

C RTP Report, Appendix D. Peer Institution Provost Survey

These responses were gathered from an informal survey of Provosts/VPAA's at a number of peer institutions. 15 responses were received. Identifying information has been removed to protect the anonymity of respondents.			
Tenure survey	Question #1		
	President's role in tenure process	Provost/VPAA/Dean of faculty role in tenure process	Has either or both overturned a decision?
Institution # 1	The college level committee is the President's Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion (ATP), and the President sits ex officio on the committee (generally attending all meetings). For cases that the _____ President affirms, they then go through the ad hoc process of tenure review at _____ where another faculty committee (which always includes two ----- faculty) make recommendations to the _____ Provost who then recommends to the _____ President.	The Provost/Dean of the Faculty chairs the committee. There are five faculty (all tenured) who vote, and make recommendations to the President.	The President has declined to support both positive and negative recommendations of the ATP. (Note language about "recommendations" from an advisory committee vs "decisions" by a P&T committee.)
Institution # 2	Dean/VPAA (that is I), chairs the Committee on Personnel and serves as a voting member. We make a recommendation to the President. The President has indicated to the Committee, that should she not agree with the recommendation, she will come back to the Committee to discuss the issues.	Dean/VPAA (that is I), chairs the Committee on Personnel and serves as a voting member. We make a recommendation to the President.	No, the president has not overturned a decision (although has returned to the Committee to discuss) in the last 9 years.
Institution # 3	The president makes the final decision based on a recommendation from a committee that consists of 4 (appointed by the Provost/Dean) faculty members plus the Provost/Dean. The president's decision is reported to the Board of Trustees, but I believe they do not have defined authority to overrule these decisions, except in the general sense that the president serves at their pleasure.	The Provost/Dean does not overrule decisions, but is part of the recommendation to the president. The president can and has made a decision not supported by the majority recommendation of the committee.	The president can and has made a decision not supported by the majority recommendation of the committee. The president is also the final decision maker on any appeals that arise following the process and there have been appeals that have resulted in overturns of the committee decision or a mandated rehearing of the case by the committee with new factors taken into account.
Institution # 4	The department, division, elected faculty executive committee, the dean, and the president review tenure and promotion files. If the review is positive, the president submits the recommendation to the Trustees who have the final say.	The Faculty Executive Committee reviews the departmental and divisional recommendations and makes a recommendation to the dean who then recommends to the president.	In the past, the dean and president have gone against the recommendation of the Faculty Executive Committee, I have been told. In the last three years, The faculty executive committee recommended against tenure in three cases. In two out of three the department recommended in favor, and in three of three, the division did. I supported the executive committee's recommendation. All three appealed, and the president sustained my recommendation.

