

CRTP Report

Appendix B. Bucknell Faculty Survey: Comments

In the spring of 2008, a survey was administered online to Bucknell faculty, with the goal of identifying underlying perceptions of and experiences with the tenure system at Bucknell. The survey consisted of 43 forced choice questions followed by a broad, open-ended question. In this appendix we present the responses to the open-ended question:

Is there anything that you think is important for the committee to address that was not included in this survey?

Responses:

- The URC should give the candidates feedback regarding their review just like committees that review grant applications do so that the candidate under evaluation knows specifically what the URC members rated positively or negatively. The information could be anonymous. This would help to demystify the URC review process and could lead to less hostility when URC decisions differ from DRC decisions.
- 1. Departments differ radically in the degree to which they offer mentorship in the tenure and promotion process. Some seem to regard mentoring junior faculty as “cheating” somehow. Mentoring needs to be built in and supported at all levels. The current mentoring system is no more than nominal in many cases. 2?. [A] faculty member was denied tenure by the URC, against the strong recommendation of the DRC, on grounds of inadequate scholarship. [This person was] offered positions at two of the highest-ranked departments in [the] field. Something is wrong here. 3. Other cases, too, suggest serious mismatch between the URC’s expectations and those of DRCs. This results in destructive and demoralizing surprise outcomes.
- The survey questions appear to assess primarily the relative weight given to teaching, scholarship, and service, with the exception of a couple questions about prestige of publications. My concern has less to do with the weighting of these categories than in how they are evaluated and thus how rewards and cautions are offered on the way to tenure. Under the current system, where the criteria of evaluation are vague (platitudes about excellence), it is difficult to tailor a career trajectory to meet research or teaching goals. Should I aim for the best journals in my field, or will the committee appreciate quantity or be able to evaluate quality itself? What incentives are there to undertake longer term projects like books? Should I turn down certain types of projects, or what criteria should I use to evaluate how they will be perceived? If these criteria are clearer at the departmental level, is there any guarantee that the URC will apply the same standards?

With regard to teaching, if I have high course evaluations, am I free to turn my attention to scholarship? What rewards are there for taking additional risks (new courses, new methods) if I’m receiving positive feedback on what I’m already doing in class? And what are “high” or “satisfactory” marks on teaching? How much time is it worth to try to “improve” from a 3.8 to 4.0 or 4.3? How can a document the effort, however much time is spent or however “effective” that effort? To me, there is an obvious inequity in the evaluation of teaching and scholarship given that producing quality scholarship demands, regardless of inherent

skill, lots of time while success in the classroom can be achieved by some with greater ease (personal flair, prior experience, perceived appeal of subject matter) or through shortcut methods like raising grades. I would like to recommend that the committee read the recently published report by the Modern Language Association on evaluating scholarship for tenure and promotion, which can be found at: http://www.mla.org/tenure_promotion

- I believe that the survey the quantitative part of the survey is based on a flawed assumption. I think that there should be more flexibility built into the system so that the individual contributions of faculty members can be recognized and the contributions of a faculty member in the various categories might vary over the course of career or dependent upon the type of program or department in which they work. Second, there also seems to be an assumption that all DRCs provide evaluative or development reports. There are some that either function purely as advocates and some where neither developmental nor evaluative information is provided. A further standardization of procedures across departments might help this. It might also be helpful to hold a workshop with chairs and/or senior members of departments about what information is expected in a DRC document. There are areas of the Faculty Handbook where the language needs to be tightened up in order to avoid ambiguities about process. The timetable for reviews also needs to be addressed. Bucknell is in a small minority of schools that gets this entire process done by mid-December. Given that there are expectations from the President that the Provost and even the Deans will help with fundraising, this makes the schedule we currently have untenable. On the other hand, because of the fact that some departments do not do evaluative or developmental reviews, I think it is imperative that all reviews 2, 4, and 6 are reviewed by the URC.
- Teaching, Research and Service expectations differ remarkably from dept to dept. Bucknell is a VERY different place, depending upon where you work. If we can't 'even the playing field', can we at least make it more transparent and clear, that tenure and promotion standards are not equitable?
- The quality of performance in research among untenured faculty has increased significantly in research years – this, not the URC or administration, seems to have the greatest impact on standards for retention and tenure.
- No – thanks for your good work!
- Expectations for classroom performance have increased dramatically over the past 15 years. This distorted, and continues to distort, the balance between teaching and scholarship, it has impacted morale, and undermined service to the university. It has also caused confusion about tenure expectations; tenure-track faculty members consider that they cannot meet both classroom and scholarship expectations with their limited time available and are therefore left to guess about which expectations to leave less than fully met and by how much. We waited a decade too long to move to a 3-2 course load. Now recognizing how long such a process takes us, we should begin immediately the process of moving to a 2-2 load for faculty.
- Unfortunately, department (in some cases) and college ? politics have polluted the tenure and promotion system. The URC, with a Provost in place, is the shining star; it is an

independent body that should be making unbiased decisions. It is also important that the URC is somewhat monitored by CAFT. More authority should not be shifted to the DRC. Expand the size of the URC if need be.

- You should NOT use my response to the question about how I think teaching, scholarship, and service are currently weighed FOR PROMOTION – I do not know the answer to this question; you should have allowed someone to opt out of the question, as you did on earlier questions.

It should not be possible for someone to get a very good review at the second year and then be denied retention at the fourth year. The second- and fourth-year reviews should be considered developmental: a person should only be denied retention if they have had two below average reviews in a row; otherwise, they should be given the opportunity to improve in the next two years. The URC has been establishing its own standards and requirements in the past couple of years instead of using the standards and requirements established by departments and programs in their procedural documents (which have been reviewed approved by CAFT and the Provost's Office). This is entirely unfair and unethical.

- Quality of the methods available to measure teaching for the purposes of retention, promotion or tenure.
- Our teaching evaluations are poorly designed. Certain questions are ambiguous (“I would recommend this professor.” Are we asking whether the student got a good grade? Are we asking if the student liked the teacher? Are we asking if the student learned a lot? Are we asking if the work load was heavy? Written comments indicate that this question measures all these things.) We need to have other ways of evaluating teaching, including colleagues' feedback for example. As an experienced faculty member, I have learned that students are unable to evaluate certain things (some are obvious: faculty competence, for example). Some things are not so obvious: if a professor omits difficult material and makes exams easier, students will give the professor a higher clarity rating. Some things are not measured at all: did the professor adhere to the syllabus? did the professor give a final exam or final paper? did the professor grade exams/papers promptly? Yet these things are part of being an excellent teacher. In addition, we need to be very clear that we expect higher evaluations in smaller classes, and we will be unsurprised by somewhat lower evaluations in required courses, large courses, 8:00 am classes, etc. Finally, we need to reward colleagues who teach classes that no one else will teach—even if the students are unhappy (assuming, of course, that the colleague does an adequate job). Otherwise, people will stop teaching undesirable classes and this is problematic for many departments.
- The required questions on teaching evaluations seem designed to measure student happiness rather than student learning. We need better questions.
- Too much attention is paid to numbers on teaching evals, which often reflect professor personality, not what the students have learned. Also variation doesn't only occur between disciplines, but between classes in the same department. Some topics are harder to sell to students. This doesn't make the professor a worse teacher. Others lend themselves to showing and discussing films. The fact that students enjoy this doesn't make the professor a better

teacher.

