

# STETSON UNIVERSITY

## REVISION OF STETSON UNIVERSITY'S TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND STANDARDS

FINAL REPORT OF THE TENURE PROMOTION POLICY REVISION TASK FORCE

August 27<sup>rd</sup>, 2010

### Task Force Members:

Paul Dascher, School of Business Administration

Kimberly Flint-Hamilton, Department of Sociology and Anthropology (chair)

Jamil Khader, Department of English

Brigid Noonan, Department of Counselor Education

Michael Rickman, School of Music

Susan Ryan, duPont-Ball Library

Alicia Schultheis, Department of Biology

## Table of Contents

Section 1:	Policies and Procedures Regarding Tenure and Promotion	3
	Procedure for Interim (2 <sup>nd</sup> - and 4 <sup>th</sup> -Year) Reviews	6
	Procedure for Applying for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor or Promotion to Professor	9
Section 2:	Standards and Evidence	15
Section 3:	Additional Recommendations to the Provost	28
Appendix 1:	Responsibilities Regarding Tenure and Promotion	30
Appendix 2:	Questions for Constituency Groups	36
Appendix 3:	Minutes from Meetings with Constituency Groups	37
Appendix 4:	Recommendation on Decoupling	70
Appendix 5:	Sample Checklists	77
Appendix 6:	Sample Rubrics for Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activity, and Service/Leadership	79

## TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND STANDARDS

### *DRAFT*

The following draft language, if adopted, will replace Section 3.3.4 through Section 3.3.5.3 in the Stetson University Organization, Policies, and Procedures Manual.

Below are the University standards, policies and procedures regarding Tenure and Promotion for the duPont-Ball Library, College of Arts and Sciences, School of Music, and School of Business Administration (hereafter referred to in this document as “University” standards, policies, and/or procedure). Each of the Schools, Divisions of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Library must interpret the University standards for excellence in scholarship/creative activity. These interpretations must be articulated in writing and must adhere to the professional standards and/or tenets of the respective disciplines within the School/Division/Library.

Interpretations of standards must be reviewed and updated every five to seven years by a committee made up of the Deans of the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business Administration, and School of Music, and Library Director, a Provost’s designee; a representative from the Diversity Council, and two faculty members who have recently served on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

#### **Section 1: Policies and Procedures Regarding Tenure and Promotion**

1. Time in rank is considered a necessary condition for tenure. Unless otherwise stated in the initial letter of appointment, a faculty member will not be considered for tenure before his/her sixth year of service in faculty rank. Tenure will be granted to faculty members who meet the standards required as outlined in section 2. Successful applicants will be awarded tenure at the start of their seventh year of service. The maximum time that may be served as a tenure-track member of the faculty without the award of tenure shall be six years, provided, however, that a terminal contract for a seventh year will be proffered if tenure is not awarded. This six-year period must be continuous full-time teaching at Stetson University with two exceptions. First, a maximum of two years interruption because of leave of absence or part-time service may be permitted by the appropriate Dean, in consultation with the Provost (see also Faculty Parental Leave Policy, 3.3.16.1). This time of interruption will not count toward the six-year total. Second, up to three years credit toward the probationary period may be counted for full-time service after the terminal degree has been earned as instructor or higher rank at other institutions of higher education and/or prior full or part-time service in temporary appointments at Stetson University. Such credit for prior service shall be defined in writing by the appropriate Dean and approved by the Provost for inclusion in the initial letter of appointment for the tenure-track position.
2. Faculty are reminded that all pre-tenure candidates serve on one-year terminal contracts. Pre-tenure reviews are not limited to the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> years, but can in fact occur at any time deemed appropriate by the Chair, Dean/Library Director, and/or Provost.
3. All administrators in tenured or tenure-track appointments must have the balance of administrative and teaching expectations outlined in writing in the initial letter of appointment. Administrators granted tenure as part of the appointment must submit an

abbreviated portfolio to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for review with a complete curriculum vitae and written responses to questions provided by the Committee. The responsibilities of an administrator (relative weights of administrative duties, teaching, research, and service/leadership) should be specified in his/her letter of appointment.

4. Tenured faculty members with a significant change in responsibilities such as appointment to an administrative position (e.g., Associate Dean) must have the balance of administrative and teaching/scholarship/service expectations outlined in writing in the appointment letter.
5. Time in rank is an important consideration for promotion decisions. Promotion does not result solely, however, from time in rank and faculty members are encouraged to apply only after every standard for promotion has been met or exceeded. Unless otherwise stated in the initial letter of appointment, a faculty member will be granted the rank of Associate Professor at the time of tenure. Unless otherwise stated in the initial letter of appointment, a faculty member may apply for promotion to Professor during the sixth year of service at the Associate Professor rank; promotion to Professor will be granted to faculty members who meet or exceed the standards required for the rank of Professor as outlined in section 2.
6. In order to support new faculty in their progress towards tenure, each year, the Provost, in consultation with the Deans, Library Director, the Senate Executive Committee, and Diversity Council will appoint a Tenure and Promotion Mentoring Committee [name TBD]. The appointment to the Tenure and Promotion Mentoring Committee and serving as a mentor will constitute University service. Tenure and Promotion Mentoring Committee members will ensure that pre-tenure faculty members are assigned appropriate senior colleagues as mentors. Mentors will meet regularly with the candidates to discuss professional development (e.g., applying for a summer grant, putting together a tenure and/or promotion portfolio, offering teaching tips, offering diversity training, etc.), as well as to help orient and integrate new faculty into Stetson. [Note: Section 2.5.2 "Academic Committees" will need to be revised if this committee is adopted]
7. For faculty members in departments of fewer than four tenured faculty members, no later than the end of the first year of service, the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair and the candidate, will appoint at least two tenured faculty members in related disciplines external to that department who will serve as ad hoc department members for evaluation purposes through all stages of the candidate's tenure process.
8. For faculty members whose work is interdisciplinary, and for those who have joint appointments, the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair and the candidate, must designate the primary and secondary departments no later than the end of the first year of service, and must appoint at least two tenured faculty members from the secondary department to serve as ad hoc department members for evaluation purposes through all stages of the candidate's tenure process.
9. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee will conduct an annual meeting in late spring [starting spring 2011] for the candidates as well as for evaluators (e.g., the candidates' tenured departmental colleagues and Chairs, faculty members within the

University, and the Dean/Library Director) to inform them of the official standards, types of evidence, processes and procedures regarding applications for tenure and promotion, and to address questions.

10. Each year in the spring semester, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee will coordinate a training session for Department Chairs who have tenure-track candidates or candidates for promotion, tenure and promotion committee members, and any other individuals involved or interested in the tenure and promotion process. The training session will focus on the procedures, processes, standards, lists and calibration of evidence related to the various types (e.g., written peer evaluation of teaching based on classroom observations, portfolio review, review of teaching materials and evaluations, assessment of scholarly work) and stages (e.g., annual, second-year, fourth-year, tenure and promotion reviews) of evaluation (including what should be covered in letters of evaluation).
11. Department Chairs are expected to participate in annual diversity training, with an emphasis on how diversity issues may affect the promotion and tenure process, as are others directly involved in the promotion and tenure process in a given year (e.g., tenured departmental colleagues of the candidates, [members of the Tenure, Grievance, and Academic Freedom committee](#)), including all promotion and tenure committee members.
12. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee will be charged with soliciting feedback on this policy from all involved in the process at the end of each year. A summary of this feedback will be shared with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Chair of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Deans/Library Director, and the Provost, will make minor updates (i.e., for clarity, process efficiency and effectiveness, etc.) to the policy by the end of the Spring term. Faculty comment will be solicited on the updates before final revision. The updated policy will be posted no later than the end of July. A thorough review of this policy will be conducted at least every five to seven years. The initial review, however, will take place between six months and one year from its inception, with ongoing review and modification to take place during the implementation phase.

#### **3.3.4.4 Procedure for Interim (Second- and Fourth-Year) Reviews**

##### A. Information about the procedure

Department Chairs will conduct Second- and Fourth-Year Reviews of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate should take steps to see that the process is completed and that all written responses indicated below have been received. In the unusual event of an untenured candidate who is serving as Department Chair, the Dean will conduct the Second- and Fourth-Year Reviews.

Written recommendations from all evaluators must include a candid, thorough, and critical evaluation of the candidate's effectiveness and accomplishments in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activity, and service, with explicit reference to how they relate to the tenure and promotion standards and the degree to which (supported explicitly by the evidence) the candidate is meeting them.

Submission dates and a timeline will be announced at the beginning of the academic year by the University.

##### B. Steps in the Procedure

- I. The Department Chair will coordinate peer observation(s) of teaching for all pre-tenure tenure-track faculty. There should be a minimum of one peer observation per semester. Over the pre-tenure period, peer observations should be conducted across a representative sample of courses taught by the candidate, and should be distributed across different peer observers. Peer observers will be selected from among the tenured members of the department (and ad hoc department members for small departments). The candidate should provide observer with relevant course materials one week prior to the scheduled observation. Peer observers should write an observation report to be given to the candidate and which becomes a part of the candidate's portfolio, and have a conversation with the candidate about their observations. Peer observation reports should include a descriptive account of the observed teaching/learning sample, candid critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's teaching effectiveness (with reference to University standards for teaching, as appropriate), and constructive suggestions for improvement. The candidate has the option to respond to peer observation reports. Peer observation reports and the candidate's responses, if applicable, will be included in the FAR/Librarian Self-Evaluation.
- II. The candidate must prepare a portfolio and submit it to the Department Chair by the date specified in the University calendar. Portfolios should include:
  - a. Documentation of University standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and divisional interpretations of the standards in effect at time of hire
  - b. Curriculum Vitae
  - c. Quantitative reports and all written student comments from student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught during the pre-tenure period at Stetson University
  - d. Written and signed peer observation reports by colleagues, as defined in 3.3.4.4, B. 1.

- e. Faculty Annual Reports (FARs)/Librarian Self-Evaluations
  - i. Each FAR/Librarian Self-Evaluation should include a thoughtful, critical assessment of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service/leadership. The candidate should address: 1) teaching/librarianship with references to strengths and areas in need of improvement as noted in student and peer evaluations of teaching/librarianship, 2) his/her scholarship within the context of the discipline, and 3) service in terms of individual contributions.
  - ii. Department Chair responses to the FARs/Librarian Self-Evaluations (required) and the candidate's responses (if applicable)
    - In the case of a candidate who serves as Department Chair, the candidate should take steps to ensure that the Dean/Library Director provides a written response to his/her FAR/Librarian Self-Evaluation each year.
    - Department Chairs should respond in writing to the FAR/Librarian Self-Evaluation before the end of the Spring semester.
    - The Dean/Library Director should ensure that Department Chairs respond in writing to the FAR/Librarian Self-Evaluation for each faculty member in the department. The Dean/Library Director should ensure that Department Chairs' responses to FARs make clear the candidate's progress toward tenure and/or promotion.
  - f. Thoughtful, introspective narratives on teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service/leadership that put a candidate's work in the context of the discipline. The candidates are encouraged to elaborate on work that intersects these roles/categories.
  - g. Copies of all pertinent research/scholarship/creative activity material.
  - h. Documented evidence of service/leadership (department, College/School, University, professional, and civic engagement), noting the candidate's level of contribution to each service activity.
  - i. Other evidence to make the strongest case for meeting University standards for tenure and promotion.
- III. By the date specified on the University tenure and promotion calendar, the candidate must present the completed portfolio to the Department Chair, who will then circulate it among tenured members of the Department. Chair will coordinate at least one meeting of the tenured members of the department (and other faculty assigned to the candidate's evaluation team, see points 6 and 7 in introduction) to discuss the candidate's progress toward meeting the standards for promotion and tenure. Additional meetings will be scheduled as needed (e.g., a meeting before writing evaluations and a second meeting afterwards to prepare for the summary letter if appropriate). The Department Chair will mandate written, signed letters of evaluation from each tenured colleague (these letters will not be shared with the candidate) with explicit reference to the University and divisional standards and pertinent evidence.
- IV. Department Chairs will prepare a written summary of the departmental colleague letters that will include the Chair's own evaluation of the candidate with explicit reference to

- the University and divisional standards and pertinent evidence. The Department Chair will share this letter with the candidate and allow the candidate a minimum of three business days and a maximum of five business days to respond in writing, if desired, before the Department Chair forwards the portfolio, the Second-Year/Fourth-Year Review summary letter, and the candidate's response (if applicable), along with the letters written by tenured departmental colleagues that are not to be shared with the candidate, to the Dean/Library Director for a written response. The Department Chair's summary letter, which must be shared with the candidate, must culminate in one of the following recommendations to the Dean/Library Director:
- a. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment.
  - b. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment and recommend another review during the next year to address areas of weakness.
  - c. Discontinue the candidate's tenure-track appointment and issue a one-year terminal contract.
- V. The letters written by tenured colleagues which are not shared with the candidate are to be maintained by the Dean/Library Director and added to the tenure and promotion portfolio by the Dean/Library Director before forwarding portfolio to College/School/Library Tenure and Promotion Committee.
- VI. The Dean/Library Director will respond to a candidate's Second-Year or Fourth-Year Review in writing by the end of the summer term. Particular attention should be paid to the Department Chair's evaluation of the candidate to ensure that it is a candid, thorough, and critical review that explicitly refers to the standards for tenure and promotion and pertinent evidence. In the Fourth-Year Review, a clear assessment must be made of the candidate's potential for success in the tenure and promotion process. If any questions emerge about the candidate's potential for success in the tenure and promotion process, the Dean/Library Director should discuss the Second-Year or Fourth-Year Review with the Department Chair and the Provost. The Dean will share this written response, with explicit reference to the University and divisional standards and pertinent evidence, with the candidate and allow the candidate a minimum of three business days and a maximum of five business days to respond in writing, if desired, before the Dean forwards the portfolio and the Second-Year/Fourth-Year Review response letter, and the candidate's response (if applicable) to the Provost. The Dean's/Library Director's written response to the Second-Year/Fourth Year Review, which must be shared with the candidate, must culminate in one of the following recommendations to the Provost:
- a. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment.
  - b. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment and issue a review in the following year to address areas of weakness.
  - c. Discontinue the candidate's tenure-track appointment and issue a one-year terminal appointment.
- VII. The Provost, in consultation with the Dean/Library Director and Chair, should meet with candidates whose pre-tenure reviews reflect deficiencies in the areas of teaching and/or scholarship and/or service.

VIII. The Provost will inform the candidate in writing of the personnel decision(s) resulting from the pre-tenure reviews.

**3.3.4.X Procedure for Applying for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor or Promotion to Professor**

A. Information about the procedure

The faculty member may discuss the opportunities for tenure and/or promotion with the Department Chair and/or Dean/Library Director at any time.

Periodically the University will sponsor informational workshops providing specific details about the tenure and promotion process and procedure.

Submission dates and a timeline will be announced at the beginning of the academic year by the University.

Written recommendations from all evaluators must include a candid, thorough, and critical evaluation of the candidate's effectiveness and accomplishments in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activity, and service/leadership and the degree to which (supported explicitly by the evidence provided by the candidate) the candidate is meeting standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor. Evaluator letters must contain explicit reference to University and divisional standards.

In the unusual circumstance of an untenured candidate who is serving as Department Chair, the Dean/Library Director will coordinate the tenure and promotion process.

Similarly, in the event of a candidate for promotion to Professor who is serving as Department Chair, the Dean/Library Director will coordinate the promotion process.

For tenure-track faculty who are pre-tenure as of August 2010, the Provost, in consultation with the candidate, the Department Chair, and the Dean/Library Director, will determine the most effective way to implement this policy. Implementation guidelines for these transitional faculty members will be articulated in writing by the Provost.

Additionally, Associate Professors intending to apply for promotion to Professor within 3 years of the inception of this policy are urged to consult with their Department Chair, Dean/Library Director, and Provost to discuss implementation of policy and to obtain, if necessary, written implementation guidelines.

Candidates may withdraw their application at any point in the process. While candidates applying for promotion to Professor may reapply at a later date, applicants for tenure and promotion may not.