CRTP Report, Appendix D. Peer Institution Provost Survey

Question # 1	President's role in tenure process	Provost/VPAA/Dean of faculty role in tenure process	Has either or both overturned a decision?
Institution # 5	President sits with the university-wide committee and can take part in the discussion, but is not a voting member of the "Committee Advisory to the President." It is then up to the president to accept the recommendation of the Committee and pass it on to the Trustees for final approval.	The Dean of Faculty chairs the committee and has a vote (usually votes only in the case of a tie). Provost is not formally a member but sits with the committee and can take part in the discussion. (Provost and president together deal with recommendations from Business and Medical Schools, which have a separate process.)	Only the president can overturn the committee's decision. The last three presidents, to the best of my knowledge, have not overturned a decision; I believe a decision was overturned back in the late 1970s, but not since 1980 or so.
Institution # 6	The President chairs the College-wide CTP committee, attending all meetings and participating in discussion. When the case goes to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees for ratification, both the President and the VPAA/Dean attend to present the recommendations and answer trustees' questions.	The VPAA/Dean of Faculty is a full voting member ex officio of the CTP and participates in all phases of the College-level review. When the case goes to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees for ratification, both the President and the VPAA/Dean attend to present the recommendations and answer trustees' questions. At that meeting, the VPAA/Dean speaks for the whole CTP, not for him- or herself. The President speaks for himself.	The VPAA/Dean has no statutory power beyond that of CTP membership and therefore cannot overturn a decision. The President could do so but has not for at least the past 7 years (as far back as institutional memory in this office extends).
Institution # 7	Practically, the tenure decision rests with the president. Formally, all tenure decisions must be approved by the Board of Trustees. The president receives a recommendation from the provost. If the decision is problematic or unclear, the provost and the president discuss the matter to arrive at a decision.	The provost's recommendation is based on an extensive tenure review process, organized by our Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. The committee makes a recommendation to the provost, who sits in on all meetings of the committee. On rare occasions, the provost has made a recommendation that is inconsistent with that of the committee.	to my knowledge, the Board has never overturned a decision of the president. I know of no instance in which the president has overturned the provost's recommendation, although it is possible. On rare occasions, the provost has made a recommendation that is inconsistent with that of the committee.
Institution # 8	Here is the Faculty Handbook language about the role of the President – "The Board of Trustees and the President should, on questions of faculty status, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail."	The Provost is a voting member of the Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee, which consists of 6 faculty and the Provost. As a result, s/he is just one vote of 7.	Since 1990, the President overturned only one PTR decision
Institution # 9	Our Faculty Personnel Committee includes six elected members of the faculty, the president, and the provost. The entire committee reviews each candidate's file and makes a final decision by consensus.	Our Faculty Personnel Committee includes six elected members of the faculty, the president, and the provost. The entire committee reviews each candidate's file and makes a final decision by consensus.	This consensus model does not allow for the possibility of the president or provost overturning a decision.
Institution # 10	The Board of Trustees authorizes all tenure decisions, but the President makes the final decision in all cases, based on recommendations from the Promotions or Reappointments Committees, both of which the Provost/VPAA chairs.	The Provost/VPAA sits with both the Promotions Committee and Reappointments Committee (each meets separately). The Provost/VPAA helps to inform the discussions of these committees and the president when s/he is in the process of making the decision. The Dean of Faculty is asked to write a letter on all tenure cases based on the materials in the file, providing an overview of the case and giving a recommendation as well. The Dean of Faculty may also write in First Review cases, when requested by either committee. The Dean of Faculty may also write in First Review cases, when requested by either committee.	The Provost chairs these committees, but does not have a vote and cannot overturn a decision. However, the President does have the ability to overturn a recommendation made by the Promotion Committee, though he does not exercise that authority very often.

C RTP Report, Appendix D. Peer Institution Provost Survey

Question # 1	President's role in tenure process	Provost/VPAA/Dean of faculty role in tenure process	Has either or both overturned a decision?
Institution # 11	The President attends all tenure and promotion committee meetings that involve contract extensions, tenure or promotions. S/he is there to monitor (listen) and inject a point of view only when it might engage the President's role in the review. This role is to receive a recommendation from the VPAA and to approve or not approve after consultation with the VPAA.	The VPAA chairs the committee, shepherds the entire process, has a vote on the committee (which consists of 11 members-- eight elected, two appointed by the President in consultation with the VPAA addressing issues of diversity of all kinds, and the VPAA).	The VPAA is chair of the committee and is a voting member of the committee so cannot overturn. In the 22 years I have been here, there has been exactly one case that has been overturned by the President. This decision reversed and negative tenure recommendation.
Institution # 12	The President receives a recommendation from the APT (Appointments, Promotion and Tenure). The President makes a recommendation to the Board of trustees	The Dean writes an independent letter assessing the case. The Dean is an Ex Officio participant on the APT.	yes, the President has made a recommendation different from that of the APT.
Institution # 13	HE MAKES THE FINAL DECISION UPON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNIVERSITY R&T COMMITTEE. SEE POLICY, ATTACHED	CHAIRS THE UNIVERSITY R&T COMMITTEE; OVERSEES THE ENTIRE PROCESS. DOES NOT VOTE OR HAVE AN OFFICIAL "SAY" IN THE OUTCOME.	PRESIDENT HAS DONE SO ABOUT FIVE TIMES IN MY 13 YEARS, ALWAYS TO GRANT TENURE (THREE TIMES) OR PROMOTION (TWO OR THREE TIMES) WHEN THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE HAS VOTED AGAINST TENURE OR PROMOTION -- IN EACH CASE IT WAS A CLOSE VOTE AT THE COMMITTEE LEVEL OR THERE WERE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT THE COMMITTEE COULD NOT BE AWARE OF.
Institution # 14	The Provost makes a recommendation to the President and the President makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.	. Only the BOT can actually award tenure and promotion.	I have been here for over 20 years and I can only recall one such instance but there may have been others. This past year we had a faculty member who was turned down for promotion by their department and Dean and recommended for promotion by the Provost.
Institution # 15	The president plays no active role in tenure. That has been delegated to the provost.	The Provost reviews all affirmative tenure and promotion files from the deans of the five schools (A&S, Education, Law, Business, and Marine Science). The Provost then makes the recommendation to the board for approval (as a public university, the Board has final authority on tenure).	In living memory, neither the president nor the Board has ever over-turned a decision of the provost, though in theory they could. The president's intervention would be highly unusual since this would countermand delegated authority to the provost -- in other words, this would be a constitutional crisis and one of us (president or provost) would likely not survive. The provost has over-turned decisions from the deans, though always in consultation with the dean.

