

Progress Report from the Ad Hoc
Committee to Review Tenure and Promotion
Policies and Procedures

March 2008 Faculty Meeting

Ad Hoc Committee to Review Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures

- ▶ Convened by Faculty Council, the URC, and CAFT
- ▶ Formed in October 2007

Ad Hoc Committee to Review Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures

- ▶ Convened by Faculty Council, the URC, and CAFT
- ▶ Formed in October 2007
- ▶ We call ourselves “CRTP”

Undertake a critical examination of Bucknell's system of evaluation for tenure and promotion . . .

- ▶ Review Bucknell's record of hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion
- ▶ Compare Bucknell's tenure and promotion system to those in place at peer institutions

Undertake a critical examination of Bucknell's system of evaluation for tenure and promotion . . .

- ▶ Review Bucknell's record of hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion
- ▶ Compare Bucknell's tenure and promotion system to those in place at peer institutions
- ▶ Additional issues to examine:
 - ▶ URC charge and its relationship with DRCs
 - ▶ URC procedures
 - ▶ URC workload
 - ▶ DRC statement uniformity
 - ▶ Review schedule
 - ▶ Process by which evolving standards should be determined
 - ▶ Presidential role in tenure and promotion

CRTP Composition

- ▶ Julian Bourg, History
- ▶ Kim Daubman, Psychology
- ▶ Paula Davis, Theatre & Dance
- ▶ Linden Lewis, Sociology & Anthropology
- ▶ Jim Rice, Associate Provost
- ▶ Geoff Schneider, Economics
- ▶ Peter Stryker, Mechanical Engineering
- ▶ Ben Vollmayr-Lee, Physics & Astronomy

General Timeline

Fall 2007 Find a shorter name. Identify the types of data we hope to collect, and prioritize ordering. Began with

- ▶ quantifying Bucknell's review history
- ▶ characterizing peer institutions
- ▶ surveying faculty perceptions

General Timeline

Fall 2007 Find a shorter name. Identify the types of data we hope to collect, and prioritize ordering. Began with

- ▶ quantifying Bucknell's review history
- ▶ characterizing peer institutions
- ▶ surveying faculty perceptions

Spring 2008 Data collection, and begin synthesis (e.g., peer institutions' policies) to determine what other information we need.

We are setting up focus groups, meetings, etc.

General Timeline

Fall 2007 Find a shorter name. Identify the types of data we hope to collect, and prioritize ordering. Began with

- ▶ quantifying Bucknell's review history
- ▶ characterizing peer institutions
- ▶ surveying faculty perceptions

Spring 2008 Data collection, and begin synthesis (e.g., peer institutions' policies) to determine what other information we need.

We are setting up focus groups, meetings, etc.

Fall 2008 Form specific recommendations. Make a report to the Faculty.

Determining Bucknell's Hiring and Tenure History

- ▶ Constructed a list of faculty hired to tenure track positions since 1987

(with the help of University Archives, Institutional Research, Human Resources, and department chairs)

- ▶ Currently documenting the *objective* aspects of the tenure trajectory for this cohort

(with the help of the Provost's Office)

Determining Bucknell's Hiring and Tenure History

- ▶ Constructed a list of faculty hired to tenure track positions since 1987

(with the help of University Archives, Institutional Research, Human Resources, and department chairs)
- ▶ Currently documenting the *objective* aspects of the tenure trajectory for this cohort

(with the help of the Provost's Office)
- ▶ One use of this information will be to obtain similar data from peer institutions

(with help from Institutional Research and the HEDS consortium)

Characterization of Practices at Peer Institutions

Selected a set of 22 institutions from

- ▶ the peer/aspirant list approved by the Board of Trustees
- ▶ schools ranked with five places of Bucknell in US News ratings

Looking at

Process — flow chart for tenure or promotion, frequency of review, level of review

Timeline — due dates, announcements, appeal deadlines

Documentation — what goes into dossier, who puts it in

Characterization — size and type of institution, types of programs, review caseload

Policies and Procedures Comparison Group

- ▶ Barnard
- ▶ Bates
- ▶ Bryn Mawr
- ▶ Colgate
- ▶ Colorado College
- ▶ Dartmouth
- ▶ Davidson
- ▶ Furman
- ▶ Holy Cross
- ▶ Kenyon
- ▶ Lafayette
- ▶ Lehigh
- ▶ Macalester
- ▶ Middlebury
- ▶ Mount Holyoke
- ▶ Occidental
- ▶ Richmond
- ▶ Scripps
- ▶ Trinity
- ▶ Villanova
- ▶ Wake Forest
- ▶ William & Mary

Bucknell Faculty Survey

- ▶ Goal was to assess faculty perceptions of what our system is, and opinions about what our system should be.
- ▶ Huge response — 228 completed the survey! Many detailed and thoughtful comments.
- ▶ We will be processing this information and using it to decide on avenues of follow-up (focus groups, etc.)
- ▶ Survey results will be made public in aggregate form.