B. Steps in the procedure

- I. The candidate is ultimately responsible for making his/her own best case in support of a positive tenure and/or promotion decision. The candidate should use the Tenure and/or Promotion Checklist (appendix 4) to take steps to ensure all stages of the process are completed.
- II. The Department Chair will coordinate peer observation(s) of teaching for all pre-tenure tenure-track faculty. There should be a minimum of one peer observation per semester. Over the pre-tenure period, peer observations should be conducted across a representative sample of courses taught by the candidate, and should be distributed across different peer observers. Peer observers will be selected from among the tenured members of the department (and ad hoc department members for small departments). Candidate should provide observer with relevant course materials one week prior to the scheduled observation. Peer observers should write an observation report to be given to the candidate and which becomes a part of the candidate's portfolio, and have a conversation with the candidate about their observation. Peer observation reports should include a descriptive account of the observed teaching/learning sample, candid critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's teaching effectiveness (with reference to University standards for teaching, as appropriate), and constructive suggestions for improvement. The candidate has the opportunity to respond to the peer observation report. Peer observation reports and candidate's responses, if applicable, will be included in the FAR/Librarian Self-Evaluation.
- III. Candidates for promotion to Professor must have a minimum of three peer observations of teaching, complete with written evaluation reports, conducted within the three years preceding the application for promotion. The Department Chair will coordinate peer observation(s) of teaching. Peer observations should be conducted across a representative sample of courses taught by the candidate, and should be distributed across different peer observers. Peer observers will be selected from among the tenured members of the department (and ad hoc department for small departments). Candidate should provide observer with relevant course materials one week prior to the scheduled observation. Peer observers should write an observation report to be given to the candidate and which becomes a part of the candidate's portfolio, and have a conversation with the candidate about their observation. Peer observation reports should include a descriptive account of the observed teaching/learning sample, candid critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's teaching effectiveness (with reference to University standards for teaching, as appropriate), and constructive suggestions for improvement. The candidate has the opportunity to respond to peer observation reports. Peer observation reports and the candidate's responses, if applicable, will be included in the FAR/Librarian Self-Evaluation.
- IV. Upon initial employment, the candidate must begin collecting, selecting, and compiling supporting documentation for his/her application portfolios. Portfolios must include the following since the date of employment or date of last promotion:
  - a. Divisional interpretations of the standards for scholarship/creative activity

- i. For candidates applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the divisional interpretations of standards for scholarship and creative activity that were in effect at time of initial appointment should be included.
  - b. Curriculum Vitae
  - c. Quantitative reports and all written student comments from student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught during the pre-tenure period at Stetson University
  - d. Written peer evaluation of teaching based on classroom observation(s) as described in 3.3.4.X, B. III.
  - e. Faculty Annual Reports (FARs)/Librarian Self-Evaluations (see Section 3.3.4.4.B.II.c.i for recommended components)
  - f. Chair responses to the FARs/Librarian Self-Evaluations (required) and the candidate's responses (if applicable) (see Section 3.3.4.4.B.II.c.ii for recommendations)
  - g. Second- and Fourth-Year Reviews (Tenure and Promotion applicants only)
    - i. Department Chair's summary letter
    - ii. Dean/Library Director's summary letter
    - iii. Responses from the candidate (if applicable)
- V. Portfolios should also include the following from the date of employment or date of last promotion:
- a. Thoughtful, introspective narratives on teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service/leadership that put a candidate's work in the context of the discipline. Candidates are encouraged to elaborate on work that intersects these roles/categories.
  - b. Copies of all pertinent research/scholarship/creative activity material.
  - c. [Until Fall 2013](#), candidates (especially those seeking promotion to the rank of Professor) are encouraged ([but not required](#)) to submit to the Department Chair the names of three to five faculty or professionals with relevant disciplinary expertise external to Stetson University that may serve as potential reviewers for the scholarship portion of the portfolio, whose letters will not be shared with the candidate. Candidates should recommend potential external reviewers with whom he/she has no personal or professional ties that could compromise the review. External reviewers selected from the submitted list of names will be asked by the Department Chair to comment on the candidate's contributions to the discipline. For candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Professor in Fall 2013 and afterward, external review of the scholarship portion of the portfolio will become a requisite component of the process.
  - d. Documented evidence of service/leadership (department, University, professional, and civic engagement), noting the candidate's level of contribution to each service activity.

- e. Other evidence to make the strongest case for achievement of the University standards for tenure and/or promotion
- VI. By the date specified on the University tenure and promotion calendar, the candidate must submit the completed portfolio to the Department Chair, who will then circulate it among tenured members of the Department. The Department Chair will coordinate at least one meeting to discuss the candidate's progress towards meeting the standards for promotion and tenure. (Additional meetings may be coordinated as necessary).
- VII. The Department Chair should then mandate written, signed letters of evaluation with explicit reference to the University and divisional standards and pertinent evidence. Letters from tenured colleagues will not be shared with the candidate.
- VIII. The Department Chair will prepare a written summary recommendation of the departmental colleague letters that will include the Chair's own evaluation of the candidate with explicit reference to the University and divisional standards and pertinent evidence.
  - a. The Department Chair's summary recommendation will be structured into three sections that address teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service/leadership. In each section Chair will provide a summary of the key evidence for each standard supporting the departmental recommendation.
- IX. The summary recommendation letter will culminate in one of the following recommendations:
  - a. Departmental recommendation to award tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor;
  - b. Departmental recommendation to deny tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and issue a one-year terminal appointment
  - c. Deny promotion to Professor
- X. Department Chairs have the option of writing a supplementary letter that will not be shared with the candidate.
- XI. The summary recommendation letter, the Chair's optional letter (if applicable) and the department colleague letters which will not be shared with the candidate will be added to the portfolio. The Chair will obtain the letters written by tenured departmental colleagues during the Second-and Fourth-Year Review that had been maintained in the Dean's/Library Director's Office, and will add those to the portfolio. The portfolio, with requisite letters, will then be forwarded to the College/School/Library Promotion and Tenure Committee for a written recommendation.
- XII. The College/School/Library Promotion and Tenure Committee's written recommendation will be added to the portfolio, which will then be forwarded to the Dean/Library Director for written recommendation. The Dean/Library Director's written recommendation will be added to the portfolio, which will then be forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for written recommendation. The Dean/Library Director has the option of meeting with the candidate to discuss his/her candidacy.

- XIII. The Dean/Library Director shares the College/School/Library recommendation letter and the Dean/Library Director's recommendation with the candidate. The candidate must have a minimum of three business days and a maximum of five business days to respond in writing, if desired. The candidate's written factual correction (if applicable) should accompany the recommendation letter to the next step in the process. Candidates may respond to correct a factual error, however no new material may be submitted. Written response is not an appeal.
- XIV. All recommendation letters in Sections 3.3.4.4.B V-XIII must include a candid, thorough, and critical evaluation of the candidate's effectiveness and accomplishments in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activity, and service/leadership and the degree to which the candidate is meeting standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor. Letters must culminate in one of the following recommendations:
- i. Award tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor
  - ii. Deny tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and issue a one-year terminal appointment
  - iii. Deny promotion to Professor
- XV. The Provost meets with the University Promotion and Tenure Committee and reviews their application of university standards prior to the written recommendation of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee to ensure consistency.
- XVI. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards its written recommendation to the Provost.
- XVII. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation letter is shared with the candidate.
- XVIII. At this point, the Provost, in consultation with the Dean/Library Director and Chair, should meet with candidates who are not recommended for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or for promotion to Professor due to deficiencies in the areas of teaching and/or scholarship and/or service.
- XIX. The Provost makes his/her recommendation and forwards recommendation letter to the President. In making his/her decision, the provost should review all recommendations and candidate responses, if applicable, and make one of the following recommendations:
- i. Award tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor
  - ii. Deny tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and issue a one-year terminal appointment
  - iii. Deny promotion to Professor
- XX. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee's and Provost's recommendations will be forwarded to the President along with the candidate's portfolio. The President will make the final administrative decision which will be communicated in writing to the candidate. In making his/her decision, the President should review all recommendations

and candidate responses, if applicable, and make one of the following recommendations:

- i. Award tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor
- ii. Deny tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and issue a one-year terminal appointment
- iii. Deny promotion to Professor

## Section 2: Standards and Evidence

### **Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

The granting of tenure ensures the academic freedom that is essential to the search for truth and attainment of excellence which are central to the University's mission to provide an excellent education within a creative community where learning and values meet, and to foster in students the qualities that will prepare them to reach their full potential as informed citizens of local communities and the world and to meet lifelong intellectual, ethical, and career challenges. In recognizing a candidate's potential long-term value to the institution, the granting of tenure is one of the most important personnel decisions made by the University. Tenure will be granted to faculty members whose potential for effective, long-term performance and achievement in serving the University's mission and whose demonstrated professional conduct and high personal and professional integrity warrant the institution's reciprocal long-term commitment.

For candidates hired at the rank of Assistant Professor, tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will be awarded simultaneously. Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will be granted only to those candidates who meet or exceed the standards specified below.

For candidates applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the divisional interpretations of standards for scholarship and creative activity that were in effect at time of initial appointment should be included and should accompany the portfolio at all stages of evaluation.

For candidates hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, an alternate timetable for tenure must be specified in writing in the initial letter of appointment (refer to relevant sections of the policies and procedures).

#### Teaching/Librarianship

Because Stetson University considers itself to be an institution centered on powerful student engagement and learning, teaching/librarianship effectiveness is considered an essential element for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The effective teacher will inspire and challenge students realizing significant disciplinary and liberal learning. The effective librarian will acquire, organize, and disseminate the appropriate resources required to support the teaching and learning mission of the University, and will provide effective research assistance and research methods instruction for those resources. Candidates must provide evidence of effective teaching/librarianship and demonstrate the likelihood of continued effectiveness throughout his/her Stetson career.

#### Standards for teaching/librarianship effectiveness:

- **Command of Subject Matter:** Across the University, command of subject matter is considered essential. The candidate must demonstrate competency in his/her discipline, must be able to integrate scholarship into the classroom (for teaching faculty), and must maintain currency in the chosen field.
- **Organization:** The candidate must demonstrate that he/she has an organized plan for each course, has clearly defined learning outcomes/objectives and appropriate

assessment mechanisms, and clearly communicates expectations to students. The librarian candidate must demonstrate the ability to organize and disseminate physical and electronic information resources effectively.

- **Rigor:** The candidate must demonstrate high standards of teaching as applied to course design, implementation, student evaluation, and assessment of student learning outcomes. The candidate must ensure sufficiently challenging course content. The librarian candidate must demonstrate that all appropriate professional standards are met in the development of physical and electronic collections that serve the curricular needs of the University. In addition, the librarian candidate must demonstrate high standards of research assistance, research methods instruction, the dissemination of information, and the development of the information fluency of students.
- **Evolution:** The candidate must demonstrate growth as a teacher, achieving a sustained record of teaching effectiveness. The candidate is expected to develop and master a repertoire of teaching techniques that facilitate effective student learning, and is also expected to address and improve techniques that are not as successful. The candidate will be expected to develop new courses and/or enrich existing courses as the discipline evolves. The librarian candidate must demonstrate growth as a librarian. The librarian candidate is expected to maintain current professional standards for collection development, research assistance, and research methods instruction, and must demonstrate the use of evolving technology to organize and disseminate information effectively.
- **Engagement:** The candidate must be an involved teacher both in the classroom and beyond, encouraging the intellectual engagement and development of each student. As teacher/scholars, the candidate must involve students in scholarly and/or creative activities and/or participate in teaching-related student activities. Effective advising, mentoring, and availability to students as well as timely and quality feedback to students are important components of teaching engagement and effectiveness. The librarian candidate is expected to be informed of the current curriculum in order to meet the evolving information needs of the University community, and to stay involved in professional development to ensure competency in advancements in resources, research and instruction techniques, and technology.

#### Evidence of teaching/librarianship effectiveness

Multiple forms of evidence must be provided to support and evaluate teaching effectiveness. The candidate may provide any evidence that demonstrates the standards for teaching/librarianship effectiveness have been met. Letters from current students may not be provided as evidence.

The following evidence is required of all candidates:

- Quantitative reports and all written student comments from student evaluations of teaching effectiveness (required for candidates with teaching responsibilities) for all courses taught during the pre-tenure period at Stetson University
- FARs/Librarian Self-Evaluations
- Department Chair's and Dean's/Library Director's responses to FARs/Librarian Self-Evaluations

- Second- and Fourth year reviews
  - Department Chair's summary letter and recommendations
  - Response from the candidate, if applicable
  - Dean's/Library Director's recommendations and response from the candidate, if applicable
- Written and signed peer observation reports by tenured departmental colleagues as defined in 3.3.4.4, B. 1 (required for candidates with teaching responsibilities).
- Syllabi from all courses taught during the pre-tenure period at Stetson University
- Classroom observations of teaching by tenured departmental colleagues and, if applicable, members of ad hoc committee at second and fourth year reviews (required for candidates with teaching responsibilities)

The following evidence is optional. However, the list is neither completely inclusive nor exclusive, and the School/Library/Division may list additional items of evidence and/or assign some evidence more weight than others.

- Unit or divisional comparative reports of teaching evaluations from the Office of Institutional Research
- External non-confidential letters from non-Stetson faculty and professionals who have observed the candidate's teaching and engagement with students and can provide professional comment on teaching and learning effectiveness
- Documentation of scholarly/creative activities with students, including resulting publications, conference papers, and other outcomes
- Study of curricular, mentoring, and pedagogical issues, sharing the information with others (e.g., presentations, documents, publications), and applying results to curriculum revision, pedagogy innovations, and/or advising and mentoring.
- Professional development activities to enhance teaching effectiveness
- New course development
- Significant course revisions/redesigns
- Engagement in student learning outcomes assessment (at program, departmental, College/School, and/or University level) and incorporating findings in curriculum revision
- Contributions to the General Education Program and liberal learning
- Contributions to University curricular development, interdisciplinary programs, and/or collaborative learning projects
- Evidence of innovative use of technology that enhances teaching effectiveness
- Evidence of innovative use of engaged pedagogies and high-impact learning practices
- Teaching-related awards

- Teaching-related grants / grant proposals (e.g., curriculum development, teaching innovation)
- Documentation of alumni/ae success related to their Stetson University experience
- Documentation of effective advising/mentoring

### Scholarly and Creative Activities

Because of its vital role in keeping faculty members abreast of new trends and ideas, and in establishing and maintaining the University's national reputation, active engagement in scholarship and/or creative activities that support the University's mission of excellence in teaching and learning is essential for achieving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Stetson University recognizes all forms of scholarship that meet the standards described below and adhere to the tenets of the candidate's discipline. For tenure and promotion to the Associate level, the candidate must demonstrate that she/he is actively and consistently contributing to the discipline, is producing high quality work, and is highly likely to continue doing so.

#### Standards for effectiveness in scholarly and creative activities:

- **Rigor:** To reach its potential, scholarship/creative activity must be shared and tested publicly. Thus, across the University, peer review is considered the hallmark of academic rigor and the primary indicator of high quality academic and creative pursuits. Thus, the candidate must provide evidence that scholarly and/or creative activities have been subjected to the peer review process in a manner appropriate to the discipline and form of scholarship/creative activity.
- **Engagement:** The candidate must demonstrate active participation with and contribution to her/his discipline, and/or interdisciplinary activities that emphasize a candidate's disciplinary strengths. As a teacher-scholar, the candidate must demonstrate the influence of scholarship on classroom instruction/curriculum development/librarianship and/or the involvement of students in research/creative activities.
- **Evolution:** Scholarly and creative activities must reflect the incorporation of current practices within the discipline and demonstrate that the candidate is developing his or her own line of scholarship since arriving at Stetson.
- **Consistency:** Candidates must demonstrate commitment to the discipline by providing evidence of continued participation in scholarly or creative activities. Though quality of scholarship and creative activity is more significant than quantity, candidates for tenure and promotion must demonstrate an involvement in *ongoing* scholarly and/or creative work and the ability to complete and communicate high quality work. Generally speaking, consistency is demonstrated by some form of scholarly contribution and/or creative expression every year.

#### Evidence of effectiveness in scholarly and creative activities

The form of scholarship varies by discipline and those who react to scholarly/creative activities critically will also vary. Thus, the candidate may provide any evidence that demonstrates that the

standards for effectiveness in scholarly and creative activities have been met. In order to be considered, scholarly and/or creative activities must be primarily completed since the time of initial employment at Stetson. Works in progress (*e.g.*, under review, under contract, submitted for publication) will not be considered as publications but may be provided as evidence of ongoing scholarly and/or creative activities. The candidate should be mindful that evaluators may not be familiar with terminology, professional associations, journals, acronyms, certifications, and other language of a particular field. Thus, providing evaluators an understanding of one's professional competence and achievements is critical.

The following evidence is required of all candidates:

- FARs/Librarian Self-Evaluations
- Responses to FARs/Librarian Self-Evaluations
- Second- and Fourth year reviews
  - Chair's summary letter and recommendations
  - Responses from the candidate, if applicable
  - Dean's/Library Director's recommendations and responses from the candidate, if applicable
- External peer reviewed publications, exhibitions, shows, or performances. Include annotations that describe publication/scholarly outlets and individual contributions to collaborative work Conference presentations/participation

The following evidence is optional. However, the list is neither completely inclusive nor exclusive, and the School/Library/Division may list additional items of evidence and/or assign some evidence more weight than others.

- Peer reviewed publications (books, journal articles, textbooks, essays, poems, book reviews, accepted/in press publications). Include annotations that describe publication outlets and individual contributions to collaborative work
- Peer reviewed publications (books, journal articles, textbooks, essays, poems, book reviews, accepted/in press publications) with student co-authors. Include annotations that describe publication outlets and individual contributions to collaborative work
- Conference presentations/participation with student co-authors
- Performances, exhibitions, shows and productions
- Grants/Grant proposals
- Scholarly/professional service to one's discipline (*e.g.*, reviewing/refereeing grant applications or journal articles)
- Awards for scholarship/creative activity

### Service

Service is expected of all faculty members at the University and includes a broad range of activities supplemental to teaching and research. Through active participation in service, faculty members share in the essential work of maintaining and enhancing the teaching and research mission of the institution.

While participation in University life is expected, new faculty members must achieve a balance between service to the University, teaching expectations, and developing a scholarly and/or creative program. Thus, service contributions for newly hired faculty should ideally involve a period of moderate and willing participation mainly at the departmental level followed by limited opportunities to participate in endeavors with a broader scope.

