

Department of Philosophy
Policy Handbook
Revised April 6, 2018

This handbook collects the policies specific to the Department of Philosophy. It does not contain a complete statement of University policies. In the event of a conflict, University and College policies take precedence over the policies in this Handbook. Please direct questions to the Chair of the department.

Flex Rules (in priority order)

1. We must meet the needs of the students, undergrad and grad.
2. See rule 1.
3. See rule 1.
4. The flex must increase credit hours.
5. The house doesn't give credit. Teaching releases aren't given for promises to teach more in the future.
6. Faculty who flex are in last priority when it comes to time slots.
7. The flex only allows a course release. All service and individual student work obligations must be met.
8. Those on flex must remain in town and be available to students on campus.
9. No TT faculty can teach more than 9 hours in a semester.

Source: Dept Meeting, Sept 12, 2003. Reviewed and approved by Dean's Office, Oct 2003.

Workload Credit for PERS 2-Hour courses

PERS courses count as a 3-hour course.

Source: conversation with Carol Winkler, Assoc Dean for the Humanities, February 15, 2015

Summer Money

1. Those teaching get 10% of their salary per course.
2. Tenure-track faculty may teach up to two courses in the summer.
3. Those who teach are not eligible for summer research money.
4. To be eligible for summer research money, faculty must be tenured or tenure-track, apply for or receive funds from a national external grant or fellowship (or equivalent donation) by March 1, and use the proper University forms, or win an external academic award or be selected as a finalist for a competitive national or international academic award.
5. Everyone who qualifies will get an equal share of the summer research budget.
6. Summer money for service roles (e.g., Director of Grad Studies and Director of Undergrad Studies) has no effect on summer teaching or research money.
7. In cases where the College of Arts & Sciences selects only a few proposals to pass on to granting agencies (e.g., NEH), submitting the proposal to the College for review will count as having applied for the grant for the purposes of allocating summer funds, even if the proposal is not ultimately selected to be passed on.

Source: Department Meeting of December 11, 2009; revised at the meeting of March 15, 2013; revised at the meeting of August 26, 2016; revised at the meeting of August 17, 2018.

Use of Graduate Assistants (GAs)

GAs are expected to work a total of no more than 10 hours per week. They work from the first day of class until the day that grades are due. If the GA is asked by a faculty to attend a class, time spent in class counts against the 10-hour limit. If a GA is assigned to more than one faculty member, the faculty members will consult to be sure that the GA works for no more than 10 hours per week. The 10-hour limit applies in each week irrespective of how many hours the GA worked in previous weeks.

While GA will perform a wide range of duties, GAs may not grade papers. They may grade essay tests.

Source: Dept meeting of October 23, 2009

Proxy and Absentee Voting

a. Definitions

Proxy voting occurs when one member of the department gives another member of the department the right to cast votes for her/him at a particular meeting.

Absentee voting occurs when one member of the department give the department chair a written or e-mailed vote on a particular motion.

b. Proxy voting

Proxy voting is allowed unless a particular committee or subcommittee decides, by majority vote, that proxy voting will not be allowed for that committee. Designations of a proxy must be made, in writing or by e-mail, to the department chair.

c. Absentee voting

Absentee voting is allowed unless a particular committee or subcommittee decides, by majority vote, that absentee voting will not be allowed for that committee. Absentee votes must be made, in writing or by e-mail, to the department chair. Absentee votes will be discarded if the motion is amended in any way.

Source: Dept meeting of Nov 9, 2001

When Publications Count

For annual evaluation reports, salary, and merit, a publication shall count as published in the year in which the journal or book lists first publication (whether online or in print, which may precede the year listed for print publication or copyright). For P&T purposes, forthcoming work that has undergone all editorial and review processes can be included in candidates' files (once an item is used for a P&T file, it cannot be included in the file for the next promotion or post-tenure review). For P&T, pre-tenure, and post-tenure reviews, candidates should describe in their research statements work in progress or forthcoming for the purposes of assessing trajectory.

Source: Dept mtg of Jan 24, 2003; revised at Dept meeting Aug 17, 2018

Summer Teaching Policy

If there is ever a summer term in which no lecturer or tenure-track faculty member wishes to teach, we will use the following procedure to determine who will teach.

