

Summary of T&P Changes Approved by Senate in April 2007

I. Student Evaluations

Summary Ratings for Student Evaluations for all courses in the Department will be included with the candidate's student evaluations in the executive binder.

II. Graduate Surveys

The minimum sample size for graduate surveys was increased from 25 to 40; a demographic form distributed by Academic Affairs will be included with a department's own form; recent graduate surveys are optional for 3rd year review

III. Colleague Letters

Extra-departmental colleague letters are optional for third year review and may be requested by the department evaluation panel or the candidate; untenured faculty are not required to write colleague letters; the chair is not required to write a separate colleague letter; any member of the department may submit a colleague letter

IV. Prior Credit

References to three years of prior credit are being removed from the manual to reflect current practice; references to special calendars for those with prior credit are being removed—all reviews will take place in the Fall; a person with 1 year credit would have a 3rd year review in their third year and be eligible for tenure in their fifth year; a person with a maximum of 2 years credit would have a 3rd year review in their third year and would be eligible for tenure consideration in the fourth year.

V. Mid-Year Hires

A schedule for tenure and promotion for candidates hired mid-year is being added to the manual. Candidates hired at mid-year will undergo the third-year review during the fall semester of the third academic year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place during the fall semester of the sixth academic year.

VI. External Review of Research

External Reviews of Research are optional; Language changes were approved to make it clear what types of letters are optional or required; Language was also modified to clarify the difference between a letter of evaluation from colleagues at other institutions and an independent external review of the candidate's scholarly work. Both letters of evaluation from colleagues at other institutions and independent external reviews are optional, but a specific protocol for conducting an independent external review is to be followed if it is conducted; the instructions for conducting the independent external review will be added to the FAM

VII. Lists of Evidence

Lacking a specific set of suggested modifications to the lists of evidence, the senate voted against a motion to review and modify the list periodically.

VIII. Exemplary Performance

Specific language for describing the requirement of an exemplary area was approved. "Evidence of exemplary performance is required in at least one of the specified professional competency areas" (This was approved in 2003-04, but had not been added to the manual)

IX. Calendar

Chairs confirm tenure list: changed from September 15 to **August 15**

Candidates submit packet: changed from Oct. 15 to **Sept. 15**

Panel Chairs assure that all evaluation data have been collected and panels convene:
changed from Oct. 27 to **Oct. 1**

Panel chairs present results to the Dean: changes from Dec. 1 to **Nov. 1**

Deans forward their recommendations: changed from Dec. 15 to **Dec. 1**

X. Membership of the T&P committee

The senate voted against making any changes in the way the members of the T&P committee are selected

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR *FACULTY ADMINISTRATION MANUAL*

XI. Process Clarification and Addition on Faculty Committee Action, M.10. (Manual Change)

We recommend separating discussion of IV.M.10, Faculty Advisory Committee Action, into parts a (Reviews for Tenure, Promotion and Retention as Senior Instructor) and b (Third Year Review) and adding more description about the actions of the Committee.

From:

10. Faculty Advisory Committee Action

The Provost will make packets of all candidates for tenure and promotion available to the members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Reappointment. The Faculty Advisory Committee will notify each candidate in writing of its recommendation. The Committee will also review third-year candidates on all negative departmental recommendations or if requested to do so by the candidate, any member of the departmental panel, the appropriate Dean or the Provost.

In cases where the Dean's decision is different from the departmental evaluation panel or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative, he/she will refer the case to the Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee for their recommendations. The Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee will interview each candidate for third-year reappointment when the departmental panel or the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries recommendation is different from the departmental evaluation panel or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative. The Provost's and the Faculty Advisory Committee's recommendation will be submitted in writing to the President.

To:

10. Faculty Advisory Committee Action

a. Reviews for **Tenure, Promotion and Retention as Senior Instructor**

The Provost will make packets of all candidates for tenure, promotion, and *retention as Senior Instructor* available to the members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year *Review*. *The Advisory Committee will review all of the evidence and make an independent assessment of each case. The Advisory Committee may interview the candidate, the Department Chair, the Departmental Panel Chair, faculty members in the Department, the Dean, and others as necessary. The Faculty Advisory Committee will make a written recommendation to the President.* The Faculty Advisory Committee will notify each candidate, *Department Chair, and the appropriate Dean* in writing of its recommendation.

b. **Third Year Review**

The Committee will *only* review third-year candidates *if there is a negative recommendation from the Dean or the Department*, or if requested to do so by the candidate, any member of the departmental panel, the appropriate Dean or the Provost. *The Advisory Committee will review all of the evidence and make an independent assessment of such a case. The Advisory Committee will interview the candidate and may interview the Department Chair, the Departmental Panel Chair, faculty members in the Department, the Dean, and others as necessary.* The Provost's and the Faculty Advisory Committee's *written* recommendation will be submitted to the President. The candidate, the appropriate Dean, and the Department Chair will also be notified of the committee's recommendation.