Standards for Service:

- **Campus Engagement:** The candidate must willingly and effectively participate in service activities. Service responsibilities should be limited initially and should, after a reasonable period, evolve into activities that support the Departmental/School/College/Library/University mission to a greater extent.
- **Civic Engagement:** While not required, community service contributions included as evidence for tenure and promotion should bear a relationship to a candidate's field of expertise and the mission of the University. Civic engagement that is noted in portfolios should be integrated with teaching and scholarship.

Evidence for Service:

The candidate may provide any evidence that demonstrates that service has been performed and has been effective.

The following evidence is required of all candidates:

- FARs/Librarian Self-Evaluations
- Second- and Fourth-year reviews
  - Chair's summary letter and recommendations
  - Responses from the candidate, if applicable
  - Dean's/Library Director's recommendations and responses from the candidate, if applicable

The following evidence is optional. However, the list is neither completely inclusive nor exclusive, and the School/Library/Division may list additional items of evidence and/or assign some evidence more weight than others.

- Committee chair evaluations of committee work
- Committee reports
- Letters from faculty or professionals external to Stetson University who have interacted with the candidate in the context of professional service and who can comment on the effectiveness of the candidate's service involvement/provision.

## **Standards for Promotion to Professor**

Promotion to Professor is the highest distinction the University can bestow on an individual and is not earned solely by time in rank. Although candidates may apply for promotion during the sixth year of service at the Associate level, candidates are encouraged to apply only after they can demonstrate that every standard has been met or exceeded. Candidates may seek promotion to Professor with less than six years of time in rank only if an alternative timetable was specified in writing in the initial letter of appointment.

### Teaching/Librarianship

Excellence in teaching/librarianship is considered an essential element for promotion to Professor. The successful candidate for promotion will demonstrate not only substantial accomplishments in teaching since the award of promotion to Associate, but that his/her teaching has matured and expertise in pedagogy has developed. The effective teacher will inspire and challenge students, realizing significant disciplinary and liberal learning. The effective librarian will demonstrate that he/she has mastered the skills to acquire, organize, and disseminate the appropriate resources required to support the teaching mission of the University, and that he/she provides effective research assistance and research methods instruction for those resources. Candidates must provide evidence of continued effective teaching/librarianship as evidenced by multiple sources of documentation since promotion to Associate Professor.

### Standards for teaching/librarianship effectiveness

The candidate is required to demonstrate continued **Command of Subject Matter, Organization, Rigor, and Engagement** as outlined as standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, promotion to Professor requires the following demonstrated standards:

- **Maturity:** The candidate must demonstrate a level of expertise in his/her teaching that is informed by years of teaching experience and growth as a teacher/scholar. The candidate must demonstrate a consistent level of teaching effectiveness enhanced by improved and innovative teaching techniques and currency in his/her discipline. The librarian candidate must demonstrate a level of maturity and expertise in his/her position that is informed by years of experience and growth as a librarian. The librarian candidate must demonstrate a consistent level of effectiveness enhanced by improved and innovative use of evolving professional standards and technology.
- **Impact:** The candidate must demonstrate that his/her classroom teaching and engagement in the teaching process has had a positive effect on students and junior colleagues. Direct evidence of learning outcomes including alumni success is especially encouraged. The librarian candidate must demonstrate that his/her expertise has had a positive effect on the development of the library and its utility to users, as well as a positive effect on junior colleagues.

### Evidence of teaching/librarianship effectiveness:

Multiple forms of evidence must be provided to support and evaluate teaching effectiveness. The candidate may provide any evidence that demonstrates the standards for teaching/librarianship effectiveness have been met (letters from current students may not be provided as evidence). In most cases, evidence should be provided for the time period since the

last promotion. Evidence that demonstrates particular achievements over the entire Stetson career, however, may also be presented.

The following evidence is required of all candidates:

- Quantitative reports and all written student comments from student evaluations of teaching effectiveness (required for candidates with teaching responsibilities) for all courses taught since promotion to Associate Professor
- FARs/Librarian Self-Evaluations
- Department Chair's and Dean's/Library Director's responses to FARs/Librarian Self-Evaluations
- Written and signed peer observations reports by tenured departmental colleagues as defined in 3.3.4.4, B. 1 (required for candidates with teaching responsibilities).
- Syllabi from all courses taught since promotion to Associate Professor

The following evidence is optional. However, the list is neither completely inclusive nor exclusive, and the School/Library/Division may list additional items of evidence and/or assign some evidence more weight than others.

- Unit or divisional comparative reports of teaching evaluations from the Office of Institutional Research
- External non-confidential letters from non-Stetson faculty and professionals who have observed the candidate's teaching and engagement with students and can provide professional comment on teaching and learning effectiveness
- Documentation of scholarly/creative activities with students, including resulting publications, conference papers, and other outcomes
- Study of curricular, mentoring, and pedagogical issues, sharing the information with others (e.g., presentations, documents, publications), and applying results to curriculum revision, pedagogy innovations, and/or advising and mentoring.
- Professional development activities to enhance teaching effectiveness
- New course development
- Engagement in student learning outcomes assessment (at program, departmental, College/School, and/or University level) and incorporating findings in curriculum revision
- Documentation of student success and direct evidence of learning outcomes facilitated by the candidate: GEAC guidelines, senior exit interviews, self-administered assessment, alumni/ae success, etc.
- Contributions to the General Education Program and liberal learning
- Contributions to University curricular development, interdisciplinary programs, and/or collaborative learning projects

- Significant course revisions/redesigns
- Evidence of innovative use of technology that enhances teaching effectiveness
- Evidence of innovative use of engaged pedagogies and high-impact learning practices
- Teaching-related awards
- Teaching-related grants / grant proposals (e.g., curriculum development, teaching innovation)
- Documentation of mentoring junior faculty

### Scholarly and Creative Activities

#### Standards for excellence in scholarly and creative activities

The candidate is required to demonstrate continued **Rigor and Engagement** as outlined in the standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, promotion to Professor requires the following demonstrated standards:

**Maturity:** Candidates must demonstrate intellectual growth in scholarly and creative activities since tenure/promotion to Associate Professor and over time.

**Development of expertise:** Scholarly and creative activities must have sufficient focus that demonstrates that the candidate has distinguished herself/himself by becoming an expert in some aspect(s) of her/his field and making meaningful contributions to the field.

**Recognition:** The candidate must demonstrate that her/his contributions to the discipline have been acknowledged as significant by peers/peer review and/or prestigious organizations.

**Consistency:** While it is recognized that there are often legitimate reasons for periods of inactivity with regards to scholarly or creative activities, the ability to meet other standards (e.g., maturity and development of expertise) requires consistent scholarly or creative output. Thus, significant gaps in productivity should be addressed in the narrative, and the candidate must demonstrate that she/he has a lifetime record of scholarly or creative achievement that is highly likely to continue. Thus, sufficient time must elapse following periods of inactivity to demonstrate a solid resumption of activity that is highly likely to continue beyond promotion.

#### Evidence of excellence in scholarly and creative activities:

The candidate may provide any evidence that demonstrates that the standards for excellence in scholarly and creative activities have been met. While scholarly activity and accomplishment that has been completed since tenure/promotion to Associate Professor should be emphasized, the candidate may include evidence of longer-term accomplishment that effectively shows the scholarly rigor, engagement, development of expertise, consistency, maturity, and recognition required for achievement of promotion to Professor – e.g., long-term projects begun before promotion to Associate Professor and completed since then. The candidate should be mindful

that evaluators may not be familiar with terminology, professional associations, journals, acronyms, certifications, and other language of a particular field. Thus, providing evaluators an understanding of one's professional competence and achievements is critical.

The following evidence is required of all candidates:

- FARs/Librarian Self-Evaluations
- Responses to FARs/Librarian Self-Evaluations
- External peer reviewed publications, exhibitions, shows, or performances. Include annotations that describe publication/scholarly outlets and individual contributions to collaborative work.
- Conference presentations/participation

The following evidence is optional. However, the list is neither completely inclusive nor exclusive, and the School/Library/Division may list additional items of evidence and/or assign some evidence more weight than others.

- Peer reviewed publications (books, journal articles, textbooks, essays, poems, book reviews, accepted/in press publications). Include annotations that describe publication outlets and individual contributions to collaborative work
- Peer reviewed publications (books, journal articles, textbooks, essays, poems, book reviews, accepted/in press publications) with student co-authors. Include annotations that describe publication outlets and individual contributions to collaborative work
- Conference presentations/participation with student co-authors
- Performances, exhibitions, shows and productions
- Grants/grant proposals
- Awards for scholarship/creative activity
- Fellowships
- Letter(s) from external reviewer(s) that are not to be shared with the candidate, as per the process defined in 3.3.4.X B V c (confidential letter to be included in candidate portfolio by the Department Chair after the candidate submits the portfolio).
- Invitations to conferences based on expertise
- Invitations to publish/present/preside/exhibit/consult based on expertise
- Scholarly/professional service in one's discipline (e.g., as reader, editor, editorial committee member, grant reviewer/evaluator)
- Mentoring successful students and alumni

### Leadership

### Standards for Leadership

The candidate is required to demonstrate continued **Campus Engagement** as outlined in the standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In addition to continuing to meet standards of service necessary for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate for promotion to Professor must also demonstrate leadership. Leadership will be demonstrated by increasing engagement at the School/College/Library and University level, impact across the University, and maturity.

**Engagement:** The candidate must demonstrate that the breadth of service contributions has expanded from that expected of an Assistant Professor to broader areas of focus, importance, and effectiveness across the University.

**Impact:** The candidate must demonstrate significant participation in service activities that have a positive effect on University life.

**Maturity:** The candidate must demonstrate the ability to complete complex service tasks successfully, to communicate across disciplines, and to work with faculty and administrators effectively.

### Evidence for Effective Leadership:

The candidate may provide any evidence that demonstrates that effective leadership has been performed.

The following evidence is required of all candidates:

- Chair evaluations of committee work
- FARs/Librarian Self-Evaluations
- Departmental chair evaluations

The following evidence is optional. However, the list is neither completely inclusive nor exclusive, and the School/Library/Division may list additional items of evidence and/or assign some evidence more weight than others.

- Committee reports
- Letters from:
  - Colleagues
  - Administrators
  - Committee members
  - Faculty or professionals external to Stetson University who have interacted with the candidate in the context of professional service and who can comment on the effectiveness of the candidate's service involvement/provision
- Leadership in scholarly/professional organization
- Service-learning and other community-engaged learning

- Administrative service (e.g., Department Chair/program director)
- Documentation of successful student recruitment/advising
- Letters from alumni/ae that describe mentoring
- Documentation of continuing education for professional certifications/licensure
- Mentoring junior faculty

## Bibliography

- American University of University Professors Publications (n.d.) *On collegiality as a criterion for faculty evaluation* (statement modified and adopted by the Association's Council in November 1999). Retrieved from:  
<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/collegiality.htm>.
- Boyer, E. (1997). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- (1996). From Scholarship Reconsidered to scholarship assessed. *Quest* 48, 129-139.
- Everett, D., Coggins, P., DeMoss, M., Grubbs, T., Reddish, M., Rickman, M., & Ryan, S. (2009). *Tenure and promotion review task force: Interim report*. Stetson University.
- Faculty Focus Special Report (n.d.) *Faculty promotion and tenure: Eight ways to improve the tenure review process of your institution*. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.facultyfocus.com>.
- Farrell, T., Coggins, P., Pollock, M., DeMoss, M., & Robinson, S. (2008). *Tenure and promotion review committee report*. Stetson University.
- Jaschik, S. (2010, March). *Different paths to full professor*. Inside higher education. Retrieved from: <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/03/05/osu>.
- University Promotion and Tenure Committee [Process Memos](#) (2006-2009). Suggestions to improve the tenure and promotion process to Stetson University Council of Deans.
- Policies consulted:
- [Elon University](#)
- [Bucknell University](#)
- [Harvard University](#)
- [Trinity University](#)
- [Davidson College](#)
- [Butler University](#)
- [Keene State College](#)
- [University of Richmond](#)
- [Willamette University](#)

### **Section 3: Additional Recommendations to the Provost**

1. Initial contracts or letters of appointment for those faculty members entering with credit toward tenure should include a statement that says tenure must be applied for no earlier than or no later than a specific year. For those candidates awarded up to 3 years credit toward the probationary period from a prior appointment, the letter should also specify whether scholarly or creative work completed during the 'credit' years may be counted towards tenure and promotion at Stetson.
2. Whenever possible, Department Chairs should hold the rank of Professor. If a faculty member with a rank less than that of Professor must hold a Department Chair position, it is recommended that the Dean/Library Director ensure proper written evaluation takes place as stated in the recommended policies and procedures.
3. School/Library/Division articulation and interpretations of standards and evidence for tenure/promotion should address on-line courses whenever applicable. For example, how does evaluation differ for faculty members who do not spend time in a classroom with students?
4. A template for external review requests should be developed and provided to Department Chairs.
5. A best practices document should be developed on peer teaching observations and written evaluation reports.
6. As the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) is a crucial evaluative tool for progress towards tenure and promotion, the Task Force recommends that the Provost appoint a work group to study and revise the FAR.
7. The Task Force recommended policies and procedures mandate that a Mentoring Committee is established to coordinate the mentoring of candidates and others involved in the tenure and promotion process. The Task Force recommends that the Provost appoint a committee carefully constructed of people well-versed in the standards, policies, and procedures for tenure and promotion.
8. The Task Force recommended policies and procedures strongly recommends annual diversity training, with an emphasis on how diversity issues may affect the promotion and tenure process, be given to all Department Chairs and others directly involved in the promotion and tenure process. The Task Force recommends that the Provost appoint a faculty member/administrator to coordinate this training.
9. After all committee deliberations have been completed and when the portfolio has passed to the Provost, all candidates should receive the written recommendations from both the College/School/Library Promotion and Tenure Committee and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. At that time, candidates should be allowed to withdraw their application or proceed through the process. However, it must be made clear to applicants for tenure and promotion to Associate who chose to withdraw that there is no chance for reapplication. The Task Force recommends that evaluative letters from colleagues, Department Chairs, Dean/Library Director, and Provost remain confidential.
10. To ensure adequate feedback on teaching, scholarship, and service for all tenured faculty members, the Task Force recommends that post-tenure reviews should be conducted

every four years from the time of tenure until the rank of Professor has been reached. Faculty with rank of Professor should be reviewed every six years. Post-tenure reviews should be conducted by Department Chairs. Reviews of Department Chairs not ranked Professor should be conducted by the Dean/Library Director.

11. Faculty members currently serving in administrative positions should receive a letter from the Provost detailing expectations regarding teaching/scholarship/service for evaluative purposes.
12. A Center for Teaching and Learning and Office of Undergraduate Research should be established in consultation with experts so as to provide opportunities for faculty development and support for scholarly activities.
13. The Task Force strongly recommends that the Provost's office, in consultation with the Deans/Library Director, develop a process to assess teaching effectiveness. This process should result in an *Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness* document that becomes a formal component of the tenure and promotion process, as an appendix of the tenure and promotion guidelines.
14. The Task Force recommends that current, updated faculty members' CVs be collected annually and kept on file in the Deans'/Library Director's office, and/or posted on departmental websites.
15. A University-level committee should be established to ensure uniformity in the School/Divisional/Library interpretation of standards for tenure and promotion.
16. The Task Force strongly recommends that the Provost's Office, in consultation with the Deans/Library Director, create a checklist for the requisite documents at the Second-Year Review, the Fourth-Year Review, and the Tenure Review. This checklist should be attached to the portfolios of candidates to ensure that all steps have been followed.
17. The President should meet annually with the Chair of the Diversity Council regarding tenure and promotion decisions after the candidates are informed of the decisions. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss patterns of tenure/promotion denials to members of diverse groups, to identify potential patterns of disparate impact, and to determine strategies of how to address such problems in future years, and how best to support members of diverse groups.
18. The Provost, in consultation with the Deans/Library Director, should consider carefully how the new policy impacts current tenure-track faculty members
19. The Tenure and Promotion Policies and Standards should be reviewed after a sufficient time has elapsed, *e.g.*, 5-7 years, and modified, if necessary, at that time.
20. To encourage scholarly and creative activity, the Task Force recommends the establishment of a merit pay structure and a system for ensuring equity in faculty workloads. For example, faculty who actively engage in scholarship and/or creative work could apply for course releases and receive merit pay.

## **Appendix 1: Responsibilities Regarding Tenure and Promotion**

### Responsibilities of Department Chairs in the Tenure and Promotion Process:

1. Department Chairs have the responsibility to mentor faculty members throughout the tenure and promotion process. The Department Chairs should use the Tenure and/or Promotion Checklist [appendix 4] to ensure all steps in the process are completed.
2. Department Chairs should meet with new faculty members within one month of initial employment to review the tenure and promotion process based on current policies, procedures, and standards. Should procedures change during the pre-tenure period, the Chair should meet with candidates to review the changes.
3. Department Chairs should take steps to ensure that a tenure-track faculty member is not overburdened with University or departmental service, especially during the first year, but also throughout the pre-tenure years. In the unusual case of a pre-tenure faculty member with unavoidable major service commitments such as directing a program or institute, the Chair should discuss the possibility of alternative schedules (*e.g.*, reduced course load, no additional service, etc.) with the candidate, the Dean and the Provost to ensure the burden is not so great as to interfere with teaching and scholarship.
4. The Department Chair will coordinate peer observation(s) of teaching as described in this policy.
5. The Department Chair will attend the University Promotion and Tenure Committee information and training sessions and is strongly encouraged to participate in relevant diversity training.
6. The Department chair oversees the completion of Faculty Annual Reports (FARS)/Librarian Self-Evaluations for members of their department, including written response by the appointed deadline.
7. The Department Chair must be available to discuss with faculty the opportunities for tenure and/or promotion.
8. In pre-tenure reviews, and reviews for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Professor, the Department Chair receives the candidate's portfolio, circulates it among tenured members of the Department (as well as other faculty designated as part of the candidate's evaluation committee), solicits individual tenured faculty letters of evaluation, writes a summary letter of the confidential department letters that also includes the Chair's own evaluation of the candidate. In the case of pre-tenure reviews, the Chair provides this letter to the candidate, allowing for a minimum of two business days and a maximum of five business days for the candidate to respond. The Chair forwards her/his evaluation letter along with the candidate response (if applicable) to the next level of the process by the appointed deadline.
9. The Department Chair will conduct the solicitation of optional confidential external peer evaluations.

