload credit hours per credit hour of the course. Faculty members who coordinate a multiple-section course should receive an additional hour of workload credit over and above any credits they would otherwise receive.

Advanced Classes:

If a faculty member is teaching a course at the 5000 level or higher with up to 15 students, then he or she should receive one hour of workload credit per credit hour plus one additional hour of workload credit. If a class at the 5000 level or higher has significantly more than 15 students enrolled, the faculty member should receive 2 hours of workload credit per credit hour.

Advising Individual Study:

When a faculty member is a student's advisor for an individual study, or directed reading course, one hour should be credited to the faculty member's workload per four student credit hours, except that no more than two hours should be credited for any number of students studying the same topic. No faculty member should receive more than four credits per semester for advising individual study or directed reading courses.

Thesis Supervision:

When a faculty member is a graduate student's advisor for a Master's or honors thesis, one hour should be credited to the faculty member's workload for that semester. When a faculty member other than the supervisor is acting as a reader on a thesis committee, he or she should receive one third of an hour's credit to his or her workload.

Off Campus and Evening Courses:

If a faculty member teaches an off-campus or evening course as a part of his or her regular load, he or she should receive one additional credit hour over and above the amount he or she would have received otherwise.

New Courses:

When a faculty member is teaching a course that he or she has never taught before, one-third the number of credit hours of that course should be added to the faculty member's credit hours. If the course is a graduate course (at the 5000 level or above), the faculty member should receive additional workload credit equal to half the number of credit hours of the course. If the new course in question is taught in a Summer I or Summer II, the additional credit should be applied in the following Fall or Spring semesters.

Revising courses:

When a faculty member is preparing to teach a course that he or she has not taught for more than three full years, or when he or she is preparing to teach a course that must be substantially revised for other reasons, one quarter the number of credit hours of that course should be added to the faculty member's workload credit.

Excess preparations:

If a faculty member is teaching more than two different courses in a given semester, he or she should receive one workload credit per different course greater than two.

Graduate Admissions Officer and TA Director

If a faculty member is serving as the department's graduate advisor or graduate admissions officer, he or she should be credited one hour of workload credit. If a faculty member is the department's TA director, he or she should be credited one hour per four students directed.

Departmental Service:

Faculty members performing departmental duties requiring significant work should receive up to two hours of workload credit. These duties may include service on any departmental committees, the directorship of the Heraclitean Society, or other duties performed on behalf of the department. Philosophy faculty working with the Ethics Center should be eligible to a share of up to four hours of workload credit per semester.

Other Service:

If a faculty member is serving as an AAUP or Faculty Senate Officer, or if he or she is serving on a university-wide or college-wide committee that requires significant time, he or she should receive 1 to 3 hours credit to his or her workload. This amount should be negotiated with the Department Chair. Similar workload credits should be allocated in similar manner for similar levels of service to national professional organizations or conferences.

Research:

The Department Chair may allocate such research release time as is available to the department to individual faculty members. This time should be allocated in a fair and equitable manner among those members of the faculty who are actively engaged in research. New faculty are also eligible.

Buy-Out:

If a faculty member has a grant or other source of funding, he or she may buy out his or her time from the department as specified by the relevant university policies. This buyout may be in any amount, and time bought out should not be considered for the purposes of determining priority for research release time as described above.

Excess Hours:

If a faculty member has more than 12 hours of workload in one semester, the amount over 12 hours may be carried over into the next semester. Hours may be carried over in no more than two consecutive semesters (fall or winter), and the amount carried over may not be more than 6 hours. If a faculty member has fewer than 12 hours of workload in one semester, he or she may be required to make up the difference in the following semester by the department chair.

Minimum Teaching Load:

No faculty member should teach less than one course per semester by virtue of their non-teaching workload credits or workload credits carried over from a previous semester. Sabbatical leave and time bought out by a grant or other source of funds should not be considered as non-teaching workload credits.

Policy on Scheduling of Classes

February 1, 1984

The department Chairperson should ask faculty member his or her preferences in the scheduling of classes prior to the construction of a tentative schedule. Prior to its submission to the Dean, the Chair should submit the tentative schedule to the Department faculty members at a faculty meeting for their recommendation, consistent with the overall department program and individual faculty member's preferences, insofar as that is possible.