- URC is critical body for averting department and college politics in engineering from making or breaking tenure and promotion decisions. Define tenure and promotion requirements and have impartial groups review faculty; groups without conflict of interest. Move to DRC of professors outside the candidate's department but close to the field; one in-department member for scholarship evaluation. Ensure all faculty in college or program have equal opportunity to succeed; need a body to oversee not greater than 5 courses are assigned except in rare unavoidable situations.

- something besides student evaluations should be in place for the teaching component

- Everyone on campus is fond of describing the tenure process as “transparent.” This is patently false. It is completely opaque, with junior faculty relying on rumors and hearsay to determine what is valued and even what procedures are. I say this as someone who has had uneventful, positive reviews.

Also, to clarify, I think the DRC should, generally, make the decision about tenure; however, we all know there are cases when departments are dysfunctional, and the URC should serve to protect faculty from this dysfunction. The URC, comprised of elected representatives of the faculty, should be the ultimate deciding body. The president has no business overriding the URC—this could only create antagonism between the president and the faculty.

- I strongly believe the URC should have the final word, and no single individual. Scholarship is very hard to assess, but I think we can ask for some additional objective numbers, such as citation counts, in addition to the subjective assessment of reviewers. By their nature, reviews are going to be positive (how many outside reviewers will agree to write a negative letter). Also, we need to let faculty know that high teaching ratings are NOT the be-all and end-all, and in some cases can indicate rigor. I think grade distributions should be available in the dossier, and the standard evaluation be changed to include items self-assessing amount of learning. Even if a professor isn't liked so well, if the students say they learned a great deal, then that should be our most important item!

- These questions seem too subjective to really provide useful information.

- 1) I said the President should have the power, but that is contingent on some pretty clear guidelines about procedure and and some sort of final, veto-proof appeal (perhaps by an alternate URC). Hopefully this would only be used once every 10-20 years. 2) As to including teaching and journal prestige information in DRC documents, I think that if those criteria ARE being applied (which is not clear now) than the information SHOULD be published. Otherwise its a shell game for junior faculty. At the same time, I think a true mission of promoting scholarship at Bucknell would include some substantial leeway for a committee and URC to assess someone's work and find that it is worthy of tenure even if it is not “popular” in top journals. I personally think that there is a narrowing and risk-aversion in much of the research presented in my fields' (social sciences) top journals. If rankings are based on citation patterns, I would like to know if there is a convergence over time in citations to a few journals. I don't know, but I have the feeling that there is more and more ritualistic citation.

With more transparency of reputation scores and more pressure to gain reputation, the effect is to unfairly increase the gap in the reputation rankings between top journals and all the rest. We know that many of the top cited articles in social science were often rejected many times before being accepted, and not always into top journals.

- As with all surveys, it was difficult to select one specific answer when there are so many factors that go into tenure and promotion. Many of my answers were based on personal experience, perception, and junior faculty paranoia in an ever-changing administrative climate.

The most challenging factor in tenure pursuit in general (and I would imagine this is true in many disciplines) is being in a specialized field where well intended people are making critical decisions on a body of work they might have little experience with. I question who should really influence tenure and promotion—the URC who might not fully comprehend a particular line of research or the DRC—who is more in tune with the nature of scholarship in their field... as someone in the middle of the tenure process, I have been frustrated and concerned by the flux in administration, e.g. no permanent provost, an interim dean and the mixed messages/policies coming from upper administrative offices. thank you for collecting input through this survey. best of luck in finding the most agreeable means of retaining and promoting excellent faculty.

- I think that the entire system of student “evaluation” needs to be altered radically (beginning with calling it what it is, a survey of students’ opinions, or questionnaires). I also think that the statement concerning whether efficient DRCs result in URC agreement might have as a follow-up the converse, namely, “If the URC is doing its job properly then its decisions should rarely deviate from those of the DRC”.

- It is so difficult to judge quality of teaching across disciplines. We need to either accept that students will judge different courses differently and not hold that against the faculty member being reviewed or find better ways of evaluating teaching (peer review, longitudinal student success data, etc.)

Also - different faculty bring different strengths to their jobs. We need minimum standards for tenure, but is it possible to think someone who is an excellent teacher but OK scholar is less valuable than someone who is an excellent scholar but only OK teacher.

- The recent complaints by the President’s office that he has an inadequate role in the retention/tenure/promotion process is based on a misunderstanding of the Bucknell process and its history.

- I think that teaching at Bucknell is currently assessed too much on the basis of student evaluations alone. While student evaluations are important indicators of a teacher’s success, they should not be weighted as heavily as they currently are, because too often teachers who give relatively high grades and who are witty, charismatic, or otherwise “fun” are popular and receive high student scores whether or not they are good teachers in terms of being rigorous and innovative.

- Rather than simply qualitative feedback, which is certainly useful, the candidates should

receive quantitative feedback on their perceived performance in the 3 areas and their overall grade/score as well as a comparison to what is expected and university averages.

- Our current process comes close to simply equating the quality of teaching with scores on student evaluations. This is because of an underlying assumption that numbers are more objective and fair than qualitative information. We allow this assumption to justify our practice not because we are confident that the assumption is correct, but because we fear the consequences of questioning it. However, both the over-reliance on student evaluations and the assumption of objectivity are profoundly flawed. We need a more nuanced, colleague-based system that uses student responses as (only) one starting point into the quality of teaching rather than a summative score. We must demand that the sources of input on teaching quality be subject to as much scrutiny as the evidence they purport to produce.
- I think that the question about the purpose of the review (evaluative or developmental) is a bit problematic. Rather than have one review system serve both purposes, I believe another option might be to create a developmental process that is separate from the evaluative one. Research in this area indicates that a process that is evaluative will be less effective in improving performance because individuals under review will hide their problems from the reviewers rather than identify and address them.
- I think it is very difficult for an untenured person to give percentages for the questions about full professors; once I get tenure, then I'll concern myself more with the professor criteria.
- The course evaluations forms need to be entirely redesigned. The rating aspect of the current form is unappropriated and does not help to properly evaluate quality of instruction.
- Consistent standards does not mean equal standards. The standards should vary by discipline but be uniformly applied. Recent URC decisions that have overturned DRC recommendations have been arbitrary and unpredictable. Untenured faculty need to be confident that standards are applied fairly, even if expectations are high. The current environment in the natural sciences will lead to the departure of good people who, unsure of the URC standards, will seek a more predictable environment. I am not sympathetic to URC complaints about workload - they appear to be making more work for themselves by ignoring DRC recommendations. URCs should only overturn DRC recommendations when it appears that the DRC has not faithfully applied the standards spelled out in their DRC document or in the Faculty Handbook. It is unclear to me what standards the URC has been using in several recent decisions.
- URC standards could be more clearly communicated in written materials.
- evaluate some specific cases of tenure denials (so that the untenured know why and how)
- Do student evaluations provide the primary (or only) data for evaluation of teaching? Should they?
Should advising count as part of teaching? If so, how should that be evaluated?