Responsibilities of Dean/Library Director in the Tenure and Promotion Process:

1. The Dean/Library Director should mentor Department Chairs through the tenure and promotion process and hold Department Chairs accountable for their roles in the process.
2. In the rare case of untenured Chairs, the Dean should be especially proactive in mentoring those faculty members through the process of evaluating untenured departmental colleagues. The Dean/Library Director should also be proactive in mentoring untenured Department Chairs through their own tenure and promotion process.
3. The Dean/Library Director, in consultation with Department Chairs and the Provost, should take steps to ensure that tenure-track faculty members are not overburdened with University, College/School, or departmental service, especially during the first year, but also throughout the pre-tenure years.
4. For faculty members in departments of fewer than four tenured faculty members and for faculty members whose work is interdisciplinary or who have joint appointments, the Dean will appoint additional tenured faculty members to serve as ad hoc department members for evaluation purposes.
5. The Dean/Library Director will attend the University Promotion and Tenure Committee information, training, and diversity sessions.
6. The Dean/Library Director or his/her designee (e.g., Associate Dean) must respond in writing to each FAR/Librarian Self-Evaluation or sign the FAR/Librarian Self-Evaluation to acknowledge that he/she has reviewed it. However, the Dean/Library Director should respond in writing to every Department Chair's FAR/Librarian Self-Evaluation. The Dean's response should include a candid, thorough, and current critical evaluation of the candidate's effectiveness and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service/leadership and put the candidate's work into the context of the discipline. The Dean's response should make clear the candidate's progress toward tenure and/or promotion with explicit reference to University and disciplinary standards.
7. The Dean/Library Director must maintain files of required tenure and promotion documentation to be provided to the candidate upon request. Required documentation includes:
  - a) Documentation indicating tenure and promotion standards in effect at time of hire
  - b) Quantitative reports and all written student comments from student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught during the pre-tenure period at Stetson University
  - c) Written and signed peer observations reports by colleagues, as defined in 3.3.4.4, B. 1.
  - d) Faculty Activity Reports (FARs)/Librarian Self-Evaluation
  - e) Department Chair responses to the FARs/Librarian Self-Evaluation
  - f) Candidate's responses to Department Chair responses, if applicable

g) Documents related to the Second- and Fourth-Year Reviews (Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor candidates only)

- Department Chair's summary letter, including recommendations
- Responses, if any, from candidate
- Dean/Library Director recommendations

8. The Dean will respond in writing to pre-tenure reviews, and reviews for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Professor. In the case of pre-tenure reviews, the Dean provides this letter to the candidate, allowing for a minimum of three business days and a maximum of five business days for the candidate to respond. The Dean forwards her/his evaluation letter along with the candidate response (if applicable) to the next level of the process by the appointed deadline.

Responsibilities of the Provost in the Tenure and Promotion Process:

1. The Provost must ensure that all faculty members, upon initial employment, receive all appropriate tenure and promotion documents, including relevant sections of the *Stetson University Organization, Policies, and Procedures Manual* and Library/Division documents pertaining to the process (including interpretations of the standards).
2. The Provost has the responsibility to mentor the Deans/Library Director in the tenure and promotion process and to hold the Deans/Library Director accountable for their roles in the process.
3. The Provost must ensure the fulfillment of all training, informational, and professional development functions contained in this document.
4. The Provost, in consultation with Department Chairs and the Deans/Library Director, should ensure that candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are not overburdened with University, College/School or departmental service, especially during the first year, but also throughout the pre-tenure years.
5. The Provost should ensure that the Deans/Library Director or his/her designee (e.g., Associate Dean) respond in writing to the Faculty Activity Report (FAR)/Librarian Self-Evaluation of all Department Chairs. The Provost should ensure that the Dean/Library Director's evaluations of candidates are candid, thorough, and critical reviews and that the responses make clear the candidate's progress toward tenure and/or promotion, explicitly referencing the University and disciplinary standards.
6. The Provost should ensure that the Dean/Library Director responds in writing to a candidate's Second- and Fourth-Year Reviews. The Provost should ensure that the Dean/Library Director's evaluations of candidates include a candid, thorough, and critical evaluation of the candidate's effectiveness and accomplishments in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activity, and service, especially as they relate to, and with explicit reference to, the tenure and promotion standards (in effect at the time of the candidate's initial employment) and the degree to which the candidate is meeting them. The Provost, in consultation with the Dean/Library Director and Chair, should meet with candidates whose Second-Year Reviews and Fourth-Year Reviews reflect deficiencies in the areas of teaching and/or scholarship and/or service.
7. The Provost, in consultation with the Dean/Library Director and Chair, should meet with candidates who are not recommended for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or for promotion to Professor due to deficiencies in the areas of teaching and/or scholarship and/or service.
8. The Provost communicates any personnel decisions resulting from the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year reviews, and makes tenure and promotion recommendations to the President.
9. To ensure consistent application of standards, the Provost should meet with the University Promotion and Tenure Committee to discuss tenure and promotion recommendations prior to written articulation of committee recommendations.

Responsibilities of the College/School/Library Promotion and Tenure Committee  
in the Tenure and Promotion Process

1. The College/School/Library Promotion and Tenure Committee receives and reviews the complete candidate portfolio and responds with a written recommendation. The College/School/Library Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards the recommendation letter along with the portfolio to the Dean/Library Director by the appointed deadline.

Responsibilities of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee  
in the Tenure and Promotion Process

1. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee will conduct the training and information sessions as described in this policy.
2. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTC) receives and reviews the complete candidate portfolio and responds with a written recommendation. The UPTC meets with the Provost to review their analysis and decision. The UTPC Chair provides the written recommendation letters from the College/School/Library Promotion and Tenure Committee and the UPTC to the candidate, allowing for a minimum of three business days and a maximum of five business days for the candidate to respond. The UPTC Chair forwards the recommendation letter along with the candidate response (if applicable) to the President and Provost by the appointed deadline.
3. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee will be charged with soliciting feedback on this policy from all involved in the process at the end of each year. The UPTC will provide a summary of feedback and recommendations for changes to the Provost.

## APPENDIX 2: Questions for Constituency Groups

1. How is teaching best evaluated?
2. What constitutes evidence of effective teaching?
3. How is peer-reviewed scholarship best evaluated? What constitutes evidence of (1) scholarship; and (2) peer review? How should it be weighted?
4. How is non-traditional scholarship such as web pages, blogs, non-refereed publications, etc. best evaluated? What constitutes evidence of such work?
5. What should constitute peer-review for non-traditional scholarship?
6. If non-traditional scholarship has resulted in a national reputation, is that the same level of distinction as a national reputation acquired through traditional venues for scholarship? If not, how should it compare?
7. How are musical performance and/or creative activity best evaluated? What constitutes evidence of such work? Consider also the issue of peer-review.
8. How should service be measured and evaluated? What do you see as the weighted role of University, department, professional, and community service? What constitutes evidence of service?
9. Is civic engagement as important as University service? If not, how should it compare?
10. Should there be external review of tenure and promotion portfolios?
11. Are there other issues regarding the tenure and promotion process you would like to see addressed? Without referring to specifics of any case, what problems has your unit encountered?

## **APPENDIX 3: MINUTES FROM MEETINGS WITH CONSTITUENCY GROUPS**

### **I. Tenure/Promotion Committees**

#### **A. University T/P Committee (Feb 22, 2010)**

TPPR Members: Kimberly Flint-Hamilton, Michael Rickman, Sue Ryan, Alicia Schultheis

University T/P Members: 3 of 5 (Kevin Riggs, Ann Small, Sue Ryan)

(sent for review to all those present)

Comments on problems with the process:

The lack of policies to deal with administrators seeking tenure and/or promotion was cited. A lack of much of a teaching and/or scholarship record makes it difficult to evaluate some candidates with significant administrative duties. It is often not spelled out well how much time is supposed to be devoted to administrative duties. A related issue is the granting of tenure to top-level administrators; no current policies guide how tenure and rank are decided on hire.

Candidates who are hired with up to three years of credit toward tenure and/or promotion are often not well-served by the current process. The two- and four-year reviews for these candidates tend to come quickly and close together and are not especially useful in evaluating progress over time. It is believed that appointment letters for those with credit generally state that the candidate is eligible to apply for tenure during a certain academic year. No provisions, however, are believed to be made for the latest date for which the candidate must apply for tenure. It is suggested that the appointment letters might state both the earliest and latest date a candidate may go up for tenure and/or promotion and that candidates be mentored to wait until they have met the standards for tenure and promotion rather than always going up at the earliest date possible.

Training is important. The annual meeting hosted by the University P&T Committee comes too late to help anyone through the process. Committee members liked the idea of a more formal junior faculty mentoring program.

Comments on Promotion:

What is the best way to measure the standards for full professor? While everyone seemed to agree in theory that investing, or participating, in the University in the form of leadership and service, they also agreed those traits are hard to measure.

One Music School faculty member suggested that music faculty must have published research if they are not performing. The Music School must come up with a way to define differences in international performance reputation and a body of local performances.

One Committee member believes that it may be a good idea to word the tenure and promotion to associate standards the same – which would avoid de-coupling. He thought, however, that this would probably lead to more tenure denials (which also may not be a bad thing in every case).

#### Comments on scholarship:

The three members of the Committee agreed with the idea that has been floated of having University tenure and promotion standards that set the “floor” for the entire campus and then having the divisions or departments interpret the standards in the context of their own disciplines. One P&T Committee member commented that the closer you get to the expertise in the field in interpreting the candidate’s work, the better. Another commented on the difficulty of assessing different types of peer-reviewed scholarship that can vary widely from short pieces of application scholarship to complex scientific research articles. Everyone agreed that the candidates, chairs, and deans must put the candidate’s work into the proper context.

A Committee member said that while the “gold standard” for scholarship is peer-review, peer-review can be expressed in different ways. We need to better define different avenues of peer-review.

The Committee members were not particularly enthusiastic about a form replacing letters by Chairs. Experience with the School of Music tenure and promotion recommendation forms has led to the belief that the forms tend to encourage less analysis and critical evaluation than letters. Forms that attempted to force answers to critical questions concerning the candidate’s progress in the process could possibly be used in addition to letters. On the other hand, a checklist used to ensure that all steps in the tenure and promotion process was thought to be useful.

#### Comments on Evaluation:

There should be a way to “close the loop” on the FARs. In other words, if problems or concerns come to light in the Chair’s response to the FAR, the candidate should respond in writing with a plan to address areas of concern. Chairs who are not yet full professors (or in the few cases where they may even be untenured), need more evaluation at the dean level or by someone appointed by the dean.

Small departments are at a disadvantage with regard to evaluation. Although faculty members from outside the department are often asked to be evaluators of portfolios at the time of tenure and/or promotion, that is too late. Evaluators must be assigned early in the tenure/promotion process for consistent, regular feedback.

#### Comments on External Review:

Most seem to prefer the system we now use – leaving it up to the candidate to provide names for external review letters – rather than a formal external portfolio review.

## **B. Business Administration T/P Committee (16 Feb 2010)**

TPPR Members: Sue Ryan and Paul Dascher

Business School T/P Members: Larry Belcher, Michelle DeMoss and Greg McCann (1 member was ill and another was unavailable)

These notes have been reviewed and approved by those in attendance

Some general themes dominated the meeting. These included the following factors or guides:

1. AACSB accreditation requirements set expectation levels in the areas of teaching and research with some attention to service. These are followed in the School and provide some guidance for internal decision making.
2. Much of the current process appears input focused, or relying on the efforts made rather than the results achieved in the areas of teaching, research and service.
3. Consideration should be considered for the strategic alignment of teaching, research and service with the mission and strategic plans of the university and the impact of individual faculty activities on this mission and plans.

Comments on Teaching: Consideration should be considered for the effects of teaching on the growth and development of our students. This adds an outcome evaluation and measures how students have individually benefited from a Stetson education. (Note: such an outcomes based focus is part of the AACSB accreditation standards. A question about university priorities was raised relative to the number of research and service awards that are given annually versus a single award for teaching.

Comments on Research: There was some feeling that research is presently evaluated purely on a numbers basis, rather than placing it in the context of scholarship and individual contribution and development. It was suggested that an engagement model that valued innovation might be more appropriate. Again, however, there was a feeling that scholarship should be generally related to the mission and strategic plans of the university and the school.

Comments on Service: It was suggested that there are several facets to service activities. First, is the fact that faculty are asked to serve. Thus provides the individual with an opportunity to balance their personal workload and gives the individual the responsibility and opportunity to control their own level of involvement. Second was the feeling that service should be evaluated in terms of its strategic output – not measuring the number of activities or the time involved, but focused on the impact of the results.

### C. Arts & Sciences T/P Committee (March 8, 2010)

TPPR Members: Kimberly Flint-Hamilton, Sue Ryan, and Jamil Khader

Arts & Sciences T/P Members: Ana Eire, Michael King, Mercedes Tichenor.

Dwaine Cochran sent an email with answers to the questions; they will be integrated within the summary below wherever appropriate.

The College T/P Committee members discussed **seven** major problems in the current T/ P policies and process:

- 1) The clarity of the guidelines especially, in regards to the expectations about scholarship in the promotion to both Associate and Full professor. The committee members feel that since the tenure decision is primarily focused on teaching, the criteria for tenure are much clearer, but still urge more clarity in these standards.
- 2) Consistency in departmental evaluations of the candidate: The committee members think that there is an inter-departmental disparity in the quality of the second and fourth year reviews. Some departments merely offer uncritical, cheerleading letters that do not adequately prepare for the tenure and promotion stage. The committee members suggest that department chairs be trained to do their jobs more effectively and objectively. Accountability must be paramount in this process.
- 3) Scholarship and research: The committee members emphasize that in evaluating scholarship, attention should be given not only to evidence of a research agenda, but also to the quality of the publications. Peer-reviewed scholarship is best evaluated as publications in peer-reviewed journals or juried events (e. g., art shows or poster admissions); journal articles, conference posters, academic books, juried art shows constitute evidence of scholarship; and peer review should be weighted 80% and non-traditional work 20%. As for non-traditional scholarship, it is suggested that Stetson could select samples of the work and ask outside experts to rate it using blind review in which the author's name is not disclosed. Therefore, the attendees emphasized the responsibility of the candidates to discuss their scholarship and explain its significance to the various committees in their scholarship narrative.
- 4) T/P as an open process: As to whether to not the candidate should have access to the T/P letters, the committee members feel there is no harm in making the process more open at the college and university levels. However, they expressed their reservation about allowing the candidate to view the letters from the department. In fact, they highly recommend sharing the college and university committees' letters with the candidate, because there are valuable suggestions and recommendations to help the candidate achieve his or her goals.
- 5) De-coupling: The committee members support decoupling, viewing it as a positive decision. Despite the stigma and the humiliation that a de-coupled candidate may feel about such a decision, the committee members think it is actually an indication that the University values the candidate and her or his contribution to the university, but feel that there are certain weakness that can be amended within a relatively short period of time (scholarship, in particular). The problems of adequate mentoring and the importance of honest and critical second and fourth year reviews were reiterated as the best method of catching problems early on in the process.

- 6) Service: Each committee/service activity should be assigned a weight which indicates amount and quality of work required; University and College (or school) service should be rated highest, while department service next and community service last. Letters from committee chairs and community members affected by the service constitute evidence of service. The value of civic service and religious activities to the T/P decision was raised. The committee members think that as long as the candidates explain how such engagements benefit Stetson back, that they should be included. Another member does not deem it as important; it should weigh only 5%.
- 7) University T/P Policy: The committee members think it is a good idea to have a University T/P policy that can be tailored to and interpreted by each department, according to the common professional standards in their disciplines.

#### **D. Music School T/P (Feb. 22, 2010)**

TPPR Members: Michael Rickman and Jamil Khader.

Music School T/P: Ann Small, Jean West, Boyd, Jean Christensen, Bobby Adams, Lynn Musco, Jan Kindred.

1) Problems in the current T/P policies and procedure: The attendees discussed various problems in the current T/ P policies and process, most important among which were the relative value of the three areas and the clarity of the policies. Attendees agreed that all three areas should be treated equally and that the criteria by which the candidates are evaluated require clarification. Moreover, the ambiguity of the institutional self-definition and mission statement (are we a teaching or research institution?) was seen as a big part of the problem. Finally, concerns about overturning the college's T/P decision were raised. No concerns were raised about service.