Spring – Summer Rotation Policy

October 13, 1983

The Department *recommends* that the Department Chairperson be guided by these rules:

1. In any year Department faculty members are in a certain order, which determines priority in choosing whether to teach or not in the extra session, whether in Spring or Summer, which course, and which time of the day.
2. A normal load for Spring or Summer teaching is on four-credit course. If enough courses are available to allow someone to teach more than on course, the person at the top of the order has the right of 'first refusal,' the second person the right of second refusal, and so on.
3. The order in any one year is normally determined by taking the order of the previous year and rotating in this way: All those who did not teach the previous year go to the top of the order in the next year, in the same relative position to each other.
4. Those who taught two courses will be given a lower priority than anyone who taught fewer.
5. A new continuing Department member shall be placed in the rotation after those who have not taught the previous Spring or Summer, but before those who did.
6. A former chairperson re-entering the Department faculty shall be treated as a new member of the Department, i.e., placed in rotation in accordance with rule 5.
7. Departures from the rotation policy can be made when a consensus of the Department faculty deem it necessary.

Policy on Program Revisions and Degree Requirements

January 20, 1986

1. Any Department faculty member may propose either the revision of departmental programs (including addition or discontinuance) and/or degree requirements and to request that these be placed on the agenda for discussion and vote in departmental meeting.
2. The Department faculty may either establish their own (ad hoc) committee or request the Department Chairperson to establish a committee for the development of formal proposals for program revision and/or changes in degree requirements.
3. The Department faculty may discuss all proposals for program revision and/or changes in degree requirements origination outside the faculty unit and to conduct a department referendum on them.
4. In all matters where extensive program revision is at stake, maximum effort shall be made to secure the response and input of Philosophy Department students.

Budget Policy

October 13, 1983

The Department *recommends* that the Chairperson be guided by these statements:

1. The Department Chairperson reviews proposed expenditures for speakers, travel and student awards with the Department faculty members at a faculty meeting and solicits their recommendation.
2. The Department Chairperson presents proposed changes in the way Department general funds are to be allocated, that is, departures from the budget, other than routine and necessary transfers, to the Department faculty at a Department meeting and solicits their recommendation before implementing the changes.
3. The Department Chairperson presents proposed expenditures from the Department's funds other than general funds to the Department faculty members at a Department meeting and solicits their recommendation before authorizing the expenditure.
4. Monthly operating reports shall be available for faculty inspection, consistent with state law.¹

Policy on Grading

April 8, 1981

The Department maintains high standards for grading. Grades of A or AB should not be given

¹ Opinion No. 5042 (July 28, 1976) of the Attorney General of the State of Michigan says: "It is my opinion the financial books and records of state higher education institutions organized under Article 8 of the Constitution of 1963 are public records subject to inspection by the public within the guidelines set forth in Grayson v. Board of Accountancy, supra, and Booth Newspapers, Inc. v. Muskegon Probate Judge, supra."

except for work of high quality. Required course work should be rigorous and demanding.

Each semester's grades will be reviewed by the Chair of the Department.

If, in the judgment of the Chair, there seem to be any problems with the grading by any individual faculty member, the Chair will discuss this with that faculty member.

If there seems to be a problem with the overall grading of the Department, the Chair will discuss this with the Department.

Summary data about the grading of the Department will be made available to the members of the Department by the Chair for each semester.

A faculty member who believes the Department's grading standards are being violated may call this to the attention of the Chair, or, if necessary, of the Department.

Policy on Evaluation of Chairperson

October 14, 1981

1. The Department faculty shall evaluate the performance of the Department Chairperson on a regular basis, and at least once every three years.
2. The Department faculty shall show the evaluations to the Chairperson.
3. The Department faculty shall decide on each occasion to whom else, if anyone, the evaluations are to be sent.
4. The Department faculty shall decide on each occasion whether to make a recommendation to the Dean on any matter related to the office of Chairperson.
5. Evaluation Form:
 - a. Grade the performance of the Chairperson. (A through E)
 - b. Write a statement commenting on the Chairperson's performance.

Departmental Evaluative Criteria

Departmental committees on tenure, promotion, merit, reappointment, sabbatical requests, and requests for assigned time for research shall evaluate the areas of performance of departmental faculty eligible or applying for these personnel actions. These committees shall evaluate faculty

members with respect to “Professional Competence,” “Professional Recognition,” and “Professional Service.”

I. Professional Competence

Effective teaching shall be understood to include the following:

- A. Demonstrated mastery of the subject matter.
- B. Ability to explain the subject matter rigorously yet clearly.
- C. Maintaining an understanding of recent developments in the field
- D. High but fair standards of grading.
- E. Ability to assist students in making further academic progress on their own.
- F. Development of new courses, new course materials, or new methods of instruction.
- G. Advising students, in the form of Directed Research courses and/or membership on Graduate Level Committees.