- Morale among untenured faculty is abysmal at Bucknell, largely due to a perception of capriciousnesses and subjectivity in the review process. The process is manipulative and degrading as it currently stands, largely due to a fixation on suspect teaching evaluations whose statistical validity has never been established. For once, why can't we see a review that says "You're doing a good job. Keep it up and you'll get tenure"? Making us paranoid about a 3.8 vs. a 4.0 is not fair, and harmful to our health.

Also, the URC is so far out of line in recent years as to take my breath away. I know that they have a big and difficult job, but they have destroyed careers, seemingly at whim, and that is not cool. Departments should be trusted to judge the quality of work unless there are signs of egregious conflicts of interest.

- Questions not included:

1) If the DRC/PRCs are to serve an exclusive or almost exclusively "evaluative" role, how and who should be providing greater developmental support? 2) What perceptions explain the delay many "senior" faculty (very advanced associates) experience before going up for full professor? 3) Why do some departments allow associate profs to participate in promotion to full reviews and others do not? 4) How have the new-ish policies on delaying the tenure review affected tenure/promotion rates? specifically, the creation of the zero-year, the ability to turn the clock off during untenured leave and childbearing/rearing leaves? Has that leveled the playing field? 5) What other factors do faculty perceive to affect the tenure/promotion process at Bucknell? 6) What are the inequalities that faculty (some) perceive in standards for tenure and why? Perhaps more open-ended questions might have elicited some unexpected but valuable answers to this survey.

- Yes, the way data is collected during reviews in different departments should be uniform. For example, there should be a standard letter sent by all departments to students seeking feedback on faculty up for review. There should also be a set standard for how many students are asked for such feedback and how they are selected. From what I know, the letters sent to students are very different in different departments and in some departments (but not all) faculty are shown the letter and asked for feedback on it before it is sent. Also, in some departments, all students in certain classes are contacted, in others it is a random selection, and in some departments the faculty member is permitted to request that a handful of students not be contacted, whereas in others this is not an option at all. The result of these differences is that the URC is seeing student feedback from very different samples.

- Two related points. First, there is a rumor around campus that untenured faculty are "very concerned and worried" that research expectations are on the rise. Informal conversations with untenured faculty consistently show this to be false. A more startling and inconvenient judgment is out there: that associate professors who have been here for a while and have been promoted with moderate research records are "threatened" by a new generation of assistant professors who value teaching and research equally and who do not subscribe to the myth that being a productive scholar means that you can't be a good teacher. There is a lot of anecdotal evidence that associate professors who say that assistant professors are concerned and worried are actually themselves concerned and worried that colleagues who are junior may end up being more productive. I have not heard a single comment from another assistant professor to the effect that he/she is worried about scholarship. If anything, people are worried about

adapting their teaching to our consumer-based system of evaluating classroom performance. It is likely that there will be some of sort of “generational” split in evidence sometime in the next decade.

Secondly, standards for tenure and promotion are likely influenced by national trends. For better or worse, recently minted Ph.D.’s (for the past 10-15 years) have higher publication expectations than earlier cohorts. This is a question of academic culture. In certain fields, the disproportion of job candidates to jobs has led to a selection effect whereby more productive people are getting hired. Liberal arts colleges and universities experience the effects of this general trend. Expectations are not just changing at Bucknell.

- I found these questions difficult to answer since there is a lot of “grey area” in the tenure/promotion process that can’t be captured in this kind of a survey. Focus groups might be more productive.
- Evaluation of spouses with shared positions
- I think Bucknell should strive to become more competitive with the leading liberal arts universities in the USA, and raising the standards/requirements for scholarship would be necessary to that end.
- Increase in the overall workload of untenured faculty as a result of increasing scholarship expectations without a corresponding reduction in other standards.
- for clarification of tenure/promotion procedure: specification of #papers etc. seems too inflexible to different needs of different departments for system questions: I like to keep system of DRC/PRC & URC for tenure, question is more how much they make decision and for tenure & promotion problems are not due to system but to for example set of evaluation questions and the lack of a more standardized way of alternative criteria problems of fairness I see due to differences in courses (required, etc.) and gender and racial issues (which I believe are very difficult to eliminate) but I do not think that the system itself needs a change
- Weight of student evaluations in assessing teaching. Some depts. and URC seem to rely exclusively on student evals. with no consideration given to syllabi, difficulty of course, aims of course, etc. As long as you get high enough evals., no one cares what you are actually doing with time in the classroom or requiring out of the classroom.
- While providing faculty with a number of publications required for tenure or promotion is helpful, difficulties can arise when sub-specialities within a department have dramatically different expectations for what constitutes a “publishable unit”. Perhaps the individual being reviewed should be asked to provide examples of the number of publications expected for tenure or promotion at other institutions, both liberal arts and research one, to help put the expectations at Bucknell in perspective. Maybe it would be more fitting for the expected publication number to be individualized based on plugging the information gathered from other institutions into a DRC-approved formula.

The level of variation between sub-specialities in a department can make it difficult for even

the DRC to evaluate scholarship. I, therefore, strongly feel that the URC should not attempt to critically evaluate scholarship, but should make every effort to assess whether the DRC conducted their evaluation in a fair and reasonable manner.

- I have a difficult time seeing how moving to a 5 course load could reasonably increase scholarship expectations. It seems more reasonable that this fairly small amount of extra time would be spent interacting with students.
- Teaching is not defined in this survey. The assumption is that all courses are equal. There are no questions that assess the amount of time (contact hours, mentoring, etc.) one is required to spend teaching in comparison to others either within or across departments. In other words, treating courses equally merely by the credit number is not fair to those who have higher requirements for contact time and mentoring even though the credit given to the student is the same.
- Trust in the system is most important. Trust is earned over time and the recent rapid turnover in the administration provides less confidence in the consistency of evaluations over time. The current system took a long time to earn the respect of the faculty and the current “fear” is likely related to the unpredictability caused by recent changes. Vocal support of the current system by those employing it would go a long way toward reducing angst, even if change is desired. Getting to understand the major value of our current system (developmental) over other models should be required prior to making changes based on perceptions of more rigorous evaluative systems.
- Of course there are explanations that I could offer with each of these questions. I will, however, limit my comments to some of what I see are two central points. First, We need standards articulated at the department level for tenure. What we come up with may differ from department to department, but whatever they are should be clear. Also, in regard to teaching, we should all have the same evaluations. A few questions can differ, as to labs etc, but how can the URC honestly claim a certain standard for teaching for the university when departments clearly do not agree with each other on what constitutes good teaching (or how to evaluate it)?

Related to this point, I think we need to have a serious discussion about teaching and scholarship. We need to get beyond the false dichotomy that is often presented on this campus. That is, those who excel at scholarship do not put enough effort into teaching, or are not as good at teaching as those who focus most of their time on teaching. I know I am best in the classroom when I am discussing things I have researched. Furthermore, I find that the vast majority of people who claim a deep devotion to teaching are actually making excuses as to why they do not publish. The notion of what tenure should mean has been lost. It is supposed to be about promoting and protecting free speech. Instead it gets wielded as club to frighten some, if they chose to be frightened. What I am driving at here is that the process needs to be clear. That said, I think for most people here tenure is relatively easy to get. Clearer standards would make for easier reviews, and ground expectations. Second, we need to discuss the culture of the Bucknell student. We need to make a collective and principled stand against the claim students continually espouse that they work hard and play hard. A best twenty-five percent fit this mold. Mostly, they play hard and benefit from grade

inflation.

