

*Notes on revisions to*

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

*In the tabulation below, I have attempted to document the specific changes that were made to the university promotion and tenure guidelines. I have organized the comments under the same headings as the guidelines themselves and attempted to provide information as to our motivation for each of the changes (i.e. who asked us or our goals), as well as what the specific changes were.*

*Our two initial charges were to examine the guidelines 1) with respect to the service component and 2) in the face of the creation of the new fixed term extension class of professorial faculty. In addition, there were a number of edits passed on to us from a committee of faculty lead by Becky Johnson last year. As the year as proceeded, we have been asked to consider other issues, most notably conflict of interest management (by the President and Provost).*

*One of the other goals that several groups suggested, was to tie together more of the material on P&T into one place. Therefore, we have linked guidelines for position descriptions, OARs, etc, that had existed in disparate locations.*

*Any “interpretation” or errors below are mine, not related to the incredibly hard work put in by the members of the FS P&T or Executive committees with the assistance of Academic Affairs this year.*

*Roger Nielsen on behalf of FS P&T Committee*

**GENERAL PURPOSES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

- Change to broaden application of these specific guidelines (rather than adapted guidelines).
- Emphasis on the significance of position descriptions in evaluation for P&T. – in several cases below, we have taken materials from the frequently asked questions section and inserted them into the guidelines, particularly for position descriptions. ,Later legal asked that the section on position descriptions be put in a separate, but linked, document. That separate document will continue to be worked on Academic Affairs in collaboration with FS P&T and exec committee.

**CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

***General Guidelines***

- Materials moved to new section on criteria for position descriptions.
- Specific metric added with respect to scholarship and creative activity (from AA and Provost).

***Faculty Responsibilities***

- New section on faculty responsibilities that defines how faculty responsibilities can be enumerated. This was constructed with the goal of providing sufficient flexibility to units who

have different ways of constructing position descriptions – yet provide sufficient structure to allow the system to evaluate faculty fairly across discipline boundaries for P&T. Further, this section is intended to align assigned duties with the main mission areas of the university, teaching, research, extension and engagement. There are now descriptive sections for each and an additional one for other assigned duties.

- New section on criteria for position descriptions adapted from a combination of information from other sections and from “frequently asked questions”. This now exists as a separate document that will be linked from here.

#### **Assigned Duties – Research:**

This section was added to provide flexibility to consider research as an assigned duty or scholarship in a position description and provide a framework for evaluation of the productivity of a candidate. This was triggered by our initial discussions related to Extension and Ag faculty.

#### **Assigned duties –Extension Education:**

An additional short section was added to help describe what constitutes Extension Education – which has some characteristics that we felt needed to be specifically annotated. We (FS P&T) also addressed (later in the document under Criteria for Promotions) the charge to the committee to examine promotion criteria for non-tenure track extension faculty. - per the charge to examine the guidelines related to fixed term extension faculty. It was the sense of the group that the increased vulnerability of this group requires more clarity in what these assignments entail.

#### **Other Assignments:**

The other Assignments section was extensively re-written to clearly state the characteristics of the group type and criteria to be included in position descriptions. Specifics for evaluation are dependent on the criteria described individualized position descriptions. One of the primary goals here is to distinguish these duties from service duties.

An important note here, other types of assigned duties may be defined under this category if they are consistent with the characteristics described. It is our opinion, that when a unit configures a position description that is innovative in that way, it is critical that they work with Academic Affairs (and their own College).

#### ***Scholarship and Creative Activity***

Additions include

- 1) Enhanced emphasis on validation and documentation
- 2) Opportunity to use peer validated service if discipline appropriate – and agreed upon beforehand. – per our charge to look at the role of service
- 3) Enhance the intent of the guidelines to include diverse forms of scholarship.

#### ***Service***

- Definition of institutional (unit and university) and professional service– per our charge to look at the role of service
- Emphasis on accountability for faculty service duties and importance for all faculty to participate
- Definition of peer validated professional service as scholarly activity

- A recommendation was made for all faculty to have some unspecified % FTE service in their position descriptions. That was further specified in the separate document on position description criteria.
- Clarification of what types of service can be considered for P&T. This section puts greater emphasis for community service outside the university that promotes the university mission.

### ***Criteria for Granting Indefinite Tenure***

Clarification of timing of tenure clock initiation, and conditions for extensions – from Acad Affairs

### ***Criteria for Promotions***

- For Assistant to Associate – service changed to - appropriate balance of institutional and professional service. – public dropped – these changes were related to the committee charge to look at the role of service
- For promotion to professor - changed to exemplary institutional , and professional service, and an appropriate balance between the two – goal is to encourage (but not require absolutely in all cases) more university service for tenured associate professors.
- Curricular development and innovative teaching added as a criteria
- Fixed term Extension Faculty added – per the charge to examine the guidelines related to those faculty
- Timing of promotion clock clarified for instructor and FRA
- Section on promotion and tenure of instructors added by Academic Affairs

## ***FACULTY DOSSIERS***

### ***Access to the Dossier and University Files by the Faculty Member***

Criteria for addition of materials to dossier clarified

## ***PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE***

Addition of third year review in the process of informing faculty as to their progress – additional recommendations related to the specifics of the timing and content of third year review have been forwarded to Academic Affairs

### ***Declaration and Management of Conflicts of Interest***

New section on conflicts of interest focused on two separate issues 1) personal relationships 2) professional relationships. For 1) the section defers to OAR rules. For 2) the section outlines the goals, and process by which the potential conflicts are announced and/or managed. This charge was added in late Fall by President and Provost to address shortcomings in the current system.

### ***Tenure Unit Review and Recommendation***

- Revised section on criteria for constitution of unit review committees
- Revised section of student committee input – committee felt that student input section should be made more uniform across campus (e.g. agreed with Academic Affairs). However, we had concerns with the process outlined – we have suggested that AA confirm a general process for AY07-8 and distribute. They did so, and have included the new process in the document that was approved.
- New statement on peer review input – this came from revisions prior to 8/1/06 – FS P&T added Extension/outreach

***College Review and Recommendation***

- New information on candidate response and faculty input – specifically sentence added “Care should be taken to ensure appropriate and adequate input by faculty throughout the college review process.” Implementation of this will require changes in practice in some colleges.

***University Review and Recommendation***

- Issue related to the role of the FS P&T committee – since the most recent revision of the standing rules for the FS P&T committee, the process for evaluation of dossiers at the university has changed. It is now being done at a retreat, where all the dossiers are evaluated simultaneously for all colleges – as opposed to college by college. In the previous process, a member of the FS P&T committee could sit in on the deliberations for a specific college without disrupting either the University process or their schedule. With the current system, it is unclear how the committee can be involved at the early stage of the process. We are involved only after an initial decision has been made, and are brought in as observers when the follow up conversations occur. Specifically, we observe on any discussions on cases that have been denied, and for which there is a follow up discussion.

***Decisions and Appeals***

New section on appeals