2) Scholarship: Various issues that pertain to scholarship were discussed including the nature of non-traditional scholarship, quantity vs. quality, the implicit institutional valorization of scholarship over the two other areas, and the need for tougher (intra-college) standards for non-performing faculty members.

- Consensus was reached as to the need for evidence of consistent and continuous scholarship, and the need for modifying the meaning of continuous, distinctive, and sustained scholarship was also raised.
- Clarity about expectations concerning scholarship from new faculty was raised, and the need for mentoring new faculty was deemed vital for minimizing future problems.
- The problem of evaluating publications was deemed central; in particular, concerns were raised about the minimal impact of publications in the academy (the assumption that no more than four people do ever read any of these publications was mentioned a few times).

3) Teaching: Music college faculty felt very passionately about the value accorded to teaching not only throughout the T/P process but also in the institution in general.

- Concerns were raised about the devaluing of teaching in the process especially, in light of the centrality of teaching to the university's self-definition and mission statement.
- Course load, compared to other colleges, was deemed an important concern that can affect the productivity of the SOM faculty.
- Strong teaching records should also include a list of graduates.

4) Recommendations: The faculty present wanted to see some changes and revisions to the T/P policies and process. First, less emphasis should be placed on sustained and distinctive research agenda. Second, there is a need to list all categories of evaluation. Third, mentoring for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year reviews should be improved. Fourth, incorporate some form of external review. Fifth, to keep decoupling and not to treat it as an automatic decision.

## II. DEANS (Feb 17, 2010)

TPPR Members: Committee Members: Michael Rickman, Susan Ryan, Brigid Noonan, Kimberly Flinthamilton

Deans: Grady Ballenger, Jean West, Stuart Michelson

Rather than go through the list of questions, we had an informal discussion of the key factors that have posed problems in the past. Major themes that emerged were:

1. Mentoring of candidates
2. Training of chairs
3. Consistent evaluation of candidates for promotion and tenure
4. Concerns about the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year reviews
5. Peer review and confidentiality of letters
6. Development of university standards with units/divisions articulating those standards to fit their culture
7. How to handle candidates who have special gifts but need extra time
8. Alternate path to full professorship
9. Teaching/Professional Development
10. External Review of Portfolios

### 1. *Mentoring of Candidates*

There was strong feeling that lack of mentoring has posed the most problems among the candidates, especially assistant professors. Sometimes there is virtually no mentoring. Other times senior colleagues, especially those who were hired at a senior rank, give misinformation. Everyone agreed that there needs to be some systematic, formal, data-driven, form-driven, centrally-coordinated process and standardizing the second and fourth year reviews is a step in that direction. The Provost's office should coordinate the process. Other universities provide workshops, websites, and even forms that faculty can download, like midterm evaluations. Such a model might alleviate many of our problems. The idea of mentoring teams was suggested – one person close to the discipline who can help the junior person understand the departmental culture, including departmental or divisional or disciplinary (including area studies) understandings of what teaching, scholarship, and service should be. There might also be another person outside the discipline who can acclimate the junior person to university life and help him/her learn how to be a good university colleague. It was stressed that the second year review should be a critical evaluation, with emphasis on mentoring the faculty member so that he/she can attain a successful fourth year review.

### 2. *Training of Chairs*

This is a particularly important area, especially in A&S because there are so many departments and chairs with diverse disciplinary standards and pedagogies. Chairs, however, have the closest contact and the greatest responsibility for their junior faculty and must understand how all the T/P criteria work and apply to their junior colleagues. To ensure consistency, they absolutely must be trained in the evaluation process and in the mentoring process, from how to help junior faculty prepare a thorough FAR to how to evaluate the FARs critically, to a formalized process for interim review, to how to assist junior faculty develop into excellent teacher/scholars, so that at the end of the six-year tenure review period there is an

accurate record of the junior colleague's progress and development. A recommendation was made for a centralized Teaching & Learning Center—see SUNY Albany. Chairs play a central role, to be sure, but there should be more support for helping faculty develop as teachers and scholars. There should also be mentoring of chairs, particularly chairs at the associate professor level (and below). Chairs need to use their important administrative service to their advancement in the portfolio when they are ready for the promotion to full.

3. *Consistent evaluation of candidates for promotion and tenure*

Thus far the evaluation process has been very inconsistent, with some units conducting thorough interim reviews with extensive documentation, and other units doing very little until the tenure year. Consistent guidelines need to be established for evaluation across all units, perhaps even going so far as to have a checklist for processes such as classroom observations, and for documentation such as letters from chairs/deans/senior colleagues. One dean urged consideration of a formal system of peer review for teaching at the assistant professor level. Such consistency should help ensure a fairer tenure review. There also needs to be accountability to the deans and provost.

4. *Concerns about 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year reviews*

There have been cases of candidates who were not critically evaluated during the interim review years. For that reason, they were not fully aware of problems in their candidacy until they received their letters denying tenure or promotion. In some instances, second year reviews were optimistic and supportive, and in the fourth year review weaknesses were mentioned too gingerly. The 4<sup>th</sup> year review especially needs to be a critical evaluation. Candidates who, after four years at Stetson, still have not made significant progress in teaching, research, or service should be encouraged not to submit a tenure portfolio, but instead look for another institution that would be a better fit. The deans were concerned, however, about the consequences of losing junior colleagues without assurances from the provost's office that replacement lines will be provided.

5. *Peer review and confidentiality of letters*

Strong sentiment was expressed about the litigious nature of our culture. Faculty members, especially in the School of Business and the Music School, are hesitant to write critical evaluative letters and sign their names. Letters that play a role in negative decisions could open the university and the individual faculty member up to lawsuits. Yet without honest critical evaluation the process cannot function properly. It was stressed that the evaluation letters from individual faculty be kept confidential. The Business School in particular has been reluctant to provide individual letters of support because of fears of lawsuits. Instead a consensus letter was submitted that reflected the consensus view of all faculty involved in the evaluation process. It was pointed out by two individuals, however, that has never in the history of Stetson University been a case of a successful lawsuit against an individual faculty member based on criticisms raised in a tenure letter. This is a nationwide trend. The only exceptions: when a faculty member knowingly makes false or slanderous claims or when an institution does not follow its own process.

6. *Development of university standards with unit/division articulations*

The deans supported the idea of a policy that provides a general university standard for tenure/promotion and allows the colleges/divisions/departments to "articulate" or "translate"

those standards in a way consistent with their disciplines as long as there is no lowering of standards.

*7. Candidates who have special gifts/talents but need extra time - Decoupling*

General discomfort was expressed with the idea of decoupling, but concern was also expressed that a policy that does not allow for decoupling would result in the loss of candidates we value but who are not ready for promotion at the end of the tenure period. Perhaps appropriate mentoring would alleviate this problem. All three deans were against decoupling in principle, but the Arts & Sciences dean indicated how agonizing it is for a candidate to come so close without success, and indicated that he appreciated having decoupling as an option to retain valued colleagues.

*8. Alternate path to full professor*

As the policy stands now, the only path is through scholarship. There was some discussion of applying the Boyer model of scholarship of application, presented and interpreted through the perspective of the standards of one's scholarly discipline as Diane Everett so successfully did in her 2008 application. Formal requirement of articulation of national disciplinary standards in an application for promotion to full might help. The concept that a criterion for promotion to full professor might include consistent investment in university life and leadership was discussed. This would not work in the Business School however. It would create problems with the AACSB accreditation.

*9. Teaching/Professional Development*

Currently the main way of assessing teaching is through course enrollments and course evaluations but both methods are flawed. Sometimes it's clear when students avoid professors who are lacking in teaching skills, other times courses don't fill for other reasons like conflicts with more popular or required offerings, or the time of day, or just luck. Course evaluations can be very effective but they are flawed. In particular, different units use different forms – on one form the highest rating is 1, on another the highest rating is 5, and students don't always take the time they need to be honest and critical. Written comments often are most valuable. We need a way of making those comments available quickly, but typed so that student identities are protected. On-line evaluations may be the answer.

We need a more systematic way of assessing teaching. There was strong support of the idea of a Teaching and Learning Center and Professional Development Workshops that provide support for a variety of developmental concerns, including teaching and scholarship.

*10. External Review of Portfolios*

The idea of sending portfolios to senior colleagues in other universities received mixed comments. While letters from outside colleagues are often helpful, especially those that speak to the impact of the candidate on the discipline, two deans saw no clear benefit associated with the added complication of sending portfolios out and awaiting comments. External reviews of portfolios would have the effect of overemphasizing scholarship, and, in the mind of the A&S dean, to diminish teaching skill. The A&S dean suggested that this practice might be appropriate for the more prestigious chairs, like the Kenan chair. The Business School dean, however, was in favor of this option, as it would provide more credibility to evaluations of our research and creative activity.

### **III. Meetings with Chairs**

#### **A. Humanities Chairs (Feb 19, 2010)**

TPPR Members: Kimberly Flinthamilton, Jamil Khader, Brigid Noonan

Humanities Chairs Present: Nancy Vosburg, Tom Farrell, Ron Hall and Roberta Favis (2 other Chairs had either teaching or meeting commitments)

Instead of going through each question, the group discussed the following areas:

1. How is faculty workload defined?  
The group was vocal that this is not explicit enough, particularly as it relates to teaching load. There needs to be a better system in place in terms of how faculty utilize their time.
2. What does “excellence” in teaching mean? How is this interpreted?  
The group emphasized that the interpretation of how teaching is evaluated is rather subjective. There needs to be a more formalized approach in the development of syllabi; how faculty prepare students (e.g., what follow-up takes place); as well as course preparation and the diversity of classes that are taught (e.g., English versus a Studio Art course versus a Theatre Art course). The group stressed that there needs to be an explicit statement in the policy that all teaching counts, and the committee needs to take into account the heterogeneous nature of the CAS.
3. Departmental size  
There was concern surrounding small departments and how faculty pursue the T/P process when there is only one senior faculty to review portfolios. Clarity and guidance in terms of how small departments manage the T/P process is warranted.
4. Evaluative process  
The lack of a formalized evaluative process needs to be addressed. There needs to be more than the Course Teaching Evaluations. Additionally, for faculty members who teach outside their department, or do “other” work outside the department, how is this evaluated (e.g., teaching or service)?
5. Decoupling  
In follow-up emails chairs were asked to comment specifically on decoupling. In one email, the sentiment was expressed that decoupling should absolutely not continue. It is demoralizing, creates cynicism, and since the guidelines for tenure/promotion aren't clear going through the process more than once takes away from teaching and scholarship. The pretenure review period should be sufficient. Another comment was made indicating that, while in principle having a “straight up or down decision” was sound, the culture of Stetson University might not allow for the kind of critical evaluation and accountability that would be required if we give up decoupling. This individual suspected that decoupling has been about more than weak teaching or scholarship, but

to do away with decoupling would result in tenure denials and that it should perhaps be retained for truly exceptional cases.

## **B. Librarians (Feb 16, 2010)**

TPPR Members: Paul Dascher, Sue Ryan

Librarians: 7 of 8 (Bradford, Costello, Dinkins, Kline, Johnson, Wald, Ryan)

(notes reviewed and approved by those in attendance)

Comments on librarianship: If you're in the field, you know good librarianship when you see it. The group is so small that we are in a "fishbowl" – we don't work in isolation nearly as much as a professor holding office hours or teaching a class. We are together 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, constantly observing each other's work, so there is probably little need for formal colleague "observation." It is relatively easy to know where to assign both credit and blame for things going right and wrong.

Librarians have standards against which to measure quantitative performance (ACRL – Association of College & Research Library – Standards, for example) in terms of a physical library. If librarians are doing their jobs, they will be meeting standards set by the profession, as well as our own in-house standards. (For example, if you are a reference librarian, are you meeting the information needs of those you are serving – if you are a cataloger, are you doing quality cataloging in a timely manner, etc.)

Primary evidence of effectiveness is the annual self-evaluation and response – a form which was specifically designed to track progress toward promotion and tenure in the three areas of librarianship, scholarship, and service. Some librarians have classroom evaluations if they do classroom sessions, but not all do. These evaluations can tend to be inflated because of the limitations of a one-hour visit of someone who is essentially a "guest."

Comments on Scholarship: One librarian thought there was more campus acceptance of non-traditional scholarship now than in the past. All of the librarians believed that traditional peer-reviewed published scholarship was important and should be weighted heavier than most other scholarly activities. By definition, peer-review gives weight to what has been produced – peer-review not only acknowledges that work is a contribution to the field, but it also is designed to keep substandard work out of publication.

In terms of non-traditional scholarship, however, most agreed that it was the content and not the distribution outlet that mattered most. One librarian commented that if the audience was large and receptive to new or innovative thinking, then blog or web postings should have some value. If a blog post is being cited and discussed (as a positive contribution to the field), then it indicates some worth. Almost all agreed, however, that without some kind of peer-review, the work should not be weighted the same as a peer-reviewed publication.

One librarian said that how we define scholarship depends on what we want Stetson to be. If we want an innovative, creative faculty, then we should think about accepting innovative, creative scholarship that might not be traditional.

Another said that scholarship must apply to the norms of your own field, but it is important that all faculty members be able to demonstrate that they can produce scholarship that shows true research and serious contemplation.

Comments on Service: Some librarians thought community service should not be counted toward promotion and tenure at all. Their thinking is that community service makes you a good person, but doesn't necessarily contribute to your growth as a teacher or scholar. Others said that it is important for faculty members to be active in community service and it should count in the promotion and tenure process. All agreed, however, that community service should count less than University service at all levels.

Librarians generally thought University service was part of the job and that everyone should perform service (committee work, for example) to a certain extent. One librarian said that some faculty members use excessive service as a way to retreat from research. It was up to the candidate to create a balance between service and scholarship.

Comments on Required External Review: Only one librarian thought external reviews should be required. While some of the librarians saw value in external reviewers, they did not want the process to be required.

Additional Comments: Teaching/Librarianship is the most important of the three traditional areas of evaluation; research is also essential. Service is something that all faculty members should do, but it should not substitute for effectiveness in either of the other two areas.

One librarian felt that a major problem with the tenure and promotion process is that "the bar" for expectations is constantly moved. Another thought that the bar really doesn't move too much within the five year period between hire and the application for a tenure decision and that it is to be expected that the bar for expectations will move over a person's career.

One librarian felt strongly that the University Promotion and Tenure Committee should never overrule positive tenure and promotion recommendations from the departments, schools/colleges, and deans. Another librarian felt strongly that until the evaluation, tenure, and promotion process was communicated and applied fairly to all faculty members in all departments, that the University P&T Committee had to assume the role of final arbitrator in the interest of fairness.

### **C. Business Administration Department Chairs**

TPPR Members: Alicia Schultheis and Paul Dascher

Business Chairs: Fred Augustine, Carolyn Mueller, Carolyn Nicholson and Judson Stryker (Dr. Belcher was teaching at Celebration but had participated in a previous session as a member of the School P + T Committee)

The discussion followed the general list of questions to be considered. Overall, there was recognition that processes in the School followed the guidelines and expectations set forth in the Business School Policy Manual. Also, accreditation requirements by AACSB International established expectations and definitions of teaching, research and service that were supported by the School.

Comments on Teaching: Many felt that classroom observations by colleagues could be a helpful part of the faculty development process and would be useful in making P + T decisions. Discussion focused on alternatives for the selection of the evaluators including some support for a process that would individuals both within and without the candidates department. The former would focus on content and the later would deal with pedagogy.

The benefit of sponsoring teaching workshops was as suggested as a valuable part of the faculty development process.

When dealing with instruments to provide student feedback and evaluations of their faculty some questioned if one, standard instrument could be effective for all aspects of our rather diverse institution. Also, on-line instruction will present its own unique set of attributes to be considered in the evaluation process. Note that aside from the University decision to offer on-line courses this summer, the Department of Accounting offers an on-line Master of Accountancy Program and an on-line MBA program jointly with the College of Pharmacy at the University of Florida.

Some of the Department Chairs had recently attended the annual Kansas State Academic Chairs Conference in Orlando and shared materials on faculty and teaching evaluation from that conference. The detail of these items went beyond the charge of this task force.

Comments on Research: The discussion began with a focus on our current processes. AACSB criteria focus on a dichotomy of refereed publications and all other scholarly activity. From this base it was suggested that evidence should focus on demonstrating the currency of the faculty member and their contributions to their discipline. The chairs implied that they tend to rely on evidence of the impact of faculty research and external evaluations of its rigor.

In exploring the matter a bit further it was suggested that impact must be evaluated in terms of the academic or professional field rather than total exposure as in a contribution to You Tube. Again an emphasis on consistency, rigor and influence on the discipline was viewed as important. Some discussion ensued as to the value of publishing outside of one's specific discipline without a definite conclusion being reached.

Comments on Service: There was some discussion as to the extent of service expectations that are part of the P + T process. Most agreed that the current service load is quite heavy in general and that for some individuals it might be excessive. However, it was also felt that service is a necessary expectation for all faculty throughout their career.

Service contributions may be difficult to evaluate in that committees and appointments may be very busy at some times and not busy at all during other periods. Thus, questions of impact of the activity were raised as being important to consider. This same reasoning bridged to service outside the university and civic engagement. All felt that it was important for the university and its faculty to participate in the community and some felt that civic engagement might be required. However, overall the consensus seemed to expectation participation in service by all faculty on a regular basis.