Teaching effectiveness is evaluated by examining some or all of the following:

- A. Syllabi, course materials, or other evidence of teaching effectiveness provided by the faculty member.
- B. Reports of any classroom visitations requested by the faculty member, or required of pre-tenure faculty.
- C. Numerical summaries of the campus-wide student rating instrument.

II. Professional Recognition

Professional Recognition shall be understood to include the following:

- A. Publication of scholarly books and articles.
- B. Preparing and receiving scholarly grants.
- C. Presentations of papers at scholarly conferences.
- D. Originality in thinking and continued familiarity with recent developments in one’s field.
- E. Participation in philosophical discussions and correspondence with other philosophers both inside and outside the department.
- F. Participation in conferences, seminars, or workshops sponsored by professional organizations.
- G. Holding offices in national or regional professional organizations.
- H. Contributions to general intellectual life through publications or formal participation in conferences and meetings not specifically philosophical.
- I. Refereeing manuscripts and proposed journal articles.
- J. Editing professional books and journals.
- K. Having one’s professional work cited and/or discussed.
- L. Continued scholarly activity, including substantial work in progress and works under review.

Without significant publications a candidate typically will not be given tenure.

Given that making assessments of one another's philosophical abilities and accomplishments requires first hand familiarity with their philosophical work, department members are strongly encouraged to read and comment upon one another's work. Department committees charged with assessing the Professional Recognition of other faculty members shall assess the merits of these activities based upon:

- A'. Their own philosophical assessments of the materials with which they are personally familiar.
- B'. Their assessment of the quality of the journal or press in which an article or book is published, or their familiarity with the high professional standards required by the professional organizations that have published the works in question or have invited the faculty member to make a public presentation of their work.
- C'. The assessment of outside experts in the field, in the form of written communications that are made part of a faculty member's personnel file, letters of recommendation for various awards or appointments, or commentary on their professional work in books, journals, or presentations.

III. Professional Service

Professional Service shall be understood to include the following:

- A. Membership on departmental committees, or assuming various on-going or rotating roles within the department, such as Graduate Advisor, or Editor of the Proceedings of the Heraclitean Society.
- B. Membership on University Councils, Committees, Faculty Senate, AAUP, or other campus organizations.
- C. Organization of conferences, seminars, or workshops sponsored by professional organizations.
- D. Contributions to general intellectual life through publications or formal participation in conferences and meetings not specifically philosophical.
- E. Reviewing manuscripts and potential journal articles.
- F. Use of one's expertise in service to the community

Appointment Policy

February 4, 1981

When a position for an academic appointment in Philosophy becomes available, the position shall be publicized in accordance with University regulation and American Philosophical Association guidelines.

A committee consisting of department faculty elected by the faculty and the chairperson shall review the dossiers of candidates, shall select several candidates who seem most highly qualified, and report the results to the department faculty. The Department faculty shall be invited to review the dossiers of those most highly qualified.

As funds permit, those most highly qualified shall be interviewed by the Department Chairperson and the Department faculty, if the interview occurs on campus, or by those faculty and/or chairperson who may be present, if the interview occurs off campus. The Department faculty and Department Chairperson shall discuss the credentials and interviews of the candidates interviewed before the Department Chairperson recommends the appointment of anyone. The faculty shall then make a recommendation to the Department Chairperson. The Department Chairperson shall make known to the Department faculty, at a departmental meeting, whom he or she intends to recommend to the Dean for appointment in order that the Department faculty may react prior to the Chairperson's recommendation being reported to the Dean.

Reappointment Policy

January 20, 1986

If the Department has the option of renewing a temporary or term appointment, a recommendation should be formulated as soon as feasible. The performance of the temporary or term faculty member shall be evaluated at a Department meeting, in the absence of that faculty member and prior to the Chairperson's making a recommendation concerning reappointment. The department faculty shall make a recommendation the Department Chairperson. The Department Chairperson shall make known, at a Department meeting, whether or not he or she intends to recommend reappointment in order that the Department faculty may react prior to the Chairperson's recommendation being reported to the Dean.

Tenure Policy

I. Eligibility for tenure consideration, probationary period, and specifications of conditions of appointment are as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

II. Criteria for tenure evaluations:

All probationary faculty shall be evaluated in accordance with the Departmental Evaluative Criteria with respect to Professional Competence, Professional Recognition, and Professional Service, during their years of probation.