Tenure survey	Question #2	
	Assuming that your institution has both departmental and university-level bodies evaluating candidates for tenure and promotion, which is more 'powerful' or makes the critical decision?	Who makes the penultimate recommendation to the president?
Institution # 1	I try to encourage in every possible way departments to make the tough decisions rather than passing them along to the college-level committee (the ATP).	The ATP does make critical recommendations, and, fortunately, the President has had to make relatively few decisions which go against the recommendations of the ATP. (The ad hoc committee at _____ also makes negative recommendations, as does the _____ Provost at times. So there are many levels of review which have consequence.)
Institution # 2	Our review process goes from the Department to the Committee on Personnel to the President.	I would say that the "power" of the decisions is in that order.
Institution # 3	Departments or Programs make a recommendation (via a vote) to the Committee, which in turns makes an independent recommendation to the president. The Committee has made recommendations that are at odds with the departmental votes in both directions, although in most cases the two are consistent.	I would say that the Committee is more 'powerful' than the department at here.
Institution # 4	I make the recommendation.	The Faculty Executive Committee, which represents all divisions of the college, is the most powerful.
Institution # 5	The university-wide committee is the more powerful in this sense.	n/a
Institution # 6	I think I have answered much of this in my response to #1. I think that many people would regard the department as carrying about 40% of the weight of a decision, the CTP 60%. But since the CTP can (and does) reverse the department's recommendation (maybe 5% - 10% of the time), one could argue that that is really where the power lies.	Note that for us, the President himself wields only "penultimate" power and the trustees get the final say.
Institution # 7	The tenure committee is the more powerful, although they most often agree with the recommendation of the department	The provost recommends to the president.
Institution # 8	I think the PTR Committee is more "powerful" but of course weighs heavily the evaluations and recommendations provided by departments	The PTR Committee makes a recommendation directly to the President.
Institution # 9	The department generates a consensus review letter for the candidate, and that letter becomes one section of the candidate's complete tenure/promotion file. It receives significant weight, but the committee's decision does not always match the department's consensus recommendation.	n/a