The chairs also felt that teaching and research were clearly the most important activities for our faculty with a ratio of expectations maybe ranging to 40-40-20. This was supported by the view that service is perhaps necessary but not sufficient for promotion or tenure.

The observations were made that seem relevant for additional consideration. These included the following:

- The chairs felt that positive or negative promotion and tenure decisions have resulted in no surprises in the School of Business Administration as everyone has been well-informed as to the criteria, the process and their own development.
- Rewards for achieving promotion and tenure have been limited or non-existent in the past. Added rewards seem both appropriate and reasonable.
- Instructors play an important role in the School and have been neglected by many of our processes. They should benefit from meaningful evaluations and support.
- Some comments were offered relative to external parties being identified for review candidates P + T portfolios. While there was some sympathy for input relative to research contributions and impact, there were concerns raised about the ability of others outside the institution to effectively evaluate teaching and service contributions.

#### **D. Natural Science Department Chairs**

TPPR Members: Alicia Schultheis, Paul Dascher

Natural Science Chairs: Cindy Bennington, Lisa Coulter, George Glander, and Ramee Indralingam

Problems with the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year reviews were discussed, particularly with regards to missing feedback from Chairs and Deans. Written, evaluative comments from Chairs are essential as is written feedback from the Dean. If the feedback is missing at the end of either review, the portfolio should be sent back to the negligent party by the Provost. There should be an explicit deadline by which the candidate should be given feedback about the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year reviews in order to give the candidate as much time as possible to address any issues. In general, the consensus was that it was not acceptable for responses to 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year reviews to come from an Associate Dean in Arts & Sciences. However, after the meeting, one chair shared with me that as long as the Associate Dean reviewed the portfolio and met with the Chair and candidate (as the Dean typically does for these reviews), it would be acceptable for a letter to come from an Associate Dean. That is, a written response from an Associate Dean is better than no response.

The need for post-tenure review was stressed, particularly during the years prior to applying for promotion for Full Professor. Perhaps there should be a process for Associate Professors that is similar to the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year pre-tenure reviews.

With regards to the questions sent out by our task force, the consensus was that the College's standard instrument for teaching is an acceptable, but superficial means of assessment and therefore should not be the only way teaching is evaluated. The standard instrument is made more useful when augmented by questions written by the instructor that pertain to each specific course. Also, one Chair thought a longer survey with more detailed questions that was randomly sent to students or recent graduates could be useful. Other Chairs felt senior exit interviews were useful in assessing teaching and, though informal, the interviews helped inform the Chair's evaluation of the candidate. Classroom observations are common (universal?) in the Natural Sciences and are seen as a valued means of assessing teaching effectiveness. Evidence of engaging students in scholarship and in mentoring senior projects was also seen as effective teaching.

In general, Chairs were satisfied with the way peer-reviewed scholarship is evaluated in the Natural Sciences. Impact factors, citation analyses, and distribution of journals were seen as important means of evaluating peer review. Interpretation of impact of peer reviewed scholarship is important and should be performed by chairs or others in the discipline who know the flagship journals and importance of venues as well as vest-pocket organizations and those set up to 'scratch others' backs'. Also, it was noted that there is a rising trend in Computer Sciences to have peer-reviewed conference proceedings. Given the University's teaching mission, publications in pedagogical journals should be given equal weight to those in traditional journals which focus on the scholarship of discovery.

Non-traditional scholarship was seen as valuable, but supplemental to traditional scholarship. Also, it is essential the Chair or other knowledgeable individual review non-traditional materials and put them into context when evaluating candidates. In particular, the concern with non-traditional scholarship centers around the lack of peer review which, in the case of traditional scholarship, helps ensure the academic rigor of scholarly activities. One chair felt that blogs, web

pages, and non-refereed publications should not count, but juried art exhibitions and peer-reviewed online publications should.

Even if non-traditional scholarship has resulted in a national reputation, it is not the same level of distinction as a national reputation acquired through traditional venues. It is the peer-review process that establishes academic rigor.

Service was seen as a necessary part of the faculty role since participation in service is necessary for the University to function. In general, evaluation of service should focus on whether the faculty member is a good steward. However, it is acceptable for a faculty member who is highly engaged in scholarship to assume fewer service duties than faculty doing less research. It is not acceptable, however, for a faculty member to do no University service, regardless of their scholarly output. Similarly, no amount of service can replace a scholarly agenda, and candidates with no scholarship should not be tenured or promoted. However, one Chair felt that because performing research in the sciences becomes more difficult the longer one has been out of graduate school, there may be a natural progression during the course of a career towards more service and less research.

In terms of the weighted role of teaching, scholarship, and service, the initial consensus was that a 40-40-20 weighting scheme was appropriate. However, several faculty felt that scheme did not align well with the University's mission and that a 60-30-10 scheme (or some variation on that with teaching most heavily weighted) may be more appropriate. It was also noted that involving students in research tends to decrease a faculty member's research productivity but is in alignment with the University's mission. Thus, taking students to conferences, publishing student co-authored papers, etc. should be given more weight than they might be at a University with a more research-oriented mission. In setting a minimum or 'floor' for peer-reviewed publications, it might be valuable for Chairs to evaluate the quantity of work performed, perhaps by relating it to what is required to earn a terminal degree in the discipline.

Civic engagement is important but should not be counted towards 'Community service' unless the faculty member is performing the work within their discipline as a representative of Stetson University. Otherwise, candidates may feel pressure to use outside activities to build their CV—a practice seen as impinging on the rights of faculty to have a private life separate from their career. Finally, the language on the FAR encourages faculty to report unrelated 'community service' by asking whether the faculty member is engaged in 'political activities' or 'church-related activities', when those activities are, in this context, relevant to only a few disciplines (e.g., Political Science or Religious Studies). Thus, that language should be removed from the FAR or clarified to indicate that reported community service should be performed as a representative of Stetson University and within the faculty member's discipline.

An improvement could be made in the T&P Policies and Procedures with regards to the degree to which one needs to document certain parts of the portfolio (e.g., should offprints of every article be included? Syllabi for all courses? Student evaluations—summaries for each course? Each semester?, etc.)

Finally, a problem unique to the sciences that is not addressed by the prescribed questions was the impact of mentoring senior research projects on faculty time. That is, the time-intensive nature of mentoring senior projects affects scholarship and inflates the number of contact hours

for faculty members even though faculty don't receive credit for mentoring senior projects in their teaching load.

In follow-up emails to natural science chairs, the topic of decoupling was discussed. There was concern that the pressure for science faculty members to conduct research with students might hurt a tenure application. Involvement in student research is extremely time-consuming, and takes away from faculty research/scholarship, which has hurt the applications of junior faculty in their division already. If the rules could be written to reward those involving students in research rather than penalizing them, as happens now, then decoupling should be discontinued. But if the rules or standards aren't changed it should be retained. Having divisional articulation or interpretation of university standards would allow the natural sciences to incorporate faculty involvement in student research as a value added component of their programs, as opposed to a greater number of publications w/o undergraduates. That would be desirable.

## E. Social Science/Education Chairs – Feb. 23, 2010

TPPR Members: Kimberly Flinthamilton

Social Science/Education: Ranjini Thaver, Richard Kindred, Glen Epley, Bill Nylan

Comments submitted via email from Margaret Venzke

### Decoupling tenure from promotion

There was a fair amount of discussion regarding the history of the process, that it has been happening for at least 30 years but only since the mid 1990s has it been happening more regularly, due to the efforts of the university to move in a more scholarly direction. Some felt that decoupling hasn't necessarily been a bad thing, and that it has helped keep good colleagues who needed more time. Others, however, felt strongly that decoupling seems to have happened arbitrarily and that there is bias in the way it has happened. All agreed that misunderstanding of criteria, lack of specificity especially regarding scholarship but also in interpreting the course evaluations (e.g., what constitutes "excellence"?), has resulted in more split decisions. Most felt that decoupling should not continue, although all acknowledged that tying tenure to promotion would inevitably lead to loss of colleagues who might be might not be ready for promotion. One person felt strongly that decoupling has served the university well at various points in the past and should continue to be an option. Most felt that tenure should be the "higher bar" since it's a lifelong contract. Scholarship, however, should still be an important component of the process since our publications are the most 'portable' aspects of what we do. If you don't publish you could find yourself trapped and unable to move, which would ultimately create embittered faculty. In addition it increases the professional self-confidence of the individual faculty member, increases his/her potential contribution to the university, enhances the reputation and visibility of the university, and has inherent value as a contribution to intellectual life.

### Promotion to the rank of full professor

All agreed that the criteria are very unclear now, and that we should have a more rigid formula that's clear, although one person felt that, rather than 'more rigid criteria,' we probably ought to include at each step the possibility of alternative individually-negotiated criteria that would be written out and ratified by the chair, dean, and provost, subject to approval by the university T/P committee.

Most agreed that emphasis should be on distinction in scholarship and *sustained contributions* in teaching and service. Scholarship should not be perfunctory – i.e., only in the year or two before applying for promotion. There was extensive discussion of the value of the rank of associate. Most agreed that in our current climate there seems to be the unspoken expectation that in time one will simply transition to the rank of full. There is value in being an associate professor and focusing on teaching and service if one doesn't want to publish or participate in scholarly endeavors. Not everyone should be promoted to full before retirement.

Most found the idea of factoring investment and leadership into the evaluative process for full professors very attractive, but this led to another discussion of maintaining the level of investment after reaching full. We need to find a way to keep faculty engaged.

## Service

It was suggested that we consider renaming the ‘service’ component, perhaps “contributions to academic life.” The term service currently has a negative connotation, a perception that it is not valued or is perhaps undervalued. A new name might help refocus the way service is counted. In addition we need to create a rubric that helps us quantify the intensity of the various service obligations so that faculty aren’t overburdened and their contributions can be counted appropriately. All agreed that chairs of committees should report on members’ participation, that this would constitute peer review. The concept of using the multiple intelligences among the faculty to engage us in different kinds of endeavors was brought up – the idea that some of us feel very passionate about student life, others about other aspects of the university, should factor into the tenure and promotion decisions at all levels. Finally, most agreed that junior faculty should be engaged in service but not overburdened, that chairs should serve as ‘gatekeepers’ for service, and that junior faculty service obligations should reflect their interests.

## General university standard with departments/divisions articulating their specific requirements

All agreed that this made the most sense and might resolve the ambiguity of the present system, although one person wasn’t sure about this and thought there might be other approaches that might make more sense. Most felt that there needs to be uniformity in disciplinary standards, that it cannot be relatively ‘easy’ to get tenured/promoted in some departments and ‘hard’ in others.

## Training/Mentoring

All agreed that there is confusion, and that even the current policy could be improved if chairs were adequately trained and all concerned appropriately mentored. There was also discussion of accountability. All agreed that the role of chair in the tenure/promotion process should be clarified. Should the chair function as advocate or judge? Does the balance of the two roles change over the course of the probationary period? Now that isn’t very clear. If that were clarified, and there were appropriate training/mentoring, it would help a great deal.

## Requiring senior colleagues to participate in the process

When asked how difficult it was to engage tenured colleagues in the tenure/promotion process of colleagues, there was a range of responses. For some there is absolutely no problem, for others the only real problem is understanding who should be involved – e.g., should those on sabbatical be expected to contribute? Finally, for some expecting senior colleagues to participate and to provide fair, balanced, thoughtful, and objective commentaries is so challenging that it is almost impossible.

## **F. Music Chair (Feb 18, 2010)**

TPPR Members: Kimberly Flint-Hamilton, Michael Rickman, Sue Ryan

Music Chair: Noel Painter

The meeting with Dr. Painter was extremely helpful and insightful. Listed below are the main issues discussed and questions which need to be addressed.

Differences in approach among the Schools and College are seen as the biggest problem in the process. Should letters of evaluation for candidates of tenure and promotion (to associate and full) be required by all faculty, by tenured faculty alone, or only by those at the rank of Full Professor? Should those letters be signed or unsigned?

All appropriate parties should be involved in the process, especially those working most closely with the candidate. In critical evaluations, it is of utmost importance that there exist an atmosphere in which faculty (candidates and evaluators) feel free to be candid, able to express innermost thoughts and observations.

Letters of evaluation - how far do they go? How much value will they have? Feelings/perceptions revealed without fear of repercussions.

Peer evaluation: How should we (faculty colleagues) participate in this process?

Two/Four year reviews should include class room observations, in which the progress of the instructor be candidly assessed as well as the progress of the student. This can also be possible in observing/assessing recital appearances (both faculty and student), including general student recital hour, degree recitals, and jury exams.

The question of outside reviews (external review) was perceived to detract from the overall process, adding to its already general complexity.

In assessing the level or quality of music performance (scholarship/creative activity), we must remember the necessity to be totally clear about criteria for evaluation, particularly in regards to "non-musician" evaluators. For example, is there an evaluative difference between local vs. out-of-town performances, out of state vs. international performances? The type/level/quality of repertoire (literature) should also be taken into consideration / evaluation. How can one, for example, decide upon or evaluate the difference between singing an opera role with Orlando Opera or with Santa Fe Opera, or performing in the orchestra of Bach's B Minor Mass with the Bach Society of Winter Park or in Handel's Messiah in a local church or civic choral group? Clearer standards for these activities will lend greater clarity to the evaluative process. Another question, which continues to arise in most of our constituency group meetings: Into what context can or should scholarly/creative activity be placed?

Candidates should present a record of previous students' accomplishments, their success in graduate school, and/or their success in professional positions. This could be presented in the narrative.

Clear instructions for each of the areas (teaching/scholarship/service) of the evaluation process must be present. Perhaps an “instructional manual” for the entire process for school, college and university wide use should be developed. It was also suggested that perhaps a team, or observation task force of the specific areas be put into place for the purpose of assessing performances. It was suggested that an overall form be adopted for the specific Music School divisions/areas.

Decoupling of T&P: Dr. Painter shared two experiences of the decoupling process, one at the University of Toronto and the other at Eastman School of Music, of which both worked in favor of the candidates. Dr. Painter did not express a strong feeling on decoupling or not.

In considering what qualities should be in place or demonstrated for promotion to Full Professor, (in addition to having achieved distinction in one’s field/discipline), leadership qualities should be evident – yes, excellence in the classroom, excellence in both service and scholarship, but demonstrated leadership, not only in the specific School or College, but across the entire University as well - a “ high profile” leader, a person possessing vision, energy, a person known and visible across the campus, a proven mentor to junior colleagues and students, demonstrating genuine depth of character (how is that quantified?).

Service – How does it “fit?” How does it fit/should it fit into the overall load of a Professor? How can it be assessed?

Community engagement, which can contribute to the University’s national reputation, should also be evident.

#### **IV. Diversity Council – Feb. 22, 2010**

TPPR Members: Sue Ryan, Michael Rickman, Kimberly Flinthamilton

Diversity Council: Leonard Nance, Elisabeth Poeter

Goal 1 of the Diversity Plan is to establish a recruitment and retention plan, and increasing retention dovetails with revising the tenure/promotion policy. Everyone agreed that simply making people more aware of the policy would improve retention. What people *hear* isn't always correct.

A number of factors seem to signal lack of institutional support, and a number of factors serve to undermine the process for faculty of color and women. There is a great deal of confusion in the process.

For women and ALANA faculty especially, service commitments often interfere with success. Teaching courses on women, gender, and race, often outside the hiring department, coupled with heavy service loads (especially advising) and speaking engagements ends up hurting faculty. These service commitments are undervalued, but they represent value-added components of the university. They also enhance teaching, research, and personal growth. Interdisciplinary work enhances the WGS program, e.g., but doing WGS work can end up counting against promotion because it's not in the hiring discipline. All present felt that we need to create some sort of rubric that categorizes and quantifies service commitments.

Everyone agreed that setting general university guidelines and allowing departments or divisions to articulate what 'distinction' means according to their disciplinary standards would be very helpful and eliminate much confusion in the process.

It was suggested that pre-tenure sabbaticals might be one method to allow junior faculty to prepare for tenure, and also enhance the pre-tenure review process. As it is, tenured faculty don't seem to have adequate time to evaluate and address deficiencies of their junior colleagues.

The culture of the academy was discussed relative to women and faculty of color. Cultural bias against diverse faculty is often reflected in the course evaluations, and sometimes even in faculty evaluations of scholarship of faculty of color. This is a difficult area to address. To correct it would require a culture change. Instead we need to find a way to handle it. One suggestion was to have more colleagues visit classrooms and explain student resistance in their letters. When a faculty member is teaching a course on race/ethnicity and student are resistant to the material, e.g., senior colleagues should try to support their colleagues by making classroom visits and, in their pre-tenure evaluations, explain the dynamics. Chairs and senior faculty need training on these matters.

There was discussion of course evaluations, which currently are reflective of student perceptions of faculty. The evaluations are not reflective of the students' responsibilities, nor are they self-reflective. This needs to change to allow students to take responsibility for their learning process.

The key to change is consistency – consistency of message regarding tenure/promotion and response.

The issue of decoupling tenure and promotion was discussed. There was very strong feeling that decoupling is a “cop-out” and punishes the victim of poor advising/mentoring. Rather than taking responsibility for proper mentoring and consistency of message, faculty are tenured without promotion. We need to formulate guidelines that are clear and put in place proper mentoring and training for all parties involved.