- There is not, and should not be, a % basis for awarding tenure. Each candidate must do well in each of the areas (scholarship, teaching and service). To allow tenure at Bucknell on the basis of being “good enough” in one area to compensate for being “poor” in another is not a good idea.

We need to address the schedule of reviews to accommodate the increased number of junior faculty without, literally, killing the URC members (especially the administrative members of the committee who serve, usually, longer than 3 years). We should not shift 2nd and 4th year reviews to departments until such time as departmental reviews are more consistent. The 2nd and 4th year reviews, done from a University point of view, will be critical if we are to have a process that nurtures and ensure that those with a commitment to the University get the best feedback possible.

- I think Bucknell should consider peer evaluation of teaching performance in addition to student evaluation.
- Using student evaluations as the only means of assessing teaching stifles innovation and faculty growth. The faculty is on record as opposing it, yet the administration finds it convenient and the faculty foolishly accepts.
- unfairness of system to candidates. candidates should be present to answer make charges raised against them by those opposing their tenure
- Some of your questions are the wrong ones to be asking. “Should expectations for scholarship increase” etc. cannot be answered if you believe as I do that the expectations vary so much across departments already that to answer as stated would be to give a misleading answer. The publication threshold in some departments seems to be so low as to be embarrassing. I believe Bucknell should become a more scholarly-oriented institution, start calling its faculty “scholar-teachers,” but not because of the move to a 5-course load. There is altogether too much emphasis placed on teaching for retention, tenure, and especially promotion, especially because “excellence” in teaching is altogether nebulously defined.
- Clearer instructions for certain issues for departments. For example, rules for minority reports should be clearer in URC procedures. If certain CAFT rulings in fact actually have bearings on ongoing reviews, then those rulings should also be included in procedures.
- Some of the answers above are not really correct. There should be many possible weightings for tenure or promotion success; any cookie cutter model is a bad idea. Also: clarity of expectations, faculty consensus on those expectations, and real effort to create a sustainable workload are important. The main thing we need is administrators (and ourselves) willing to treat faculty time as a budgetable, finite resource as opposed to some infinite pool we don’t have to think about. And, of course, evaluation of teaching that does not reward grade inflation and light workloads should be on the table.

- Teaching Loads sometimes differ dramatically within the same department and are not noted. This is absolutely terrible. Also what is the point of the external review by experts? Why not just look at the ratings of the journals people publish in? That may not work in certain departments in which people don't publish in journals. In those cases perhaps you need external reviewers. But if a person publishes primarily in journals, just look at journal quality ratings.
- A few disjointed thoughts about the operation of DRCs, the URC and the involvement of administration in the P&T process. In my mind (any many others, both internal and external), Bucknell is primarily a teaching oriented university. By its actions, Bucknell (and the URC) seems to be behaving more like an aspiring new research university. It is an interesting situation among universities and PP&T reviews in general. Many schools are increasingly demanding that their faculty publish x articles in top tier journals. In any field, there seems to be 2-5 "top tier" journals. Some of these journals are quarterlies. When combined, the number of articles published by "top tier" journals each year is probably in the range of 100-200. Half of these publishing opportunities are already consumed by the veterans of the field. This leaves 50-100 publishing opportunities for thousands of junior faculty across the country. If each university demands more than one article in these journals, that leaves room for 25-50 faculty to publish in the field's most respected journal each year. Specifying publishing requirements at this level is a losing proposition for everyone. While some level of expectation needs to be clearly communicated to junior faculty (I am unaware of any such clear communication at Bucknell), it is also dangerous to quantify expectations too precisely. I am advocating a return to a P&T system where teaching is more highly weighted than research. An increased emphasis on teaching, however, brings inherent difficulties with faculty "pandering" to students for better evals (usually in the form of higher grades). While I don't have a suggestion for an alternate system, I don't think that end of the semester evals are taken seriously by the students, yet, they are taken extremely seriously by DRCs and the URC. At the same time, there are many claims of grade deflation over the years. But since over these same years, Bucknell has also increased its entry requirements, thus confounding a meaningful study of grade deflation. Plotting grades over time does not tell the complete picture. My impressions over the way that the 5 course load was presented to the faculty is that it would be to provide additional time to interact with students outside of the classroom and to enhance the educational experience. I suspect, however, that a reduced course load will directly translated into an increased expectation for scholarship in top tier journals. This is an unfortunate result that I suspect was driven by our failed provost. Should the teaching load be reduced even further, will we begin to behave more like public research universities? Concerning P&T procedures, there have been several past incidents where the URC has deviated in practice from its written guidelines for its behavior and functioning. This disparity between what is shared with candidates (standards, procedures, quantity of things, etc) and the actual behavior of the URC needs to be re-aligned so that clear expectations and procedures are expressed to candidates well ahead of their reviews. Concerning new hires, I believe that each new hire that we bring in should be expected to perform better than those who are already here. Anything less results in stagnation. Ever increasing demands will help drive things forward and increase the prestige of the university. However, this is also at odds with my previous discussion of the balance of teaching and research and increasing expectations for both. Some universities allow faculty to choose their own weightings of teaching and research. Essentially, at the beginning of each review period, each faculty member is allowed to

allocate their own distribution of weights among teaching, research, and service. At the end of this same review period, the faculty member is evaluated according to the weightings that they themselves chose. These relative weightings can then be adjusted at the beginning of each new review period, should the faculty desire to do so. This allows each faculty to excel where they are best equipped and may be a potential mechanism for Bucknell to explore. Yes, this also has the potential to affect accreditation issues. Moving on, I can't think of a reason why the President or the Provost would NEED to override the decision of the URC and DRC (assuming that the URC and DRC agree). What information does the President or Provost have that the URC and DRC do not? I'm not sure that this power is a good thing for the administration. Leaving this decision power with the respective RCs would indicate that the senior administration trusts in the process and the people that represent the process. Also, related to the current Merit Review System, the economics of this system in its current form are inequitable when comparing un-tenured and tenured faculty, as well as faculty in different departments. The fixed dollar allocation per merit point for tenured faculty leads to high levels of salary compression since junior faculty receive a % of their base pay as raises. The fixed dollar allocation also gives disparate percentages raises to faculty in different departments. When two faculty in different departments receive merit raises based on equal merit scores, there is too much potential for one faculty member to receive a much smaller percentage raise than the other faculty member ? leading to new forms of salary compression. A 5% raise for everyone should be a 5% raise for everyone, not 2% for some and 7% for others. This is, however, probably beyond the scope of the current survey. It seems that every few years, we need to make ?adjustments? and ?fixes? as a result of compression issues. I can think of no better evidence of a broken system.