Question # 2	Assuming that your institution has both departmental and university-level bodies evaluating candidates for tenure and promotion, which is more 'powerful' or makes the critical decision?	Who makes the penultimate recommendation to the president?
Institution # 10	<p>Our Promotions Committee includes three elected full professors, as does our Reappointments Committee. Both bodies make the recommendation to the President, based on recommendations from departments, the file submitted by the candidate, classroom visits, and range of other materials (including teaching evaluations). The Promotions Committee is charged with processing tenure reviews and reviews for promotion to full professor. The Reappointments Committee is charged with processing first reviews (third year reviews), contract reviews (for term faculty), and ten-year reviews, which are professional reviews for full professors. Several years ago, one elected committee did all the reviews, but we voted to divide the committee into two bodies because the workload was too intense.</p>	n/a
Institution # 11	<p>I would really say that the process at our institution is marked by an equally "powerful" departmental recommendation and a "powerful" and independent tenure and promotion committee. Good check and balance process that protects and insulated candidates from departmental politics and issues of collegiality that go beyond the boundaries regarding issues of collegiality stated by the AAUP which we include in the Faculty Handbook.</p>	<p>The penultimate recommendation is made by the VPAA (me) on behalf of the tenure and promotion committee. So while it might seem that the VPAA has two bites at the apple, in reality it does not work that way, although there is a private conversation that happens between the VPAA and the President about the recommendation. But since the President has heard all of the argument in each case, this conversation is not controversial and the process is trusted in the community. What is difficult is if there is a split recommendation coming from the department-- but this actually does not often happen. We really try to catch problems with a very clear and forcefully honest review at the third year review-- the major review before tenure.</p>
Institution # 12	There is no departmental review.	n/a
Institution # 13	UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE IS MOST POWERFUL	UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
Institution # 14	We do not have a university level committee but are considering it,	Dean's make the penultimate recommendation to the Provost.
Institution # 15	<p>Procedures in A&S are probably the most applicable to your question. Recommendations from the departmental faculty as a whole or a subset such as a personnel committee in a department (there is some variation from department to department) comes to the Dean of the Faculty with a recommendation of the chair or director. In the Dean's office, this is reviewed first by a six-member, elected Advisory Committee on Promotion, Retention, and Tenure (RPT) who make a written recommendation to the Dean. The Senior deans in the office also review and advise the dean. If the dean intends not to follow the recommendation of the RPT committee, he informs them of his/her reasons. The dean then makes his/her recommendation to the provost. There is no further committee review as a matter of course.</p>	n/a

Tenure survey	Question #3	
	What is your tenure rate in terms of percentage of faculty hired who are awarded tenure?	Given that precise data may not be available, what is your perception of your institution's tenure rate (e.g., high, low, average)?
Institution # 1	In terms of faculty (mostly junior but a sizeable number of senior faculty) who are hired with the prospect of tenure since 1990, 27% received tenure.	The 10 year average of tenure success for those nominated by their departments into the tenure process (see above) is 84%. Attrition occurs throughout the pre-tenure period, accelerating before/at the department nomination step.
Institution # 2	Our tenure rate is about 90% of those reviewed for tenure. however, we have a very thorough review at the 4th year. This is the time when clear and strong feedback is provided about the trajectory of the candidate for tenure. We like to say that there should be no surprises at the tenure review. Thus, this is the time when junior faculty make important choices about whether or not to stay at Bates.	n/a
Institution # 3	we don't generally release information concerning your #3.	n/a
Institution # 4	In 2005-6, the college denied tenure to three people. It hadnot denied tenure to anyone since 1994.	I would say that our tenure rate is high.
Institution # 5	Generally, a little over half those who are hired ultimately receive tenure. The actual percentage who receive a positive decision at the time of tenure is quite a bit higher, but some are not renewed at the time of the third-year review, others leave on their own for a variety of reasons before the tenure year, and a very small number, who see that they will not get tenure, decide not to come up for tenure but accept a terminal one-year appointment.	n/a
Institution # 6	We tenure at a rate that hovers in the low 90% range. We are very comfortable with that and feel that it reflects a very careful hiring process, multi-level mentoring of probationary faculty, and an institution that tends to inspire a high degree of faculty loyalty.	Retention overall is remarkably high at our institution.
Institution # 7	Our tenure rate is about 90%.	On the surface this appears high. But wehave a strong mentoring program for new faculty, and our pre-tenure review is a critical hurdle that provides very clear information regarding what a faculty member must do to achieve tenure. As a result, those who reach the tenure review are largely successful.
Institution # 8	Since 1993-94, 74% of those who stood for tenure were successful.	My perception is that this is about average for an institution of our kind--I will of course be interested in seeing what the rate is for the other institutions you surveyed.