Regarding mentoring, since there are so few full professors who are ALANA and/or women, it was suggested that we seek alternative mentoring models, such as tying into the Thurman scholars, many of whom have signaled a willingness to serve as outside advisors. We also need to have training for chairs that includes diversity training.

## V. Senate Executive Committee – Feb 19, 2010

TPPR Members: Sue Ryan, Paul Dascher, Alicia Schultheis, Brigid Noonan, Michael Rickman, Jamil Khader, Kimberly Flinthamilton (member of both groups)

Senate Exec: Michael Branton, Mitchell Reddish, Jennifer Foo, Jane Christeson

### *1. Senate charge to T/P Policy Revision Committee*

Last year the senate voted to study the issue of tenure/promotion decoupling and make a recommendation to the university faculty, but the administrative transition and workload has made it impossible to conduct that study before this academic year is over. In light of the provost's appointment of this task force, however, the senate executive committee has asked the T/P Policy Revision Task Force to explore the issue and make a recommendation to senate regarding decoupling. This committee will make a preliminary report to the senate at the March meeting. There was a brief discussion of the history of decoupling at this university.

### *2. Enforcement of policy*

There needs to be clarity in the process. A form that indicates the requisite steps and paperwork at each step of the process, especially at the interim review and tenure application process, would be very helpful. In the past there has been inconsistency in the quality of evaluations from chairs and tenured colleagues. We should consider also that in Arts & Sciences, where most of the problems have occurred, there is tremendous diversity of disciplines and too many departments for a single dean to effectively administer without rigorous guidelines. The associate deans need to be more directly involved in the process too. But whatever policy we develop needs to be enforced from the top down. This has been very difficult to do in the past w/o a provost, but now the top-down approach can work very effectively.

### *3. General university policy with departmental 'articulation' of disciplinary standards*

All were in favor of a system that allows this.

### *4. Formalized training of chairs and evaluators*

All agreed that this was essential. We need some way to learn and communicate current practices in teaching, pedagogies, and balance of teaching and research at a national level.

### *5. Role of university t/p committee*

There was discussion of how the university committee functions. In principle it should ensure consistent application of standards and policy. There was some discussion of having some sort of 'escape clause' in the policy for emergency situations so that hands are not tied when things go wrong.

### *6. Role of the provost in the process.*

Two models were discussed – (1) the provost sits with the university t/p committee and either signs their report or writes his/her own; (2) the provost receives the report, does not sit in on the deliberations, and responds to report. This year the provost was an observer on the university t/p committee. The members of that committee present felt that it was very

helpful to have her involvement in this transition year, but in the future provost involvement at this level could represent a conflict of interests. There was a general feeling that the provost should, as a matter of policy, simply receive the report and not be included in university t/p committee deliberations.

## **VI. Tenure, Grievance, and Academic Freedom Committee (TGAF) (Feb 26, 2010)**

TPPR Members: Sue Ryan, Brigid Noonan, Kimberly Flinthamilton

TGAF Members: Mary Pollock, Jamil Khader (member of both groups)

Since there haven't been any cases yet the TGAF committee discussed general issues such as training of chairs, workshops, accountability in the process.

Faculty development was a major topic of discussion. Where do faculty members go when they encounter problems with teaching or scholarship, or with intra-departmental dynamics/responsibilities? Right now it can be very easy to get lost in the system. Stetson needs a faculty development committee that has sufficient institutional support. The idea of a teaching effectiveness office was discussed. Young inexperienced faculty members can lack confidence, and if we had an office similar to the one at University of Texas and standardize the developmental process, we would probably have fewer problems.

The group was very engaged with the idea of mentoring teams. Each new faculty member should be assigned a team of senior faculty members to help him/ her adjust to the new institution and understand all the responsibilities expected of them

The Art of Self-Promotion workshop that Mary Pollock, Jamil Khader, and KFH participated in at the end of the 2007 spring term was discussed. Perhaps something similar could be offered on a rotating basis – one year focus on teaching, next year scholarship, etc. This would be especially helpful to ALANA and women faculty who sometimes get lost in the process.

## **VII. Faculty Women's Caucus (Feb. 25, 2010)**

TPPR Members: Sue Ryan, Jamil Khader, Brigid Noonan

FWC Members: Anne Hallum, Ramee Indralingam, Ann Small, Carol Corcoran, Gail Choice, Missy Gibbs, Julia Schmitt, Carolyn Nicholson, Leena Taneja

FWC Members felt that students' evaluations of women are seen as not being fairly evaluated (e.g., women grade too tough). Additionally, members voiced their concern that they receive no feedback from the A&S Dean regarding their FARs, and that the evaluation tool utilized currently is "broken." There needs to be a better and more systematic way of evaluation, as evaluations are not a "popularity" contest. Members also felt that the McEniry Awards is out of proportion in terms of the winners (e.g., almost all are men).

Discussion also ensued concerning how service is evaluated and that women are too often called upon to do service oriented work. Students expectations concerning what women faculty are able to give them are not the same as what male faculty are able to give them (an example was given where a student came to speak with a male faculty member, when told by a female faculty member [who was also busy] that that faculty member could not speak with them, the student assumed that the female faculty could meet with them). Members felt that receiving feedback on FARs, teaching, service, etc. is critical and does not take place systematically. They felt that the FAR needs to be reconstructed.

Committee members were positive about the possibility of mentoring teams, however they wanted to make sure that whatever is put into place is clear and proactive in terms of assisting faculty members.

When discussion shifted to publication, members wanted to ensure that there be no ambiguity concerning the guidelines. They voiced concern that the present T/P guidelines were ambiguous and had the capability to be misinterpreted and reinterpreted. They expressed that they would like any articulation of what constitutes publication to be within that particular field (i.e., what does scholarship mean to that field).

### **VIII. Gender Equity Council (Feb. 17, 2010)**

TPPR Members: Brigid Noonan, Jamil Khader, Kimberly Flinthamilton

GEC Faculty Members: Debbie Dinkins, Ramee Indralingam, Mary Pollock

Discussion focused on the burdens that women and faculty of color have throughout the tenure/promotion process. Faculty felt that it's not fair to overburden these faculty, and that their contracts, upon hire, should indicate that they have only so much service, so as to protect them. Some felt that should be some way to override or modulate the scholarship requirement for those burdened with program directorships and the like, but not the teaching requirement.

Faculty felt that the provost needs to take responsibility for conducting workshops and to train mentors. Mentoring is essential. There also needs to be training for chairs but there should also be some other mechanism to protect the individuals in the process.

The issue of start-up funds in the natural sciences was discussed, the fact that some faculty don't get any start up funds and that cripples their whole career because they can't get off to a good start. That isn't fair to the individuals, to the programs, or to the university.

All felt that there needs to be institutional support to enable faculty to succeed, some sort of formalized and funded professional development program or office, more than what we have now. We should bring experts in to guide us in this process.

Someone or some committee needs to examine how non-traditional scholarship is reviewed – how does one count online blogs? Successful grant writing?

The issue of decoupling was brought up and followed up in personal discussions and emails later. No one in favor of decoupling in principle, but some felt that if there were some way to make sure that it happened fairly and not just to women and ALANA faculty then maybe it could work in this environment. Others were strongly opposed to decoupling, and felt that there was no way for it to happen fairly.

## **IX. Decoupled Faculty (2 meetings, one on March 12 and the second on March 16, 2010)**

TPPR members: Paul Dascher, Michael Rickman, Alicia Schultheis, Jamil Khader, Sue Ryan, Brigid Noonan, Kimberly Flinthamilton

Faculty members (both meetings combined): Toni Blum, Shawnrece Campbell, Carol Corcoran, Ramee Indralingam, Emily Mieras, Susan Peppers-Bates, Elisabeth Poeter, Harry Price, Hari Pulapaka, Rusty Witek

Comments submitted via email from Melissa Gibbs, Craig Maddox, and Ranjini Thaver

There was a discussion of the power of words, both to do harm and to help. The importance of words, even word order, cannot be overstated. The chairs must understand and accept the power they have in drafting a letter. Wording is everything. If the chair doesn't put the candidate's accomplishments in a positive light, the process is tainted from the start. Avoid the "comma, but" kinds of statements, e.g., "Candidate has done x, y, and z, but ....." This casts doubt. Clarity is everything.

Faculty felt that there's too much secrecy in the process. Candidates need more information about their status in the t/p process, not less. They also need a chance to rebut a negative decision. How can you submit a viable appeal if you don't know the grounds on which you were denied? The way the policy works now, candidates go to the administration and get a cryptic response. There needs to be an opportunity for clarifications and rebuttal. The rebuttal could take the form of a written response submitted to the committee. Possibly the provost could be present if a candidate wants to speak with the committee in person.

Some faculty members talked about their personal circumstances. The issue of childbearing came up, and the fact that the parental leave policy hasn't been well known for very long and faculty don't always understand that they can stop the tenure clock for such issues. Several faculty had heard – either by being told directly by supervisors or by mentors – that one needs to focus on two of the three "legs" of the tenure-track stool: teaching, scholarship, or service. Two out of three would be enough. Many throw themselves into service, directing programs and/or serving on faculty senate, e.g.. Even with good teaching evaluations, and doing everything they were told to do, they still suffered decoupling.

Almost every faculty member present talked about the pain of decoupling. There is humiliation and anger, but the pain of decoupling is what stands out most. This is a highly emotional situation. Faculty feel lost and abandoned, used and unappreciated. To whom can they turn? The purpose of decoupling may be to urge candidates to greater accomplishments, but because there is so much secrecy candidates may never know why they were decoupled, resulting in a high cost in terms of morale. Faculty wanted the university to pay attention to the strong emotions associated with this issue. The pain and anger can persist for years. Some faculty members were still frustrated and had difficulty talking about the circumstances that lead to the decoupling decision more than a decade after it had happened.

There needs to be quality control, i.e., some way to ensure that all the candidates are being held to the same level of standards. There is the perception that the 'bar' keeps rising during the pre-tenure review, and it can feel like sharecropping – you can never really have enough to satisfy the changing demands.

There needs to be an option to recuse members of t/p committees with whom candidates have had negative interactions. The recusing needs to work both ways – t/p committee members should be able to recuse themselves, and candidates should be able to request that members be recused from their evaluation process.

Faculty referred to “fuzzy standards.” Sometimes mentors do not do the job of mentoring and bad advice, or no advice, is given. Other times, however, mentors do everything they can to understand the process and give good advice, but the understanding of each of their mentors, each administrator, and each of the t/p committees, is DIFFERENT. It seems that the majority opinion – the support of departmental colleagues for tenure/promotion, and the dean, and college t/p committee – is often trumped by the minority opinion - that of the university committee. Understanding of the standards has been different from one group to another and that has been very problematic.

Discussion ensued over what constitutes scholarship – departments and the committees should acknowledge that it's more than just publishing articles. We should acknowledge the time investment of long-term research, the research needed for excellence in teaching and course preparation, interactions with students, especially those conducting senior research, and collaborative efforts as well. This should all be indicated in the tenure narratives by chairs as well as candidates.

Several faculty members felt that the guidelines, such as they are, are very unclear. The candidate must receive clear advice. Some of the advice they'd received made little sense. Why can't scholarship come from the dissertation, e.g.? It's much too easy to get trapped into service commitments, and service doesn't seem to count very much toward tenure or promotion to associate. This is especially true for women and faculty of color who serve as department chairs and program directors. They're the most committed university servants and they're the ones being denied promotion to associate and full professor. It would help to have clarification and quantification of guidelines, especially for scholarship, as that would help protect junior faculty. The idea of a pre-tenure sabbatical or course releases was discussed as a way to support assistant professors in tying loose ends in research projects/publications.

When candidates are denied promotion to full professor, how do they know whether the problems are with quantity or quality of publications? Since there is no minimum number given in the guidelines, how can anyone say that there are too few? Faculty members perceive that there may be a 'club' mentality. Those who aren't well-known by the members of the committees aren't in the 'in-group,' and they have little to no chance of achieving promotion. The comment was made that currently the system rewards those who are most disengaged from university life. They suggested two possible paths to full professor: one that emphasizes scholarship with some service/leadership; another that emphasizes leadership with some research.

Mentoring is essential, not just pre-tenure but throughout the career. All faculty members should be engaged in mentoring, to support and guide each other through these difficult processes. This is a learning community and we should support each other.

Mentoring, however, has been difficult to do properly because the culture of Stetson is so “conflict-averse.” It almost seems passive-aggressive. No one wants to argue or make negative comments about another faculty member. One faculty member described a case in which the department made a hire that wasn’t a good fit for Stetson University, but no one in the department was willing to do or say anything about it until the time came to write letters for tenure. There was some sense that decoupling might be the salve to senior faculty members, or a jab at juniors – since no one had the guts to criticize a junior colleague, decoupling satisfies the passive aggressive urge to lash out.

The concept of the ‘tier-1’ or ‘pinnacle’ journals for fields was discussed. Maybe as recently as 5 years ago there were just a few journals in certain fields that were considered the top ones. It can take a long time to get an article published in these journals, as long as 1.5-2 years. But the concept of the 2 or 3 pinnacle journals is quickly changing, especially because of the emergence of web-based journals. We need to accept that our fields have broadened.

There are also newly emerging brands of scholarship, and we don’t always have someone on faculty who understands the value of contributions in these areas. In cases like that, we might consider inviting scholars outside of Stetson to participate in the tenure evaluation.

There was discussion of a two-tiered process that might be more family-friendly. If new faculty, at the time of hire, were invited to indicate which they wanted at the end of pre-tenure review, tenure only or tenure and promotion, maybe those who want families wouldn’t be so hurt at decoupling because they never wanted to be considered for associated professor at the same time as tenure. Faculty could have an opportunity to reconsider at, say, the fourth year review, so that they could select tenure only if they weren’t ready for promotion.

There was strong feeling that sample portfolios would be extremely useful, but only if they were fairly recent.

There was also a strong sense of frustration that the process is so ‘fuzzy’, that there is so much secrecy, and that, with the current policy, there’s no way to know whether or not you’re really prepared for the tenure/promotion decision.

In one group, faculty members became quite emotional over the decoupling issue, both over the unfairness of being penalized without any guidance, and especially over the injustice of seeing their junior colleagues work so hard only to experience the same pain they’d felt. There was also frustration and concern over the demographics of the decoupled population as well as of the population who attempt a promotion to full professor and who are ultimately denied – women and ALANA faculty populate this group primarily. Faculty of one group felt strongly that the Provost should conduct a study of institutional bias against women and ALANA faculty (p. 22-23, Everett report). Faculty members cited examples of unintentional as well as overt bias from colleagues that they’d experienced right here at Stetson University. Even though the Everett report cited no evidence of obvious, systematic, intentional negative bias on the part of individual members of the University T/P committees (Everett report p. 22), faculty pointed out

that bias throughout the process is linked to the possibility of bias on the committee. If the system is tainted the individuals in the system are tainted too.

Professional development was discussed. There is great need in this area, and over the years, in response to economic exigencies, professional development budgets have declined. Faculty wished they had access to pre-tenure course releases or research leaves to enable faculty to focus on their scholarship. In a perfect world that would happen, but here strapped budgets prevent this kind of creativity.

Some faculty commented that decoupling seems to be an excuse and doesn't serve anyone very well. But if we were to do away with it we'd need a process that's much better defined than what we have. We'd also have to grandfather in colleagues who are in the process now. Also, we need more formalized process of mentoring and more information sharing. The perception of decoupling, for both, was similar to "I want to marry you but I also want you to change".

Other faculty members believed that, if the tenure/promotion policy could be fixed, they would be opposed to decoupling, but expressed doubts that it can be fixed. One problem is the perception that the University t/p committee likes the power too much. We could resolve a lot of the problems if we articulate the relative importance of different kinds of scholarship and what matters the most in the tenure review process, and then decoupling wouldn't be necessary.

In a follow-up email to one of the decoupled faculty members about the demographic of the decoupled group, the comment was made that: "Decoupling has served institutional racism well as this university. It must be stopped!"