- Good survey ... I appreciate the attention to the significant problems of communicating standards to candidates, and of review goals (development, etc.).
- Two things occurred to me as I was filling in this survey:
 - 1) Although, personally, I have not altered my teaching / grading to improve student evaluations, I do believe that there is a direct correlation. Moreover, there is, I believe, widespread concern among junior faculty that student evaluations have too much influence over tenure decisions (with obvious consequences).
 - 2) I answered that the DRC should make the critical decision about whether someone in their department is retained, but this only holds if standards across departments are set in place and upheld. I suppose what I really think is that DRC recommendations should only very rarely be overturned, but the URC should certainly ensure that standards are upheld across the university. Perhaps that is exactly how it is now.
- While there is ambiguity around exact criteria for retention and tenure, this is better than having rigidly specified targets (numbers of pubs., numeric teaching ratings, etc.)
- The URC should respond to questions regarding a rejection of a tenure/promotion?.
- 1) How individuals are identified for promotion – more guidance and encouragement needed from dean, perhaps at time of merit reviews? 2) accountability of URC – needs to report to faculty and be held accountable for its practices over time. It is far too long since they updated their communications to faculty.

- For the question, “how heavily should teaching/scholarship/service be weighed in deciding whether someone should be promoted to full professor”: I left it blank; thought it was somewhat ill-posed. To me, such a promotion should be granted if one excels in any one of these three areas (eg, writes several books, serves on the URC and other time-consuming committees year after year, wins teaching awards, etc). For the question, “if the DRCs are doing their job, should the URC’s decision diverge from that of the DRC in terms of granting tenure...”, it is my firmly held belief, based on my own experience and the experience of half a dozen close friends in different departments (as they related it to me), that the DRCs are NOT doing their job. So the question, as put on this survey, “IF the DRCs are doing their job...” does not really address the problem, which is, in my view, “ARE the DRCs doing their job...”
- This survey is asking questions with the assumption that the DRC is working towards helping the candidate get tenure. This is not always the case in the College of Engineering. The COE is a political nightmare and as a result is not functioning efficiently or in an unbiased manner. We NEED the URC and a PROVOST in on the review process. This will allow an impartial and unbiased system to help candidates get properly and fairly reviewed for tenure and promotion.
- Yes. The concept of “scholarship” needs to be expanded to include more than “publications” in peer-reviewed venues. There are many other “significant” contributions that have positive public impact, which faculty now and in the future will engage in. These may have an importance in the national, public arena that are far beyond that of several peer-reviewed published articles or even a book or two, which only a handful of people ever read. A 21st C. academic community must expand its concept of what constitutes “scholarship” to include public intellectual commitments, programs, and projects by its faculty. The same is true of the concept of “service,” which must include major permanent contributions to the university curricular and co-curricular programs. This type of service is rarely rewarded, because it does not fit the narrow interpretation of Bucknell’s model of service.
- Some means in addition to student evaluations must be used to evaluate teaching. Yearly classroom observation by other faculty would be my choice. Service as dept/prog chair (or other outstanding service) should be acceptable in lieu of some scholarship in promotion decisions.
- student evaluations
- Issue of protecting faculty primacy in decision making about retention, tenure, and promotion
- As a untenured faculty I have concerns about the uniformity of the expectations for tenure with regard to my department chair, dean, provost and president of the university. I am being told I need 1 publication from my dean while others tell me I should have 3 - 5 peer reviewed publications. Also, several of our tenured faculty have received tenure without having a publication as a Bucknell faculty. They literally used their dissertation publications as their output for scholarship. Several faculty have also used the untenured leave to join another lab for a year and conduct research with another PI. Should this count as scholarship towards tenure, since the faculty member is using the resources and ideas of another established

researcher? I have done a post-doc, should I be able to use the publications from my post-doc towards tenure? Another factor complicating this issue, in the engineering and sciences, is the availability of lab space and start up funds. Many in engineering are not given any lab space and expected to conduct experiments for their scholarship. Further, start up packages are only about 18 K. To put this in context, a research heavy institution will provide a new faculty member anywhere from 500 K to 1 Million dollars to start up their research. Now we do not have the same research expectation as a research institution but 18 K cannot buy most new faculty the equipment or supplies they need to conduct research at a level that can get the faculty member a peer reviewed publication. Even chemistry provides their new faculty with start up packages between 60 K and 100 K. If the university is going to expect more output from faculty (for tenure) then they need to hold the faculty accountable but also provide the new faculty with the resources to conduct their research. Also, the untenured faculty leave and tenured faculty sabbaticals should not just be granted so a faculty member can have a paid vacation. The university should demand the faculty members be active in research to get a sabbatical.

- The last question surveys an impression as URC work is confidential—conjecture abounds. Regarding tenure and review decisions, my own impression and experience as candidate and as DRC reviewer (several times) is that the URC is where the decision is made, and the URC too easily disregards the DRC's well-informed decision. Too often they second-guess and consequently the DRCs have to spend too much time trying to strike the right tone that won't push URC buttons to lash out. URC members are overworked, but at least now they take a course release. I could not answer the question regarding the proper weights to T/R/S in making decisions because each candidate brings his or her own strengths and accomplishments to the dossier. There ought to be room at the university for diversity of accomplishment and excellence, not a cookie cutter approach. On the other hand, how can one be specific about tenure expectations and still allow for the diverse possibilities for excellence? Thank you for allowing this brief statement.
- What counts as an acceptable publications? This can differ wildly from department to department. (I expect that). I'd like clearer guidance from my own department.
- the merit system: standards, methods, equity.
- Standards for scholarship should vary across departments because standards vary across disciplines and some departments may be able to recruit more highly talented scholars than others.
- The university should be better at promoting policies that integrate teaching and scholarship. Right now, there is little incentive to do this well.
- Evaluate teaching using tools other than only student surveys and comments. Teaching standards should not be defined in terms of average course evaluation numbers. Untenured faculty should be able to voice their views and contribute to the department and college in their own way without so much pressure to conform. With diversity, independent thoughts, and varying opinions comes a higher quality and more meaningful academic environment.

- 1. A very important issue is missing: “If the DRCs/PRCs are doing their job, the URC’s decision to deny retention or tenure someone should rarely diverge from the DRC/PRC decision.” This is an especially important issue since DRCs and PRCs have no recourse in the event of their decisions being overturned. Nor, it seems, are DRCs/PRCs “entitled” to an explanation for the reversal of their decision. 2. Unfortunately, moreover, this survey does not allow for the differences between the DRC, URC, and administration in what constitutes “tenurable,” leaving the candidate (and departments) in an untenable situation. Furthermore, the assignment of percentages to weight consideration cannot address the substantive issues raised above. This issue needs to be resolved; otherwise the process is, in my estimation, illegitimate. 3. Hopefully this CRTP process will proceed from this survey to a serious critical examination and revision of a broken process of reviewing candidates for tenure and promotion. 4. In the final analysis, the tenure and promotion standards are unclear and inconsistent. I will be more than happy to discuss these matters with the committee.
- DRC as the appropriate body to make critical decision on tenure presumes that the Department is functional. For those that are not, URC is more appropriate. Performance reviews of untenured faculty could be completed bi-annually as opposed to DRC/URC reviews.
- 1. I think that faculty promotions should be based on exceptional performance at least in one of the three areas - teaching, scholarship, and service - rather than balanced between the three. This would enable faculty to be promoted on the basis of excellence in the area which they have made the greatest contribution to the university. 2. The URC - and BU faculty in general - need to begin to think about the full dimensions of their so-called desire for increased diversity?. Students evaluate faculty based on their gender, race and other characteristics? Students bring their racial biases with them to campus and their biases affect their evaluation of faculty of color. URC members also need to be aware that having a diverse faculty will also mean that they are unlikely to adopt the perspectives of the dominant culture.
- 1. Candidates have rights (e.g. CAFT appeals) and appropriately so. But DRCs have no rights; they cannot appeal actions by a candidate and/or the URC. That seems unfair.
 2. The URC seems to be an autonomous body with little to no accountability. Certainly, specific decisions about retention/tenure need not be publicized. But the URC rarely responds to inquiries that it receives from DRCs about its procedures, deliberations, and decisions. 3. Junior faculty members have told me that during the annual URC information/open forum, the URC chair/chairs mention irregularities or ambiguities in URC procedures or criteria (i.e., the “specs” or instructions in the documents that the URC distributes to candidates.) Apparently, however, the URC has not addressed, much less solved these irregularities.
- Although there is an oversight committee to address procedural errors or oversights on the part of a DRC or the URC, there is no such oversight committee in place to consider substantive errors or oversights. A standing committee that would consider substantive errors or oversights should be available to the candidate, especially when the URC has disagreed with and has set aside a carefully considered DRC recommendation, and has not provided an adequate explanation for what appears to be an inequitable URC decision.
- Procedurally, the role of minority reports should be clarified and standardized. Professional