Question # 3	What is your tenure rate in terms of percentage of faculty hired who are awarded tenure?	Given that precise data may not be available, what is your perception of your institution's tenure rate (e.g., high, low, average)?
Institution # 9	I am told that approximately 90% of faculty who apply for tenure are awarded tenure. Of course, that does not account for faculty who do not survive the third year review or who choose to leave the college for other reasons (which might include a sense that the chances for tenure do not look good) prior to the tenure year.	n/a
Institution # 10	Based on data from the 1990s, our rate of passage of tenure for those hired on tenure track is approximately 56%. However, it's important to keep in mind that this attrition rate also includes colleagues who choose to leave the college (for example, for positions at other institutions).	If you only take into account the rate of passage for faculty who come up for tenure, I would say our rate of passage is pretty high.
Institution # 11	about 85% since 1985. But lower rates pass the third year review- but marginally lower. The most important part of the entire process, in my view, is the hiring process and then the successful implementation of the hire. We've generally hired our first choice in almost every faculty hire for the last 20 years. Almost every hire.	n/a
Institution # 12	n/a	High
Institution # 13	IN LAST TEN YEARS, ABOUT 93 PER CENT	SOMEWHAT HIGH. HOWEVER, WE HAVE A COMPREHENSIVE THIRD YEAR REVIEW, ALONG WITH A LESS COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL REVIEW, FOR UNTENURED FACULTY. SEVERAL, UPON BEING NOTIFIED THAT THEY WRE NOT MAKING GOOD PROGRESS, VOLUNTARILY LEFT THE UNIVERSITY BEFORE THE TENURE DECISION DATE. MORE IMPORTANTLY, WE HAVE BEEN HIRING VERY WELL, ALMOST ALWAYS GETTING OUR FIRST CHOICE; AND WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO PROVIDE BETTER TEACHING LOADS (5 COURSES PER YEAR), SOME FIRST SUMMER SUPPORT (SECOND AND BEYOND IN TWO OF OUR FOUR COLLEGES()), AND BETTER LAB START UP PACKAGES. ALL COMBINE TO YIELD THE HIGH TENURE RATES.
Institution # 14	If we remove faculty who leave the university before being considered for tenure I can recall 4 in the last 5 years since I have been in the Provost's Office. We have had 15-20 faculty across the university considered each year so something like 1/15 or 1/20 who are considered for tenure and denied would in the right ballpark.	n/a
Institution # 15	We track this two ways. First the perctnage of any tenure-eligible cohort who receive tenure, since we have a very rigorous third-year, interim review, and second the perctnage of those who prepare a tenure dossier who receive tenure. About 60% of a cohort will receive tenure. About 85-90% of those coming up for tenure will receive tenure.	n/a

Tenure survey	Question # 4	
	What would you identify as the strengths of your institution's process?	What would you identify as the weaknesses of your institution's process?
Institution # 1	It is rigorous!	It is very long
Institution # 2	n/a	n/a
Institution # 3	<p>1) The staging of the decision from department to committee to the president allows a greater domain a factors to come into play at each level, which is a strength. 2) The fact that the members of the Committee are Division Directors who are appointed by the Provost/Dean is another factor that is both a strength and a weakness, the former because good people are appointed and the latter because there is probably less trust in the process overall as a result. 3) We haven't been successfully sued very often, which is not really a strength per se, but it does mean that we do a passable job of following our procedures, which seem largely to stand up to scrutiny. However, there can be 'compliance issues' at the departmental level; these are hard to fully eradicate. Overall, though, this is a plus.</p>	<p>1) The participation of the Provost/Dean at the Committee level means that he/she is fully informed as to all the intricacies of the case (a plus), but the time that takes is extraordinary (a minus). 2) A weakness of the procedure is that departments do not like to be overruled and can become quite disgruntled when it happens. This is less the case with the Committee, when the president does not follow their recommendation, as they have greater understanding of the complexities.</p>
Institution # 4	<p>Complex, time-consuming, and reasonably fair. People at each level take it seriously, but it is very difficult to reach a negative decision in mixed cases. We work hard at making good hires, and we put considerable weight on the third year review (two of ten candidates in the last two years received terminal contracts in the last two years).</p>	n/a
Institution # 5	<p>the university-wide committee has traditionally functioned well as a group and is well thought of on campus; good efforts to get information about both scholarship and teaching (e.g., we write to 80 of the candidate's students to seek letters); an overall thorough vetting, which includes a letter from the relevant associate dean that gives an overview of the case for the committee.</p>	<p>candidates still sometimes find the process and/or criteria for tenure opaque; lack of a good appeals process (currently, the only appeal is back to the committee itself); sometimes a lack of expertise on the committee to deal with questions about the scholarship (perhaps the chair of the department or an outside expert in the field should be invited to meet with the committee).</p>
Institution # 6	I do not see the basic infrastructure as in need of attention.	<p>The clearest gap, to my mind, is that we do not solicit any outside assessments of scholarship. I would very much like to change that (and hope to do so some time before I retire!) But two years of experience tells me that the process is handled with a very high degree of professionalism and care for both the candidate and the institution.</p>