- a. The names of all lecturers and tenure-track faculty who have never taught during the summer will be arranged in alphabetical order, e.g., Altman, Andrew; Berry, Jessica; Cohen, Andrew I.; Cohen, Andrew J; etc.
- b. We will then choose a name from a hat to determine who will teach in that first summer. In subsequent summers, should the problem arise again, we will simply proceed down the alphabetical list.
- c. When everyone has taught one summer, we will return to the top of the list.
- d. New faculty will enter at their alphabetical point on the list. However, no new faculty members will be chosen to teach during their first summer at Georgia State.
- e. If a faculty member's name comes up and if, by September 15, s/he has secured a grant that prohibits teaching in the summer, then that faculty member will trade places with the next person on the list. Summer grants secured after September 15 will not constitute grounds for automatic relief from summer teaching.

Source: Department Meeting of March 16, 2007

Search Procedures for Tenured and Tenure-Track Hires

Search Committees

The philosophy search committee will be composed of all tenured and tenure-track faculty with primary appointment in philosophy who wish to serve. The department chair will not be a member of the search committee but will select the chairs of the search committee.

AOS/AOC and Ad Copy

The chair of the search committee will draft an advertisement. This ad will indicate the AOS/AOC (either or both of which, of course, could be "open"). The draft will then be considered as an amendable document by the entire search committee. The draft will be approved according to a series of majority votes on proposed amendments, if any, and then a majority vote on the entire ad. A quorum for any vote is a majority of the eligible search committee members.

Consideration of the Candidates

1) First list. The first list will be composed of all candidates nominated by any member of the search committee by the deadline set by the search committee chair. Each member of the committee may nominate as many candidates as s/he wishes. The chair of the search committee will then distribute the first list to the search committee and specify a period of time for everyone to look again at the files of those on the first list.

2) Second list. Everyone on the search committee will vote for up to 15 of those on the first list. The second list will be composed of all those candidates who get at least one vote. The chair of the search committee will then specify a period of time for everyone to look again at the files on the second list. Once the second list has been formed, names may added to it if and only if a member of the search committee nominates someone and this nomination is approved by a majority vote of the search committee. (This last sentence establishes a procedure for considering applications which arrive after the second list has been formed.)

3) Screening interviews. Any member of the search committee may make a motion to conduct screening interviews. If properly seconded and approved by a majority of those voting yea or nay, the motion passes. Members of the search committee will then vote for up to 12 of the applicants on the second list. The top 9 candidates will be interviewed by the same method (e.g., skype) by any search committee members who wish to attend. Once the screening interview list has been formed, names may added to it if and only if a member of the search committee nominates someone from the second list and this nomination is approved by a 2/3 supermajority vote of the search committee.

4) On-campus interviews. Everyone on the search committee will vote for up to 5 of those on the second list. The top 3 vote-getters will be ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd on the on-campus interview list. The names of the top 3 vote-getters will be struck from the on-campus interview list and then everyone on the search committee will vote for up to 5 of those remaining on the second list. The top 3 vote-getters will be ranked 4th, 5th, and 6th on the on-campus interview list. This procedure will be repeated until all candidates on the second list have been ranked on the on-campus interview list, or until a majority of the search committee agrees to rank no further candidates at that time. Upon a majority vote of a properly seconded motion, the search

committee may later resume ranking candidates on the second list. The candidates will be invited to campus as ranked on the on-campus interview list until 3 candidates accept the invitation. The committee will consider motions to invite more than 3 candidates to campus if the department chair confirms that the budget allows it, or to invite fewer than 3 candidates to campus. Any such motion requires a 2/3 supermajority to pass.

5) After the invited candidates have come to campus, the search committee will consider a motion to invite additional candidates to campus. To pass, this motion requires a 2/3 supermajority to pass. If this first motion passes, the search committee will consider a motion to reorder the candidates on the on-campus interview list. This motion only requires a majority to pass. If this second motion passes, the search committee will reorder the candidates using the voting procedure in 4) and then consider motions regarding the number of additional candidates to invite to campus.

6) Final recommendation to the chair. Everyone on the search committee will vote by ranking those candidates brought to campus as follows (where X equal the number of candidates brought to campus): X points to the candidate judged to be the best of those interviewed on campus, X minus 1 points to the candidate judged to be the second best of those interviewed on campus, X minus 2 points to the candidate judged to be the third best of those interviewed on campus, etc. Members of the search committee may give 0 points to a candidate or candidates, if any, judged to be unacceptable. Here "unacceptable" means that, in the committee member's view, we should not offer the job to this candidate. In addition, the search committee will rank the candidates using any other voting procedure requested by any member of the search committee.