ethics should also be an official category for evaluation. The role of numerical teaching evaluations should be reexamined—do the questions asked really get at the important aspects of teaching quality? We should also officially recognize that the averages will differ across types of class (required vs. elective, CLA, student expected grade in the class, student effort in the class, etc...) and look at evaluations accordingly.

- I think the current system works well, and I do not recommend significant changes.
- I don't think the questions allocating % to teaching, scholarship, and service capture our current system or the ideal—I didn't want to answer them but couldn't continue. The three areas aren't interchangeable—the candidate should meet the stated criteria in each area; therefore, the issue is how high the bar should be. In my time on the URC, I don't recall there being an issue of whether one area weighed more heavily—it was whether the candidate passed the bar on each. Percentage are relevant to the merit system, not the DRC/URC system.
- I found the questions asking for weighting how heavily teaching, scholarship, and service should be and are weighted to be difficult to answer. In my mind there is a threshold that should be met in each, and if that threshold hasn't been met in any one of the areas, they shouldn't be retained, get tenure, or get promoted.
- In the years that I spent on the URC ?, the levels of teaching, scholarship and service necessary for promotion and tenure were based upon a sincere interpretation by the committee members of the language in the Faculty Handbook. The criteria was not difficult; sometimes the judgements were. I hope that this has not changed.
- There are some absolutely absurd practices taking place on this campus regarding promotion and tenure. We ask for outside reviewer to comment on research and then the DRC and URC proceed to ignore or marginalize those evaluations. The current URC is conducting evaluations of full professors despite the fact that the minority of the members of the URC are themselves full professors.

The reliance on student evaluations is absolutely absurd – and I get high student evaluations. These are misused and it cripples us as faculty by keeping us from being able to make difficult decisions in the classroom in terms of rigor and grading policies. Students will respect the institution more if it upheld standards. Instead students' opinions are raised to an absurd level where they are determining teaching policies.

- The URC is a jury of our peers. Our peers therefore evaluate a candidate's performance against a published Faculty handbook standard. Increasing scholarly productivity and teaching quality is a function of increasing self-imposed expectations on the part of the excellent new faculty hires.
- I understand that the current President wants BU to have the same retention rate as Yale and/or Harvard. If BU does a great job as they hire people then a higher percent of professors will be retained here. Reaching for arbitrary numbers of people to fire is not intelligent and does not benefit the student body.

Additionally: 1) if you tell the truth that you've made some mistakes and work towards correcting them you lose your job. If you are completely incompetent at your job but you lie that you are perfect you get to keep your job, and 2) if your DRC is willing to cover up your mistakes you can get by with the lies. Herein lies the worst of the worst problems of BU's retention procedures. Shame on this university and the current President for setting up arbitrary (hiring/firing) standards and forcing people to pretend they are perfect. If BU had an honest (and worthwhile) retention process people could get help with the areas in which they need help and become better professors overall (and everyone would benefit).

- I don't really know what to say about who should make these critical decisions. I guess I think that it should be a combination of people who make the final decision about someone's tenure or promotion.

One question in this survey was kind of nicely phrased: "If the DRC does its job, . . . ". I would suggest that this is one of the most critical factors in a successful path to tenure. But from what I have seen, which is of course admittedly largely random, DRCs do not and in some cases cannot do their jobs well, since faculty, even with the 3/2 load, are pressed for time and completely stressed out with everything they are asked to do around here. I have known DRC committee members who are clearly unfamiliar with the scholarly work of people on whose DRCs they just sat only 1-2 months previously. That indicates to me that a half-baked job is being accomplished on the DRC level. Thus, it is not fair for DRCs to complain that the URC can't overturn their decisions when the DRCs cannot do their jobs well in the first place. Also, the standards for tenure are unclear for junior faculty in many departments. Many people just do not know how much they need to produce scholarly-wise. Upon getting here they are told some random estimate by one or two faculty members in their or a related department, and that is all some junior faculty have to go on. This is fundamentally unfair, since it seems obvious that this undefined system makes it nice and easy for a department that doesn't like someone personally to be able to shoot them down for any number of vague and undefined reasons when it comes time for tenure. If we had more of a structured expectation, less of the personal would be involved in the tenure process. Also, far less emphasis should be placed on student evaluations. I do not like feeling that a 19-year old's opinion of the way I teach a topic about which I am an expert could be held against me for something as serious as job retention.

- I applaud the URC for all of its hard work. The fact that faculty are involved at all levels of this process is of key importance and is one of the beautiful things that sets Bucknell apart.

I don't think it would be appropriate for every DRC/PRC to be locked into the exact same evaluative criteria (implied by the questions). But I do think that they should be independently evaluated for some level of equivalence. This is also tied up in keeping course evaluations equivalent and fair across different courses and departments, which does not currently seem to be the case.

- Assessment of teaching (especially in subjects such as engineering, math, and science) based solely on student evaluations causes serious grade inflation to occur. If teaching and learning is truly what is important here, other ways to assess how well a faculty is teaching and how much students are learning should be employed.

- URC policies imply (not stated anywhere) coauthors to recuse themselves from DRC reviews. This discourages colleagues from collaborating. Needs clarification and uniform application
- You asked “how heavily should quality of teaching, scholarship and service be weighted in deciding whether or not to” retain, tenure, or promote professors at BU. I gave weightings, but what I really believe is that the DRC/PRC and the URC should look holistically at what each person under review accomplishes for/brings to the university. A truly outstanding scholar who is an adequate teacher might still be enough of an asset to the university to be retained/tenured. An outstanding teacher, especially one who teaches inordinately time-intensive courses but who is a mediocre scholar might be worth being retained/tenured, etc. When it comes to full professor, the person should be a role model & should have a solid service record. The person should be outstanding in either teaching or scholarship and good at the other. It’s great if they can be outstanding at both. But does the person have to be outstanding at both teaching and scholarship to be an excellent role model in one of the two and to give strong leadership to his/her dept and the university? I don’t think so.
- The definition of scholarship has come to mean publications. I disagree that publications should be the sole determining factor of scholarship. Additionally, having publications as the primary metric limits the professor’s ability to concentrate on helping the student further his/her learning. Instead the professor has to have his/her own selfish goals of the work and has to spend some effort concentrating on those goals. Publishable work does not always mean interesting/useful-to-students work.