Rationale: The protocol for review of third year review cases is sufficiently different from tenure and promotion cases to warrant separate discussion. Current wording only describes interviewing of third year candidates. Deans and chairs have asked to be informed of the committee's recommendations.

XII. Process Change and Clarification on Reporting Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel, Section M.7. (Manual Change)

We recommend that the current statement in IV.M.7 be changed:

From:

“The chair of the departmental panel will meet with the faculty member being evaluated to inform him/her of the panel’s written recommendation, which will include actual vote splits. Third year candidates will sign the panel’s evaluation.”

To:

“The chair of the departmental panel will meet with the faculty member being evaluated to inform him/her of the panel’s recommendation, including the actual vote splits. A copy of the panel’s written recommendation will be provided to the candidate. The candidate will sign the copy of the panel’s written recommendation included in the packet.”

Rationale: In some departments, chairs share the panel’s written recommendation with the candidate for promotion and tenure and in other cases the department chair only relates the vote of the panel to the candidate. The Committee recommends that a consistent policy for all departments be in place.

The current statement in the *FAM* is vague, and the Committee recommends that a more specific policy be included in the *Manual*.

The Committee believes that candidates have the right to know the issues that were raised in the panel’s recommendation.

The committee also recognizes that the candor of the panel letter might be compromised if the candidate is allowed to have a copy of the letter, and this concern has been discussed at length. The committee has concluded that the right of the candidate to have the information included in the panel’s recommendation outweighs the potential danger(s), such as a lack of candor in the panel letter.

Welfare Committee

The Welfare Committee has discussed the above proposal and has offered a compromise solution. Based on their position, the Tenure and Promotion Committee drafted this alternative proposal for consideration.

To the following existing passage, add the italicized lines:

IV.M.7 Reporting Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

After due deliberation, the panel will take its vote by written ballot. The chair will draft a statement for the members of the panel to sign that reports the

recommendation and vote of the panel. This statement should include justification for the panel's recommendation. While maintaining the confidentiality of any meetings, the statement will summarize the discussion that took place among panel members, including positive and negative deliberations.

The chair of the departmental panel will meet with the faculty member being evaluated to inform him/her of the panel's written recommendation, which will include actual vote splits. Third-year candidates will sign the panel's evaluation letter. *In all other cases, the panel chair will prepare a written summary of the panel deliberations for the candidate. Each panel member will sign this summary and the chair will provide the candidate with a copy of the signed summary. The summary must be sufficiently detailed to inform the candidate of any deficiencies. The Panel Chair will add a copy of the candidate's summary to the packet.*

Rationale: A summary letter will give the candidate enough feedback to adequately prepare for possible interviews with the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Provost. References to specific external reviewers (common in panel letters) can be edited for confidentiality.

XIII. Increase the minimum sample size for graduate evaluations for instructor evaluations. (Section K.1.b.4)

From: Recent graduate evaluations on teaching: either all majors or a sample of at least 25 students selected randomly from among all majors in the department who have graduated within the past five years and whom the candidate has taught;

To: Recent graduate evaluations on teaching: either all majors or a sample of at least **40** students selected randomly from among all majors in the department who have graduated within the past five years and whom the candidate has taught;

And, from: In cases, where a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than 25 graduates the Department Chair should indicate that this has occurred.

To: In cases, where a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than **40** graduates the Department Chair should indicate that this has occurred.

Rationale: We need a larger sample size to ensure an adequate number of responses from graduates. The Senate approved this same change for tenure, promotion and third year review last spring.

XIV. Change in Advising Requirement for promotion to Senior Instructor (IV.K.b)

Change the List of “Specific Criteria for Promotion to Senior Instructor”, part b

From: There should be active and sustained participation in departmental and college-wide advising programs.

To: There should be active and sustained participation in departmental advising.

Rationale: Requirement seems out of place in the context of the Academic Advising Center.

XV. Modification in Language of Library Promotion Requirements

L.4.a.(1)

Promotion to the rank of Librarian II requires evidence of progress toward meeting the tenure requirement of ~~sustained effectiveness~~ *exemplary performance* in the area of professional competency.

L.4.b.(1)

Tenure for library faculty requires ~~sustained effectiveness~~ *exemplary performance* in the area of professional competency.

L.4.c.(1)

Promotion to the rank of Librarian III requires sustained *exemplary performance* and significant effectiveness in the area of professional competency.

Rationale: The adjective “exemplary” matches the language in the introduction to section L, “Third-Year Review, Tenure and Promotion of the Library Faculty”, that states “Because professional competency is the primary responsibility of any librarian, evidence of exemplary professional competency is expected for tenure and promotion”.

(**Note:** “sustained exemplary ” is also a phrase used to describe performance in teaching for promotion of instructors. **See p. 80 item K a.**; the library faculty voted unanimously in support of the modified wording)