

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Promotion & Tenure Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » Annual Report 1991-1992

Promotion & Tenure Committee

Annual Report 1991-1992

The Faculty Senate Promotion and tenure Committee is responsible for reviewing policy and observing activities related to the promotion and tenure process. The major role of this committee is to provide a faculty observer to be present for meetings of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee includes the Provost, the Vice President for Research, Graduate Studies, & International Programs, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Dean of the Graduate School. When the University Promotion and Tenure Committee does not achieve a consensus on an individual dossier and/or there are some unusual circumstances they wish explained, a meeting is arranged with the candidate's Dean. A Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee member is present at these meetings.

The following remarks and recommendations are based on observations made in the spring, 1992 meetings.

1. A problem encountered repeatedly over the years has been how to evaluate individuals on faculty appointments who have major responsibility in non-traditional teaching areas. These people are often in extension, the library, and counseling. A long run suggestion is to adopt career advancement criteria that are more relevant to the balance of responsibilities in these areas than those used for individuals in resident instruction. This is a complex issue and it requires careful thought and consideration.
2. Another problem observed was the failure of some department heads or chairs to give faculty members timely feedback on their progress. Further, chairs should monitor young faculty members' participation in service activities to be sure they are not overburdened in a way that will detract from their promotion and tenure evaluation.
3. Administrators seemed concerned with the lack of consistency between colleges or even departments in presentation and evaluation of teaching performance.
4. There still appears to be inconsistency regarding the presence (or absence) of time "windows" for promotion and tenure. Confusion could be mitigated by a clearer definition of what administrators consider to be normal ranges for time in rank. Summary statistics on the 1991-92 promotion and tenure decisions are available in John Dunn's office.

We recommend that the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee continues in its role as observer to the promotion and tenure process. We hope that our comments and suggestions will be considered in next year's procedures.

Respectfully submitted,

1991-92 Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee
B. Starr McMullen, Chair
Rebecca Donatelle
Roger Fletcher
Flo Leibowitz
Alice Mills Morrow
Robert Sproull