Other matters

If there is more than one search, the search committee will, at each stage, have two lists/rankings--one for each search. Candidates may appear on more than one list.

All the candidates' files and all search committee meetings will be open to all tenured and tenure-track members of the department.

All votes will be by secret ballot.

The chairs of the search committees will have a vote.

Tie votes will be broken by each member of the committee voting for one of the candidates who are tied. The top vote getter will be struck from the list and, if necessary (i.e., if more than two candidates are tied), vote again among the remaining candidates who were tied. This procedure will be used iteratively to break ties into rankings. If ever there is tie vote which cannot be broken by this method (e.g., there are eight members of the search committee, two tied candidates and the vote is 4-4), then the chair of the search committee will break the tie.

Changes to the procedures

Proposed changes, if any, will be made as non-amendable motions. Approval of a motion to change the procedures above will require a supermajority of 2/3rds of those voting yea or nay.

Source:

Department Search Committee, last modified April 6, 2018

Policy on Directed Readings

The Department expects students and instructors in Phil 4999 or Phil 8950 to meet a minimum of once a week for an hour in face-to-face meetings during the semester of enrollment. If this is not possible, the following alternate arrangements are allowed, in descending order of preference:

- The student(s) and instructor may meet face-to-face for one hour for each week in the semester while not meeting every week (e.g., they may double up on some sessions);
- The student(s) and instructor may meet face-to-face for some meetings and make other technological arrangements for non-face-to-face meetings (e.g., e-mail, phone, videoconferencing, etc.)

In any case, the student(s) and instructors will have at least half as many distinct face-to-face meetings as there are weeks in the semester of enrollment.

Source:

Department Meeting of November 2007

Policy on Use of Blumenfeld Funds

The monies to be used from the Blumenfeld Fund will be used solely for meals and such had with visitors.

Source:

Department Meeting of March 14, 2008 & January 14, 2011

Guidelines on Grades in Graduate Courses

The Department emphasizes that faculty are free to assign grades as they see fit.

Nevertheless, to provide guidance to graduate students and encourage appropriate levels of consistency of grading across courses, the Department has approved the following rough guidelines for the meaning of grades given to graduate-level assignments.

The following guidelines mention letters of recommendation to philosophy PhD programs. However, it is important to emphasize that grades are only one of many factors considered when instructors write such letters. Other factors may include but are not limited to: the trajectory of the quality of a student's work, the quality of the student's MA thesis, the quality of the writing sample, activity in the profession (e.g., conference presentations), teaching performance, maturity, organizational skills, responsibility, and the student's future goals. In general, a letter of recommendation to a philosophy PhD program is an instructor's evaluation of an individual's promise as a philosophy professor and therefore letters may reflect anything relevant to that evaluation.

In the following, "assignment" refers to a significant course assignment, e.g., a paper or an essay exam.

Students should not take the grade on a particular assignment as a global evaluation of their work. When grading an assignment, instructors evaluate only that particular assignment. For example, when grading a paper, an instructor considers only that particular paper. In contrast to letters of recommendation, the grade on a particular assignment does not consider a student's other work, a student's maturity, a student's teaching performance, etc.

A+ Consistent production of work of this assignment's quality would be one factor indicating recommendation to any philosophy PhD program, including the most highly-regarded.

A Consistent production of work of this assignment's quality would be one factor indicating recommendation to a very highly-regarded philosophy PhD programs.

A- Consistent production of work of this assignment's quality would be one factor indicating recommendation to widely-respected philosophy PhD programs, but not the very highly-regarded ones.

B+ Consistent production of work of this assignment's quality would be one factor indicating that a student's work was at the minimum level needed for recommendation to a philosophy PhD program.

B Consistent production of work of this assignment's quality would be one factor indicating awarding of the MA but not recommendation to a philosophy PhD program.

<= B- Consistent production of work of this assignment's quality would indicate that improvement will be required to earn the MA.

Source: Department Meeting of November 2, 2007
Amended at Department Meeting of November 7, 2010

Policy on Distribution of Service Courses

All TT faculty members teach one half their teaching load in service courses. The service courses are: Phil 1010, Phil 2010, Phil 2030, Phil 3010, Phil 3020, Phil 3060, Phil 3080, Phil 3330, Phil 3710, Phil 3720, Phil 3730, Phil 2500/4500/6500, PERS courses

Source: Department Meeting of November 7, 2008
PERS courses added by chair on February 25, 2015
Phil 2030 added by chair on January 14, 2016
Phil 3330 and 3710 added by Chair on Aug. 4, 2017

Policy on Unity and Diversity in the Department

All emails should be sent to all graduate students and all graduate students should be invited to all philosophy events and meetings.