A. Professional Competence

Professional Competence shall be evaluated in terms of the criteria and definitions specified for Professional Competence in the Departmental Evaluative Criteria. In order to be recommended for tenure, candidates must demonstrate clear teaching competence and show signs that they will continue to be effective teachers in the future. Candidates for tenure shall supply to the departmental tenure committee course syllabi for all courses taught either since being hired, or since the last tenure review, whichever is more recent, as well as information from the campus-wide student ratings instrument, for each semester administered during this same period. Candidates remain free to submit other evidence of teaching effectiveness, and the tenure committee may likewise request additional information.

B. Professional Recognition

Professional Recognition shall be evaluated in terms of the criteria and definitions specified for Professional Recognition in the Departmental Evaluative Criteria. Thus in particular, in order to be recommended for tenure, a candidate must have reached at least a satisfactory level of recognition or achievement, which will normally include some significant work accepted for publication. At tenure reviews prior to the final review, a candidate must show evidence of being able to receive a positive evaluation upon final review.

C. Professional Service

Professional Service shall be evaluated according to the criteria and definitions specified for Professional Service in the Departmental Evaluative Criteria. A demonstrated willingness to participate in faculty governance is normally required in order to receive a positive evaluation with respect to Professional Service.

III. Tenure Review Procedures:

A. Probationary faculty members shall be reviewed at the beginning of the second, fourth and sixth years of

- his/her Probationary period.
- B. The review shall be made by the Tenure Committee of The Department in accordance with the criteria specified in II above.
 - C. The Tenure Committee shall be the Department's tenured faculty.
 - D. The Tenure Committee shall elect its own chairperson and shall follow usual rules of informal parliamentary procedure.
 - E. The Department Chairperson shall give timely notice, in accordance with the contract timetable, to probationary faculty members of the date by which it is to receive data. The probationary faculty member must submit to the Tenure Committee all evidence he/she thinks relevant by that date.
 - F. Recommendations of the Tenure Committee shall be determined by majority vote of the Committee.
 - G. The Tenure Committee chairperson shall inform the probationary faculty member of the Committee's recommendations at the conclusion of each of the three reviews. To allow time for appeal, this information should reach the probationary faculty member in advance of the contractually specified date on which it is to be presented to the Chair of the Department.
 - I. The probationary faculty member may appeal to the Committee by the date designated in the current contract. He/she may submit comments and request changes. The Committee must consider such appeals.

Promotion Policy

- I. Eligibility for promotion is as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- II. Criteria for Promotion Evaluations.

All faculty shall be evaluated in accordance with the Departmental Evaluative Criteria with respect to Professional Competence, Professional Recognition, and Professional Service.

 - A. Minimal Requirements for any Promotion:

All faculty wishing to be considered for promotion shall normally present to the departmental promotion committee course syllabi and numerical summaries of the campus-wide student rating instrument for each individual section where administered since last promoted, or since joining the faculty, whichever is more recent.
 - B. Promotion to Associate Professor:

In order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor, a faculty member must be judged either to:

 - 1) have achieved satisfactory Professional Recognition and outstanding achievements as a teacher during time in rank, or
 - 2) be a competent faculty member whose major achievement is outstanding professional recognition during time in rank.
 - C. Promotion to Full Professor:

In order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Full Professor, a faculty member must be judged to have either:

 - 1) achieved outstanding Professional Recognition and a satisfactory record of professional competence; or
 - 2) achieved outstanding success in professional competence and gained substantial professional recognition; or
 - 3) gained substantial professional recognition, a satisfactory record of professional competence, and rendered significant professional service.

III. Implementation

- A. The Department chairperson shall inform all those faculty eligible for promotion of that fact. An eligible faculty member may withdraw his or her name from consideration. A faculty member who intends to request an exception to the eligibility requirements must do so as provided for in the Contract.

- B. The Department Promotion Committee shall consist of all unit faculty members on campus at or above the rank in question who are ineligible for promotion and not requesting an exception to the eligibility requirements, or who are eligible but have withdrawn their names.
- C. The Department Promotion Committee shall notify in writing any faculty member whose request for an exception has been rejected, giving the reasons for its decisions.
- D. The Department Promotion Committee shall elect its own chairperson, and shall follow usual rules of informal parliamentary procedure.
- E. The Department Chairperson shall give timely notice to the faculty, in accordance with the contract timetable, of the date by which it is to receive data. The candidate for promotion must submit to the Department Promotion committee all evidence he or she thinks relevant by that date.
- F. Recommendations of the Department Promotion committee shall be determined by a majority vote of the Committee.
- G. Notification of recommendation: the candidate, Department Chair and College Promotion Committee shall be notified of the recommendation of the committee as specified in the Contract.
- H. The candidate may appeal to the Committee by the date designated in the current contract. He/she may submit comments and request changes. The Committee must consider such appeals.