Given the limited student resources of Bucknell (no PhD and few MS students in my domain) puts more pressure on the professors conduct research, themselves. In R1 universities, the professors concentrate on research, but do not actually do the work because that is the job of the graduate students. Here it almost seems that the nontenured folks have the worst of both worlds, they are expected to be good teachers and expected to do the grunt research work, as well.

- Though scholarship is mentioned here, I would like to underscore the fact that there is not an ethos of scholarly productivity generally at Bucknell (some depts, yes, most depts, no). Some professors are very active but others somehow manage to do very little peer-reviewed work. It’s not the quantity of work at issue here—I understand that this is a teaching institution—but I do think it’s important for all of us to be engaged with our profession outside of Bucknell, to be actively contributing to our disciplines, to be creating knowledge on the highest level. It’s too easy here to center all of one’s energies on the campus. I think the Admin should actively encourage us to attend conferences, give papers, publish papers and books. The current level of “encouragement” is pretty pathetic. The 6 course load has been a huge obstruction for many in this regard and 5 courses is just slightly better. There should be more \$\$\$ for the following: research, conferences, travel, symposia and lecture series in departments, etc. And there should be more attention paid to scholarship in the reviews for retention, tenure, merit, and promotion. It is a university after all!
 - A decision to increase scholarly expectations should be discussed broadly among the faculty, not ramped up by individual departments, DRCs, and the URC.
- Bucknell’s review system is one of the best I’ve encountered or heard described. Folks on

the URC take seriously the job to review only what is in the dossier. They work hard to apply standards evenly across the university. Although the work load is extremely heavy, it is important and necessary work. The work load could be evened out by changing some of the timelines so that all pre-tenure reviews do not have to be complete in the fall semester. Or changed so that reviews can begin earlier in the fall. I do not think the President should have veto power over URC decisions. I heard President Mitchell argue that the President has a better sense of what is best for the institution than the URC. I disagree. Presidents come and Presidents go. The URC is staffed with faculty and deans, many of whom have spent their entire professional lives at Bucknell. They, even more than the President, have a stronger vested interest in maintaining a high quality faculty.

- I struggle with the question of an evaluative vs. developmental process. It is evaluative by nature, and I would like for it to be developmental, but I'm not sure that it can be, because candidates are on their guard. A separate developmental process can be less threatening to candidates, but doesn't necessarily address the concerns of the DRC. I'm really stumped on that one. As for consistency across programs, I think there should be a common standard for quality of teaching and scholarship, as defined within each discipline, but we should accommodate diversity among the disciplines. On the issue of the five course load, I don't think that faculty should necessarily be expected to increase their scholarly productivity, but the university can legitimately expect something more from us (e.g., increased service, new teaching initiatives). Ideally, I think faculty should be able to use the extra time to pursue their own unique professional interests. If there is an expectation of greater scholarly productivity, this should be communicated to the faculty.
- I was unsure how to respond to several items so I would like to offer my candid impressions at least as concerns the retention and tenure process. I haven't been a part of promotion process yet so I don't feel that I have a basis to comment. It seems to me that the criteria are either not clearly specified and if they are then they may not be evenly and consistently applied within departments and across departments at the University. If criteria or standards were more transparent then DRCs might be able to provide a statement to the candidate as to where they stand relative to those standards and what they might do to get closer to them in the event that they are not making adequate progress. It is not at all fair to anyone to have ambiguous criteria, where meeting the criteria becomes a matter of who has the strongest DRC and/or who had a DRC that has more experience in knowing how to write a letter that will shield the candidate. With regard to consistency of criteria across departments, I am not sure that that is possible or desirable but I believe there should be a consistent statement as the University level about what constitutes adequate progress toward becoming a tenured faculty member at Bucknell. The rate of scholarly productivity differs greatly from discipline to discipline and it is unfair to hold all to the same quantity standard. But there should be some consistent University statement that can be unambiguously articulated. Another issue that has been troublesome has been the message it appears that junior faculty are given when they arrive about "protecting themselves" from service. My experience is lately that this message is corrupted to mean little to no service expectation prior to tenure. What this does is place the burden of service on tenured faculty, the time for which must come from somewhere. Typically that time comes from scholarly productivity and hence the tenured faculty are seen as non-productive and not the "best of the best". There was a time when junior faculty participated in departmental service as a matter of routine and this helped

junior faculty find their voice in the department. University committee service might have developed more slowly. I would like to see a stronger statement of service expectations for junior faculty that can then be applied by the DRC. But again, clear articulation is essential for all parties. Guessing games are no fun for anyone.

- Clear disclosure of expectations during recruiting process. The insanity of a one-year review. A clear statement that teaching is the primary job of faculty at Bucknell and that scholarship only exists to support that. A mechanism for rewarding untenured faculty in departments where they bear the burden of long term planning and implementing new initiatives. A mechanism for rewarding faculty who carry out tactics to implement Bucknell Plan goals. A scheme for teaching evaluation/development that doesn't make education researchers wince in embarrassment.
- It is time for the university as a whole (including the URC) to reexamine methods for evaluating teaching and scholarship. Current evaluations of teaching rely much too heavily on student evaluations (which while valuable need to be balanced by input from others) and there is too much emphasis (at least the perception that there is too much emphasis) on counting publications. Explicit criteria that broaden the evaluation methods and mandate that evaluations must be more broad are both necessary and beneficial.

I strongly oppose any system that gives any individual, president or provost, veto power over the thoughtful and objective decision of a broad committee composed of administrators and faculty. Any move in that direction elevates the prestige of the president over the best interests of the university as a whole.

- emphasis on student evaluations & the feeling among jr faculty that the evaluations play a major role in decision making, despite the literature available saying they are not a reliable indicator of teaching ability.
- Bucknell relies far too heavily on teaching evaluations for assessing the quality of faculty performance in the classroom. I believe the reality of this, or even the perceived reality of this, discourages faculty from taking pedagogical risks, empowers students in counterproductive ways, and tempts (at least) faculty to grade more leniently. I would propose a rubrik-based system in which teaching evaluations would not be weighted more than a certain percentage (say 30-40%). The remaining percentage would be made up of faculty, alumni, or other evaluative sources. I would suggest that the departments be given at least some discretion in determining the composition of the remaining percentage. Faculty input could be based on departmental review of teaching materials, peer evaluation, or other possible methods.
- I am paranoid that I will not get tenure and I often feel that I cannot get a straight answer from anyone who would be in a position to advise me. I do not think I am alone, and it is a shame for people who are putting forth incredible efforts to be good teacher/scholars to be so unsure of themselves.
- I am very happy and grateful for the two-tier committee based system. So many other schools have a decision structure that involves a single individual (department chair, Dean) who has excessive authority to make the decision on their own. Committees are crucial. Furthermore,

it is equally crucial to have not only a department level review system but also a university level committee. ... If we want to diversify our faculty, we need to keep this two tiered system to protect the new AND DIFFERENT faculty hires. It's easy to say that the standards for retention and promotion should be made more uniform but difficult to come up with a model that would apply equally well in all departments. I think we need to stay flexible and responsive to the different ways that faculty in different departments contribute to the work of the University.