Source: Department Meeting of December 11, 2009

Policy on Service List

When the Department receives a request for the presence of a faculty member at an event, the department chair will first see if s/he can attend. If s/he cannot attend, s/he will consult the alphabetically service list. If this person cannot attend, the chair will ask the next person on the list. When a person attends a service list event, they go to the end of the list.

Source: Department Meeting of December 11, 2015

Order of Office Selections

By rank and then by time at Georgia State in a continuing position. For faculty who came the same year, by date of acceptance of the offer. #X = order of accept of offer in a year.

Dept Chairs, Full Prof

1. Eddy Nahmias (2005, #1)

Individuals promised office priority at hire

Dept Chairs, Assoc Profs

Dept Chairs, Asst Profs

Regents Profs

Distinguished Profs

Ctr Directors, Full Profs

Ctr Directors, Assoc Profs

2. AI Cohen (2005, #4)

Ctr Directors, Asst Profs

Endowed Chairs, Full Profs

Endowed Chairs, Assoc Profs

Endowed Chairs, Asst Profs

Professors

3. Andy Altman (2001)

4. Andrea Scarantino (2005, #3)

Associate Professors

5. Tim O'Keefe (2003)

6. Christie Hartley (2005, #2)

7. AJ Cohen (2005, #5)

8. Jessica Berry (2006, #1)

9. Sebastian Rand (2006, #2)

10. Dan Weiskopf (2009)

11. Eric Wilson (2010)

12. Neil van Leeuwen (2011)

13. Suzie Love (2018)

Principal Senior Lecturers

14. Sandy Dwyer (1999)

Senior Lecturers

15. Steve Jacobson (1997)

16. Ed Cox (2008, #1)

Lecturers

Faculty with Administrative Appointments

Source: Department Meeting prior to 1998

Updated Dec. 5, 2017

Policy on Publishers Presenting in the Departments of Philosophy

From time to time, publishers may ask to come to set up a display table and talk with faculty. We want to encourage faculty interaction with editors but we have limited space and limited time. In addition, it may not be academically appropriate for certain publishers to come to the department. When requests from publisher are made, the relevant department chair will consult with departmental executive committee and the chair of the other department. The relevant department chair will then make a decision as to whether, in the chair's professional judgment, it would be appropriate and useful for the publisher to come to the department.

Source: Decision of the Chairs of Philosophy and Religious Studies, October 18, 2010

Policy re “Unallocated” Grant/Donation Funds

“Unallocated” funds is money that comes to the Department from a grant/donation whose use is not specified either in the grant/donation or by a College or University policy. All unallocated funds will be added to the graduate student budget.

Source: Department Meeting of January 12, 2018

Locker Usage Policy

- Lockers are assigned to graduate students on a first-come, first-served basis
- Graduate students must provide your own lock.
- Lockers are semester-base usage only. At the end of each semester, students must clear out all contents of their lockers. Failure to do so will result in the cutting of the lock and the discarding of its contents.
- No food/beverages, hazardous, or illegal materials may be stored in the lockers.
- Lockers should be used to store school/teaching supplies and personal items necessary for use at the university.
- Graduate students are solely responsible for the contents of the locker. The Department assumes no responsibility for loss or damage of any item(s) in a locker; locked or unlocked.
- Graduate students must keep your locker in good condition.
- There is a fee for damaged lockers. It is the cost to repair the lockers plus \$25.
- Failure to comply with the usage guidelines may result in loss of privileges.
- All lockers are the property of GSU. Although the Department will attempt to respect the privacy of locker occupants, the Department reserves the right to cut any lock at any time. The Department also reserves the right to alter the policies governing the use of lockers.

Source: Decision of Chairs of Philosophy and Religious Studies, January 15, 2015.

Policy on Cross Listing of Graduate Level Courses

Courses not taught by phil faculty may be cross-listed on a case-by-case. They must be requested by the student, approved by the faculty member teaching the course, and approved by the DGS. Cross listing is discouraged in a faculty member's first year at GSU.

Source: Department Meeting of January 16, 2015

Definition of Research-Oriented Masters Courses

The Department of Philosophy defines research-oriented masters courses as 8000-level courses with "seminar" in the title.

Source: Department Meeting of April 28, 2017.