## APPENDIX 4: Recommendation on Decoupling

A Recommendation on Decoupling of Tenure from Promotion

at Stetson University, Presented to Faculty Senate

29 March 2010

From the Tenure & Promotion Policy Revision Task Force

Members: Paul Dascher, Jamil Khader, Brigid Noonan, Michael Rickman, Susan Ryan, Alicia Schultheis, and Kimberly Flinthamilton (chair)

### Background

*a. The Farrell et al. Report, "A Report on Some Statistical Patterns Associated with the Tenure and Promotion Process at Stetson University" (Fall 2008)*

During the 2007-2008 academic year, in response to ongoing discussions regarding the demographic patterns of decoupling decisions – i.e., granting tenure to assistant professors without promotion to associate professor – the Faculty Senate appointed a committee, chaired by Terrence Farrell,<sup>1</sup> to analyze the patterns associated with tenure and promotion at Stetson University. The committee analyzed five phenomena: faculty retention, tenure success, assistant-to-associate promotion success, associate-to-full promotion success, and associate-full promotion delay. The results of that study indicated that faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), especially in the Division of Natural Sciences, are retained at a lower rate than those in the School of Music (SOM) or School of Business Administration (SOBA); that CAS faculty experience lower success rates of assistant-to-associate promotion; that faculty in the SOM experience lower frequency of associate-to-full promotion and higher rates of promotion delay, that ALANA faculty members experience lower frequency of assistant-to-associate promotion and higher rates of associate-to-full promotion delay; and that there seems to be a correlation between department size and retention, with smaller departments in the CAS experiencing lower retention rates than medium and larger

---

<sup>1</sup> Members include: Patrick Coggins, Michelle DeMoss, Mary Pollock, and Stephen Robinson.

departments. The committee recommended that all three colleges continue to “revisit and clarify T&P guidelines and procedures.”<sup>2</sup>

*b. The Everett et al. Report, “Stetson University Tenure and Promotion Review Task Force Interim Report” (November 2009)*

In response to the findings of the Farrell committee, President Doug Lee appointed a second committee in Spring 2008, chaired by Diane Everett,<sup>3</sup> to further investigate the patterns associated with tenure and promotion. The main areas examined by the Everett committee were: academic unit, sex, ALANA status, and home department size. In an effort to understand the rationale for the patterns of negative outcomes for women faculty, ALANA faculty, and faculty in small departments, the committee raised the issue of unclear standards and criteria and/or how those standards were interpreted (p. 22). They concluded that: “[T]he evidence we reviewed suggests that, in the absence of clearer standards and examples of how they could be interpreted in the CAS, the University’s general criteria and identical lists of evidence (required to demonstrate that candidates are qualified for tenure and promotion) have created confusion and have made it more difficult both for candidates to know what is expected of them and for the committees to come up with consistent, equitable decisions” (p, 24). The Everett committee made twenty recommendations, which include creating a clear set of guidelines, policies, and procedures for tenure and promotion, and clarifying the standards and criteria for tenure, promotion to associate professor, and promotion to full professor (p. 34).

*c. The Provost’s Task Force*

At the end of the Fall 2009 term, Provost Paul formed a task force charged with “revising existing tenure and promotion policies into a unified University policy.” Called the “Tenure and Promotion Policy Revision Task Force (hereafter TPPR task force), this new committee was also charged by the Faculty Senate to make a recommendation regarding decoupling – should the standards for tenure and promotion to associate be written in such a way as to make tenure a separate process from promotion, and allow the tenuring of faculty members without simultaneously awarding promotion to associate professor, or, instead, should the standards for tenure be identical to those for promotion to associate, thereby eliminating the possibility of decoupling?

---

<sup>2</sup> Farrell report, p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Members include: Patrick Coggins, Michelle DeMoss, Tandy Grubbs, Mitchell Reddish, Michael Rickman, and Susan Ryan

## Procedure

### *Materials*

The Everett Report

The Farrell Report

Ernest Boyer. 1996. "From Scholarship Reconsidered to Scholarship Assessed." *Quest* 48, 129-130.

Ernest Boyer. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered, Priorities of the Professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Stetson University Organization, Policies, and Procedures Manual (also called the Faculty Handbook), Academic Affairs, sections 3.3.4-3.3.5.3 and 3.3.7.

Interviews with the following constituency groups:

- Faculty Senate Executive Committee
- Academic Deans
- University Tenure/Promotion Committee
- CAS Tenure/Promotion Committee
- SOBA Tenure/Promotion Committee
- SOM Tenure/Promotion Committee
- Library Tenure/Promotion Committee
- Chairs, SOBA
- Chair, SOM
- Chairs, CAS Humanities Division
- Chairs, CAS Natural Sciences Division
- Chairs, CAS Social Sciences Division + Education
- Faculty Women's Caucus
- Gender Equity Council
- Diversity Council
- Tenure, Grievance, and Academic Freedom Committee
- Faculty who have experienced decoupling of tenure/promotion to associate

## Findings

The committee met several times, including twice with Provost Paul, during the Spring 2010 semester to discuss the pros and cons of the current tenure and promotion policy. Much of our time was devoted to meeting with the constituency groups listed above. One or more members of the TPPR task force was present for each of the meetings. A list of open-ended questions was sent to the members of the groups ahead of time regarding the evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service and members were asked to think about them and to include any other issues they would like to see addressed, or to point out any problems that their unit has experienced. At nearly all the meetings the issue of decoupling was raised, either by members of the task force or by one of the members of the constituency groups.

Feelings about decoupling seemed to fall into one of four categories:

- Support for decoupling;
- No strong feelings expressed;
- Mixed feelings with some members strongly for it and others strongly opposed, or,
- Opposed to decoupling.

#### Support

The CAS t/p committee strongly supported decoupling, as did the SOM t/p committee. The CAS t/p committee especially regards decoupling as a positive decision, and allows the tenured assistant professor a few extra years to improve on weaknesses (scholarship, in particular).

#### No strong feelings expressed

In the meetings with the SOBA t/p committees, the SOBA chairs, the Librarians, and the SOM chair, there were no strong feelings expressed regarding decoupling. It happens so infrequently in these units that the topic has not been as volatile as in the CAS. The meeting with the Faculty Women's Caucus also did not touch upon the issue of decoupling. The focus of that meeting was on the serious flaws in the current systems of evaluation, and time ran out before the issue of decoupling could be explicitly raised. Finally, the TGAF committee had not heard any cases yet, so the focus of that meeting was on training of chairs, workshops, mentoring of chairs, candidates, and senior colleagues involved in the process, and accountability.

#### Mixed feelings with some members strongly for it and others strongly opposed

The Social Science + Education chairs expressed strong feelings regarding decoupling. All the chairs agreed that misunderstanding the criteria, lack of specificity in guidelines, and lack of accountability have resulted in decoupling, and most agreed that it should not continue even though that would likely result in loss of colleagues. One chair, however, felt very strongly that decoupling has served the university well over the past 20+ years and it should still be an option.

The meetings with faculty who have themselves experienced decoupling were also split. Some felt that there should be a 'tenure w/o promotion' option. This might be a way to support women who have children during their pretenure review period – although they acknowledged that the ability to stop the tenure clock for up to two years would also be helpful. Most of the faculty who had experienced decoupling, however, agreed that clearer guidelines, more support during the pretenure review process, more transparency in the process, and more accountability would solve the problems that have resulted in decoupling decisions, which are painful, frustrating, and humiliating, and they were opposed to decoupling.

#### Opposed to decoupling

The majority of constituency groups in which an opinion was expressed felt that decoupling should be eliminated. The Academic Deans were opposed in principle to decoupling, but one dean commented on how agonizing it is for a candidate to come so close without success, especially those whose skills and special gifts pull into burdensome service commitments thereby effectively reducing the time they might have for scholarship, the main reason for most of the decoupling decisions. This dean acknowledged the problems of decoupling but has in the past been grateful to have had the option.

The University t/p committee, like the CAS t/p committee, has viewed decoupling as a positive decision, but one University committee member commented that it might be a good idea to word the tenure and promotion to associate standards the same so as to avoid decoupling, even though it would likely lead to more tenure denials.

The Natural Science chairs felt very strongly that decoupling should not continue, although there was concern that, in this division, the pressure to get students involved in faculty research is great, and that might slow down the publication rate, which ultimately could negatively affect the tenure decision. If, however, the divisions articulated the general university guidelines and the sciences indicated that student/faculty research was a significant component of tenure/promotion, that concern is mitigated.

The issue of decoupling did not come up in the meeting with the Humanities chairs, but in follow-up emails some chairs indicated that decoupling has happened far

more frequently than it should have over the years. Of the chairs that expressed an opinion, all favor a straight up or down decision, and agree that better mentoring, more clarity in the process, and accountability would resolve most of the problems that have resulted in decoupling. But one chair in particular expressed little faith that we, as a community, can do the hard work of honest, critical evaluation of colleagues, chairs, and deans that would be required if we give up decoupling. In a better world, we should end decoupling, but in the world of Stetson University, maybe decoupling should be retained.

4

The faculty members present at the Gender Equity Council meeting were opposed to decoupling, but felt that, if we were to retain it, it would be acceptable as long as the guidelines were clear, there was appropriate mentoring, and accountability.

The Diversity Council was strongly opposed to decoupling. Decoupling, in the words of one individual, is a “cop-out.” It can – and some felt that it has – allowed administrators and senior colleagues to avoid doing the difficult work of evaluating and mentoring colleagues because there’s a safety net. The failure to train chairs, lack of clarity in guidelines, and the secrecy of the process have resulted in humiliation of our junior colleagues, many of whom, if they had received proper mentoring, may have produced a very different, and stronger, portfolio for tenure/promotion.

### **Recommendation**

Clearly there are mixed feelings about decoupling. The TPPR task force, however, feels that decoupling has caused more problems than it has solved. Even those who supported decoupling feel that better training and holding those involved in the process more accountable would help reduce its frequency. In one group which considered decoupling a positive option, “The problems of adequate mentoring and the importance of honest and critical second and fourth year reviews were reiterated as the best method of catching problems early on in the process,” so as to avoid having to decouple faculty. One wonders to what degree fear is motivating those who wish to keep decoupling an option. The comments of the Humanities chair who doubted that Stetson University has what it takes to make the tough decisions are very telling.

---

<sup>4</sup> In a follow-up conversation with one of the Humanities chairs, following the Senate’s endorsement of this recommendation, a stronger sentiment was expressed in support of keeping decoupling as an option for truly exceptional cases, therefore the Humanities division should more appropriately be placed in the “Mixed” category.

Many of the constituency groups referred to “fuzzy” standards and inconsistency in evaluation by colleagues, chairs, and deans. Most felt that, if the guidelines were clearer and adequate training, mentoring, and evaluation were provided consistently, and if the parties involved in the process were held accountable for their responsibilities by the provost, decoupling would cease being a problem. Even though eliminating decoupling will likely result in loss of colleagues, clearer guidelines and standards will ultimately save others.

The faculty who themselves have experienced decoupling expressed particularly strong feelings on the issue. The pain and humiliation of being decoupled was powerfully evident among these colleagues, and lays to rest any thought that decoupled faculty members feel very little bitterness and disgrace, a comment various members of the TPPR task force have heard a number of times from supporters of decoupling. The decoupled faculty commented on the secrecy of the process and the frustration of not knowing what you did wrong, the inability to get a straight answer from administrators about what to fix or how to improve, the lack of clarity in the guidelines and lack of mentoring, the feeling that the bar for promotion keeps getting raised and there’s little one can do to avoid being trapped, the conflict-averse (even passive-aggressive) climate of Stetson that seems to prevent junior faculty members from getting honest, critical evaluations until negative comments are cloaked by secrecy during the tenure application. There was the sense, expressed both among the decoupled faculty and the Diversity Council, that decoupling punishes the victims of poor advising/mentoring. Even so, the decoupled faculty members were conflicted over whether they supported the process, but most seemed to agree that decoupling does more harm than good.

Based on the data presented in the Farrell et al. Report, the Everett et al. Report, the Stetson University Organization, Policies, and Procedures Manual, and our meetings with various constituency groups, we have concluded that the majority of decoupling incidents have resulted from, or been strongly influenced by, lack of clarity in the tenure and promotion guidelines.

It is the recommendation of the TPPR committee that decoupling be eliminated, and that the standards for tenure and for promotion to associate professor be identical.

## APPENDIX 5: SAMPLE CHECKLISTS

### CHECKLIST FOR 2nd YEAR REVIEW

Notification of candidate

Classroom visits coordinated (for teaching faculty)

Portfolio, including the following:

Curriculum Vitae

Compilations of all teaching evaluations (for teaching faculty)

Faculty Activity Reports (FARs)/Librarian Self-Evaluations + responses

Evaluative letters from tenured colleagues

Chair's summary letter

Dean's/Library Director's response to 2nd year review


### CHECKLIST FOR 4th YEAR REVIEW

Notification of candidate

Classroom visits coordinated (for teaching faculty)

Portfolio, including the following:

Curriculum Vitae

Compilations of all teaching evaluations (for teaching faculty)

Faculty Activity Reports (FARs)/Librarian Self-Evaluations + responses

Second-Year review summary letter + Dean's/Library Director's response

Evaluative letters from tenured colleagues

Chair's summary letter for 4th year review

Dean's/Library Director's response to 4th year review


### CHECKLIST FOR TENURE/PROMOTION

Notification of candidate

--



**Appendix 6: Sample Rubrics for Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activity, and Service/Leadership**

<b>Teaching/Librarianship: Tenure and Promotion to Associate</b>	
<b>Teaching Standard</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
Command of Subject Matter	Student course evaluations; Second- and fourth year reviews and responses; classroom observations by colleagues; colleague letters; publications, conference papers, and other scholarly/creative activities with students; limited samples of student work that demonstrates teaching effectiveness
Organization	Student course evaluations; Second- and fourth year reviews and responses; classroom observations by colleagues; colleague letters; syllabi
Rigor	Student course evaluations; Second- and fourth year reviews and responses; classroom observations by colleagues; colleague letters; limited samples of student work that demonstrates rigor; sample exams; syllabi; awards; grants/grant proposals; unit or divisional comparative reports of teaching evaluations and grading from the Office of Institutional Research; direct evidence of learning outcomes
Evolution	Student course evaluations; Second- and fourth year reviews and responses; classroom observations by colleagues; colleague letters; new course development; substantive course revisions; evidence of innovative use of technology that enhances teaching effectiveness; syllabi
Engagement	Student course evaluations; Second- and fourth year reviews and responses; classroom observations by colleagues; colleague letters; publications, conference papers, and other scholarly/creative activities with students; mentoring students (Independent Studies, SURE grants, etc.)

<b>Teaching/Librarianship: Promotion to Full Professor</b>	
<b>Teaching Standard</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
Command of Subject Matter	Student course evaluations; Second- and fourth year reviews and responses; classroom observations by colleagues; colleague letters; publications, conference papers, and other scholarly/creative activities with students; limited samples of student work that demonstrates teaching effectiveness
Organization	Student course evaluations; Second- and fourth year reviews and responses; classroom observations by colleagues; colleague letters; syllabi
Rigor	Student course evaluations; Second- and fourth year reviews and responses; classroom observations by colleagues; colleague letters; limited samples of student work that demonstrates rigor; sample exams; syllabi; awards; grants/grant proposals; unit or divisional comparative reports of teaching evaluations and grading from the Office of Institutional Research; direct evidence of learning outcomes
Engagement	Student course evaluations; Second- and fourth year reviews and responses; classroom observations by colleagues; colleague letters; publications, conference papers, and other scholarly/creative activities with students; mentoring students (Independent Studies, SURE grants); mentoring junior colleagues
Maturity	Student course evaluations; Second- and fourth year reviews and responses; classroom observations by colleagues; colleague letters; new course development; substantive course revisions; involvement in curricular changes/development; evidence of innovative use of technology that enhances teaching effectiveness
Impact	Student course evaluations; Second- and fourth year reviews and responses; classroom observations by colleagues; colleague letters; publications, conference papers, and other scholarly/creative activities with students; limited samples of student work that demonstrates teaching effectiveness; direct evidence of learning outcomes; documentation of student success; documentation of alumni/ae success; awards (McEniry)

<b>Scholarship: Tenure and Promotion to Associate</b>	
<b>Standard</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
Rigor	Peer reviewed publications, Substantive grant proposals
Engagement	Conference presentations/attendance, Reviewing/Refereeing, mentoring SURE recipients, senior projects, ISY's, grant activity
Evolution	Publication record, Presentation record
Consistency	Publication record, Presentation record, Record of mentoring SURE recipients, senior projects, ISY's, grant activity throughout tenure

<b>Scholarship: Promotion to Full Professor</b>	
<b>Standard</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
Rigor	Peer reviewed publications, Substantive grant proposals
Engagement	Conference presentations/attendance, Reviewing/Refereeing, mentoring SURE recipients, senior projects, ISY's, grant activity
Maturity	Publication record, Presentation record, Record of mentoring SURE recipients, senior projects, ISY's, grant activity throughout tenure
Development of Expertise	Publication record, Presentation record, Invited papers and/or presentations, Service as editor/editorial committee of professional journal, panel reviewer for NSF
Recognition	Awards, Invited papers and/or presentations, Service as editor or on editorial committee of professional journal or as panel reviewer for NSF, external review of scholarship
Consistency	Publication record, Presentation record, Record of mentoring SURE recipients, senior projects, ISY's, grant activity throughout tenure

Service: Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Service Standards	Evidence
Campus Engagement	FARs / Librarian self evaluations and responses from committee chairs and Deans (as appropriate); Second- and Fourth-year reviews and responses; Committee chair evaluations of committee work; committee reports; letters from colleagues, administrators
Civic Engagement (optional)	If evidence of Civic Engagement is presented (newspaper articles, reports, commendations, substantive letters of thanks), the evidence should relate to the candidate's field of expertise and/or the mission of the University

Leadership: Promotion to Full Professor	
Leadership Standards	Evidence
Campus Engagement	FARs / Librarian self evaluations and responses from committee chairs and Deans (as appropriate); Second- and Fourth-year reviews and responses; Committee chair evaluations of committee work; committee reports; letters from colleagues, administrators
Civic Engagement (optional)	If evidence of Civic Engagement is presented (newspaper articles, reports, commendations, substantive letters of thanks), the evidence should relate to the candidate's field of expertise and/or the mission of the University
Impact	FARs / Librarian self evaluations and responses from committee chairs and Deans (as appropriate); Second- and Fourth-year reviews and responses; Committee chair evaluations of committee work; committee reports; letters from colleagues, administrators
Maturity	FARs / Librarian self evaluations and responses from committee chairs and Deans (as appropriate); Second- and Fourth-year reviews and responses; Committee chair evaluations of committee work; committee reports; letters from colleagues, administrators