Question # 4	What would you identify as the strengths of your institution's process?	What would you identify as the weaknesses of your institution's process?
Institution # 7	Faculty say they are very clear about the criteria for tenure and promotion and the review process. We have a very dedicated review committee that does an excellent job of reviewing review materials.	A continuing challenge is receiving good input from students. We have gone back and forth with quantitative and qualitative course evaluations and letters. Quantitative course evaluations provide general patterns, but lack the real insights that come from student letters. But the latter are often hard to get in sufficient quantities. We take student input very seriously.
Institution # 8	see second answer	The strengths and weaknesses come from the fact that we have a very open tenure process, in that the candidates see all of the written documents and who wrote the information (e.g. the external reviewers are identified). Candidates can respond to any part of their record. In addition to the letters written by Department Heads that capture the discussion of the meeting of the tenured members of the department, each senior member of a department is asked to submit an evaluation and recommendation, which again the candidates read before releasing to the committee. We have had some difficulty in getting external evaluations because faculty at other institutions want their authorship to be confidential. Some faculty find it difficult to write anything negative in the individual letters requested of each senior member of a department. Candidates appreciate the openness because they can respond to factual errors or to evaluations with which they disagree. The other negative is that the file is very thick, especially when one compares these files to tenure dossiers put together at research universities.
Institution # 9	I have yet to experience the process, but I think the fact that the committee works until a consensus is reached avoids the possibility for conflict between the faculty committee and the administration.	I have heard concerns expressed that the consensus evaluation letters from departments are not as helpful as they might be. We may need to do some department chair development work in order to better prepare chairs for the job of writing those letters.
Institution # 10	On the plus side, we have a strong system of faculty governance, as elected committees are responsible for making the most important decisions. The administration facilitates this decision-making process and the President can overturn the committee recommendation, but that happens rarely. As a result, I think the faculty has a pretty high degree of confidence in the system.	On the downside, I would say this is a very labor intensive process, which gives six highly-regarded colleagues teaching reductions and diminishes their presence in the classroom. Another side effect of the system is the anxiety that some junior faculty feel while going through the review process. Much of this is inevitable, but the anxiety often seems to center on the teaching evaluations, which students fill out. We've tweaked the forms over the years to clarify their purpose-they are not just instruments of surveillance-but their status in the review process is always a topic of discussion.
Institution # 11	n/a	Lingering young faculty perception that there are different standards for promotion and tenure from department to department or changing standards over time. The former is an issue that will never be able to be completely washed from the system (the nature of young faculty anxiety) but we work on this in a variety of ways every year. The latter is the nature of higher education. It's a topic I could talk about for an extended period of time.

Question #4	What would you identify as the strengths of your institution's process?	What would you identify as the weaknesses of your institution's process?
Institution # 12	the absence of a departmental review supports interdisciplinary research.	there is no opportunity for faculty member to respond to a negative APT decision before that decision goes to the President. The candidate appeals directly to the President.
Institution # 13	EMINENTLY FAIR, THOROUGH, AND COMPREHENSIVE	A LACK OF "HARD NOSED" RIGOR AT THE DEPARTMENT AND COLLEGE LEVEL ON OCCASIONS.
Institution # 14	I think departments and deans would tell you that they view the autonomy they have in doing this as a strength but I'm not sure the Provost's Office would. In general I would say that a strength is that there are not a lot of last minute surprises. If we have done a good job hiring and mentoring and giving feedback with annual reviews then we should not end up with faculty who are surprised by the outcome.	The variability in what is presented to the Provost by the different schools has been viewed as a weakness and we will work to change that this year.
Institution # 15	rigorous, transparent, broadly consultative, and generally fair .	time-consuming, labor intensive