Policy on Sabbatical Leaves

November, 1979

A. Procedures

1. Each eligible applicant for a sabbatical leave during the following fiscal year must submit a proposal to the Department's Sabbatical Committee by a date consistent with the current contract. This Committee shall consist of all tenured unit faculty in the department.
2. The Committee shall study and review all applications submitted by a deadline consistent with the current contract.
3. The committee has the right to reject any proposals it feels do not meet minimum standards, as explained in the criteria defined below. Such rejection is subject to majority vote.
4. All proposals meeting minimum standards may then be voted on by the Committee for recommendation for approval by the Department. If there is more than one approved proposal the Committee may, by majority vote, rank the proposals according to merit.
5. The Committee shall then forward its recommendations to the Department Chairperson.

B. Criteria

1. Only applications for sabbatical leave with the intended purpose of advancing the applicant's scholarly research in philosophy and/or for reasons that would enhance his/her teaching effectiveness in philosophy are to be considered for recommendation by the Committee.
2. Proposals satisfying part 1. And deemed to be of sufficient merit by the Committee shall be recommended for approval by the Department. Any dispute as to whether a given proposal satisfies this condition is to be settled by a majority vote of the committee.
3. In evaluating any proposal for sabbatical leave the Committee must take into account the merits of the proposal
 - i. In its own right;
 - ii. For the individual; and
 - iii. For the university.

Policy on Merit Pay

October, 1987

- I. Criteria – The criteria for merit shall be the judgmental criteria of the department’s promotion policy. Highly meritorious teaching shall also be considered.
- II. Cumulation – Each year’s consideration shall emphasize performance during the previous twelve months, but work accomplished during a reasonable number of prior years may be considered. However, work previously adequately rewarded shall not be rewarded a second time.
- III. Merit Committee
 - a. The merit committee shall consist of all tenured unit faculty. The committee may request a committee member to leave the room when his/her own work is being assessed for merit.
 - b. The merit committee will be convened by the department chair, in a timely fashion. The Chair has the responsibility of assuring that the committee begins its deliberations. After commencement of the meeting, the Chair may, at the committee’s discretion, remain in the room for consultation purposes only.
 - c. While the merit committee is free to consider any information known to it, the primary obligation of providing data for merit rests with the faculty, and the committee is not required to take into account any information provided by the faculty member for the purpose of assessing merit. Thus, each faculty member who wishes to be considered for merit should submit their merit activities in a timely fashion. The department chair should announce the first meeting of the merit committee early enough to allow faculty fair opportunity to assemble this material.
 - d. Faculty may withdraw from consideration in writing at any time.
 - e. Faculty shall be notified of the committee’s recommendations as soon as possible after recommendation is made, and in any case no later than two weeks before the recommendation must be sent to the Dean. A faculty member who wishes to appeal (that is, to ask the committee to reconsider its recommendation) should do so as soon as possible, and in any case not later than one week before the committee’s recommendation is due to the Dean. Such appeals shall be sent to the department Chair, who shall reconvene the committee in a timely fashion.
 - f. If a faculty member so requests, the merit committee shall provide him/her with reasons for its decisions in writing.

- g. The Department Chair shall announce to the Faculty the time-table for merit proceedings, in a timely fashion.
 - h. Names of those recommended with amounts recommended shall be forwarded to the Dean. Supporting data, in the form of summary teaching evaluations, listing of articles published or presentation made, committees assignments, etc., shall be forwarded to the Dean, with the rationale for awarding merit.
- IV. Amounts – The merit committee shall determine the amount awarded to each faculty member who receives an award. The department’s policy is to prefer larger rather than smaller awards.

Policy on Revision, Addition, or Amendment

February 4, 1981

1. Any faculty member has the right to propose revision, additions, or amendments to any existing department policies.
2. The department faculty shall consider all such proposals and approve or reject them by majority vote.
3. If approved by the department faculty, the recommendations shall be sent to the parties designated by the current contract.

Policy on Graduate Faculty

March, 1995

Departmental criteria shall conform to the University Policy on Graduate Faculty, accepted April 18, 1979; November 19, 1981; September 28, 1989.

The main criterion is competence and currency in the field. This requires publication in one's field within the past five years. Publications may be in the form of journal articles, chapters in books, or entire books. Additional evidence of competence and currency includes presentations at professional meetings and ongoing research projects.

The Department shall initiate and conduct reviews of new appointments and reappointments and forward its recommendations to the Chair in accordance with dates and procedures specified in said University Policy on Graduate Faculty.