

Rights and Responsibilities Standing Committee Review of Recommendations and Responses to University Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Promotion Process

Committee: Nina Coyer, Marcel Robles, Mixon Ware, and Paula Kristofik, Chair.

Charge Received: August, 2004. Submitted to Executive Committee February, 2005.

1A. Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

Only the negative tenure recommendations will go to the college and university committees. Negative promotion recommendations will go *only* at the request of candidate.

Rationale for

Improved efficiency and recognition of department primacy.

Rationale against

Primacy at the department level may lack objectivity. There is also a stake at the level of college and the University. The department decision may be contradicted at an *administrative* level; thus, the chain of command becomes administratively top-heavy.

1B. Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

Faculty peers, specifically at the departmental level, shall have primacy throughout the P&T process. Faculty and administrators shall recognize the primacy of departmental recommendations.

Rationale for

Departmental colleagues have the most intimate knowledge of peers' performance.

Primacy at the departmental level represents a move away from "top-down" toward "bottom-up."

Rationale against

Departmental recommendation is important but should not be the sole deciding factor in a positive recommendation. Departmental support may lack objectivity (i.e., be based on personality more than work/productivity), and primacy at the departmental level fails to include the whole academy in determining the character and make-up of its faculty.

Applications should be reviewed at all levels to insure quality control.

R&R proposal

All tenure recommendations go forward. To insure primacy, the upper levels – *both* committee and administrators – shall defend their recommendations by relying on the candidate's documents *as measured* by the department's criteria.

2A. Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

The University Committee establishes *separate* specific, documented criteria for promotion and for tenure.

2B. Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

All departments and colleges also establish criteria and that such criteria falls within the parameters set by University Committee.

Rationale for

Faculty expressed strong dissatisfaction regarding current specificity. Greater specificity also desired by new Provost and Dean of A&S. Meets a faculty-identified need for more concrete standards that take the criteria for different disciplines into account.

Rationale against

The current nebulous and general criteria allow for variety to meet the needs of our diverse community. A caveat regarding the criteria in general: AAUP's position is that "collegiality" should not be separated from faculty performance in teaching, service and scholarship, but inherent in all three.

R&R proposal

At the university level, the criteria may appropriately be general, but at the department level, specificity is needed to insure fairness and transparency. In addition, if a candidate somehow does not measure up to a college or university criterion but has met the department criteria, then adjustments are needed to align, and the candidate will not suffer.

3. Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

While four areas of performance (teaching, scholarship/creative, service, and professional decorum) shall be reviewed according to expressed criteria, the area of teaching will receive emphasis, in accordance with ECU's long-standing mission.

Rationale for

It is explicitly stated in the mission statement of the handbook.

Rationale against

Departments may wish to emphasize another area or no area.

R&R proposal

The emphasis on teaching shall mean that if one is expected to teach in the undergraduate classroom, one must exhibit qualifications according to department criteria. Only after the teaching criteria have been met, will the P&T process move to consider other areas.

4. Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

Change in first-year evaluation process. First year faculty evaluation will occur in *second* semester only done by *admin.* (i.e., the Chair or designate).

Rationale for

First year hires need time to develop a dossier of material to be evaluated on, and it is more informal if they just sit down with one rather than a whole committee. The meeting should be experienced as mentoring more than monitoring.

Rationale against

It is administratively directed as opposed to peer-directed.

R&R proposal

Peer mentor to be optional assignment for new hires. Mentor and New Hire can *together* prepare materials for evaluation.

5. Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

The tenure clock to be extended to *six* years from five years.

Rationale for

Offers people more time to meet more demanding criteria.

Rationale against

Faculty input on the survey and input since the recommendations have come out suggest that faculty are very happy with the current clock at five.

The Chair's Report, a separate document from the Promotion and Tenure Recommendations document, recommends inclusion of family friendly policies that, if accepted, would address this recommendation.

R&R proposal

See Number 6 R&R proposal (below) regarding extending the tenure clock for extenuating circumstances.

6. Ad Hoc Committee Chair's Report Response

The Chair's Report, a separate document from the Promotion and Tenure Recommendations document, recommends inclusion of family friendly policies; specifically, a provision for extending the tenure clock for extenuating circumstances.

Rationale for

Family friendly policies are being considered at other institutions nationally. They are important to colleges needing to recruit women and minorities into academia from potentially non-traditional paths.

Rationale against

Timeline cannot be indefinite and policies must be consistent and non-discriminatory.

R&R proposal

The normal tenure clock is 5 years with exceptions to be negotiated at the time of hire, or negotiated later based on extenuating circumstances. Extenuating circumstances should be delineated to insure consistency across the university. There shall be a maximum of 7 years to complete the tenure process.

7. Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

A terminal degree relevant to the faculty member's appointment shall be required for tenure. Exceptions shall be *justified and approved in writing* at the time of initial appointment into a tenure track position.

Rationale for

Strengthen the quality of education in both perception and reality.

Rationale against

Should be a department call.

R&R proposal

Exceptions to this may be justified not only at the level of individual but also at the level of department.

8. Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

Faculty members serving on P&T committees shall be *current, full-time* employees of EKU with tenure and a *minimum rank* of Associate Professor. They will be *elected* by their peers to serve

Rationale for

Insures that only invested faculty make judgments regarding others.

Rationale against

Committee make-up needs *also* to consider concerns of diversity and equity of representation.

R&R proposal

Additional appointments may be made by administrator to achieve balanced perspective.

9. Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

Administrators shall not serve as *voting* members of P&T committees at *any* level, but may *participate* at request initiated *either* by Committee or by Administrator.

Rationale for

Administrators have separate role and should not duplicate their vote; however, each may contribute to the process of deliberation that the other undertakes. All tenure review committees should be made up of 100% faculty.

Rationale against

Small units may need numbers. Administrators may have a sense of the individual's performance.

R&R proposal

Accept recommendation that administrators may serve as non-voting, ex officio members.

10. Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

Faculty and administrators should not act on P&T applications at more than one level of decision-making.

Rationale for

Promotes fairness, consistency; avoids double vote or influence.

Rationale against

Sheer numbers may make this unfeasible or unwise

R&R proposal

The departmental committee that puts forward a candidate should send an advocate to speak to the documents but the advocate may not vote.

11. Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

The university shall continue to permit faculty to apply for promotion in rank prior to being considered for tenure.

Rationale for

Allows for recognition of work prior to hire without extending full commitment that tenure implies. For such a commitment, a fuller probation is still advised.

Rationale against

In practice, it is virtually impossible to separate one from the other in terms of either criteria or expectations. It may cause legal problems for someone to be granted promotion and subsequently not receive tenure.

R&R proposal

If the minimum and maximum period is granted, then one might treat the two as the same: early promotion and tenure or later promotion and tenure or timely promotion and tenure.

12. Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

The P&T process shall *not require* but *will permit* candidates to supply reviews by persons outside the university as part of their documentation.

Rationale for

Lack of support for external review among faculty except at the level of full professor.

Rationale against

Should this not be left to the discretion of individual departments?

R&R proposal

If requirement occurs, it shall be expressed at the department level only.