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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
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**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)
Constructing 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
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.