- I think that DRC's should be making the decisions about tenure for positions in their departments and that the URC should be in place to not to duplicate the process but to protect a candidate who is being unfairly treated. I also think that the great strength in our system is openness with the candidate - that the candidate gets to see all parts of the evaluation process at every step. It matters terribly to the morale of the campus that this process is not obscured, and that there is no wild card veto looming over candidates and departments.
- It's important for Bucknell to be true to what it wants to be. Bucknell wants to be excellent at teaching, it is important to have our faculty to be heavily invested in quality teaching and to be somewhat invested in making continued contributions to the advancement of their disciplines, but only as long as they can successfully involve students in their research. I don't believe that Bucknell can reach the standard of excellence in teaching that it wants to have if it also wants the faculty to start investing more and more time into producing new knowledge.
- RE teaching: DRC reviews should be evaluative more than developmental because the department's (and university's) contributions to the professor's pedagogical development should be ONGOING, beginning with new fac orientation. Problems or failures at the DRC level tenure decision often indicate to me a failure of the department and university at sufficiently mentoring and developing faculty as educators. RE current expectations: I suspect that this survey is tapping only general knowledge, often based on rumors or half-truths, about what is required at the university level for tenure, promotion, etc. The fact is, much of the process is secretive. The bigger problem, of course, is the widespread lack of consensus about what matters and what doesn't, and the disparities between departments. AND to close with what is to me the single biggest problem, many departments have people in them whose narrowness and rigidity in their views of what "scholarship" is or what "good teaching" is make for a very painful and incomplete process in reviewing and giving feedback to untenured profs, or even assoc profs going up to full. It might be the case that too many departments are plagued by senior faculty with hardening of the attitudes, which create ideological and morale and communication problems given that it's the elders who are in positions of power over others. I guess this is why we have the URC, to provide a check and balance.
- Ideally, the DRCs should make the critical decisions, but there should be a second-level review to ensure that DRCs are doing their jobs.
- 1. Preset prescriptive expectations in either teaching or research are problematic, and no two cases are alike. 2. If DRCs do an honest job at 2nd and 4th year reviews, there are very few problems. 3. RC should only read controversial cases. Deans and the Provost should at least

skim all files, so they have some clue of what the faculty are up to.

- A big problem is relying almost exclusively on course evaluations for assessing teaching performance. In my courses, even the most benign question about teaching performance has at least a 12 correlation with course grade and the “essential/required” questions have above 80% regression coefficient with average course grade. I can decide my course evaluation average by how I grade a specific course. In quantitative disciplines, course evaluations are not a desirable measure of teaching performance since they are linked so closely to grades. Another problem is the weight administrators give to negative comments. There is no attempt to realize that when there are both positive and negative comments that the statistical average is good. The least statistically meaningful aspect of course evaluations are student comments, and yet in my experiences these are given priority over the numerically averaged score on the “standard” questions. How about peer review of teaching, administrative review of teaching, or even, a quantitative assessment of attainment of course outcomes.
- All of the subtleties and complexities that the questions in this survey eliminated. It is obvious, for example, that the criteria for full professor are hopelessly vague and idiosyncratically applied. I defy anyone to guess at how the percentages in the decision-making fall. Likewise, it is pointless to ask how Bucknell’s tenure requirements measure up to other institutions: WHICH other institutions? Harvard? Penn College? Slippery Rock? A coherent policy that serves our interests need not have much in common with other schools if it works and everyone understands it.
- Three general comments:
 1. I find a three-tiered system appealing: (i) DRC review followed by (ii) URC review followed by (iii) review by senior academic officer such as a provost or president. These provide increasing levels of objectivity and diverse review criteria that help to base a tenure/promotion decision on as many relevant factors as possible. I would urge that any changes to the system retain a three tiered approach. The key in my opinion is that the last item (provost or president) needs to be done with the same rigor/transparency/guidelines as (i) and (ii). I have been overall impressed/pleased with the openness and clarity of DRC and URC processes.
 2. I don’t know what exactly is being considered I suppose, but I favor retaining a form of university wide review in order to enhance objectivity and also philosophically to show that we are trying to perform our scholarship/teaching in a liberal arts context and that gaining the professional recommendation of peers on a university wide scale is still important (some might say old fashioned, but I think it’s very appealing still).
 3. I think we should always be looking for ways to increase our research/scholarship simply because this is what we do, and also because I think at Bucknell we do a fabulous job of getting students involved in that process. As a statement of ambition, always trying to improve our research is a good thing. I think that when an administration and a faculty try together to increase scholarly expectations gradually with the support of items like improved internal funding for research, course load compromises, etc. that good things can happen. This is the ideal in my opinion.
- I was unsure how to answer the questions “the current system for evaluating teaching/research for retention and tenure is fair,” as it is not clear to me exactly what the current system is. While the `_process_` is explained well (what documents to submit etc.), it is not at all clear

what standards one needs to attain to receive the approval of the DRC and especially the URC. For example, is 4 the magic number for teaching evaluations? For scholarship, the phrases “initiated projects beyond the dissertation” and “scholarly work of high quality” in the URC document are unhelpful. They are also not relevant to new faculty with postdoctoral experience – presumably such new faculty have already moved beyond their dissertation by the time they start at Bucknell, so do their requirements differ?

In the question about which body should make the critical decision about whether someone is retained, it should be a combination of the DRC and URC, but this was not an option so I chose “unsure.” More specifically, the URC should typically concur with the DRC if the DRC has done a conscientious and objective job. In the absence of the DRC doing a good job, the URC should make the critical decision.

- There is no consistency with regard to tenure. All that is needed is a departmental document that can evolve as standards evolve. Folks can be grandfathered in to the date of hire.

The common excuse provided for having no written standard for tenure within each department (“It allows us to keep really good people—we’re not pinned down by a document”) is a sham to avoid coming to terms with disciplinary, teaching, and service standards. Those are weasel words suited to managers with poor command of management standards, or academics with none whatsoever. Why, for example, no required classroom visits?? Assuming (as we claim) that senior folks are better teachers, why can’t that be part of the required process? Putting that job onto undergraduates is irresponsible, unprofessional, and lazy. Full professors MUST be judged by scholarship above all, otherwise that rank is not transferable to peer or (gasp!) higher tier institutions. Full professor for SERVICE?? Are we administrators or are we scholars??

- I really appreciate the committee members doing this important research.
- The university really needs to let the new faculty know exactly what the expectations are for tenure. The process as described to me over the year has been extremely vague. I have been asked to focus as much time as possible on my scholarship so that I can feel more secure. I think this is absolutely wrong.

I feel like we have an identity crisis - are we an undergraduate institution focused in the education of the students or are we striving to be a research institution? I have talked to some senior members of the faculty and the only consistency I find is in the lack of consistency of the reply of the faculty who have been around and are likely to be in my URC or DRC. I agree with the fact that we need to be active in our scholarship so that we can enhance our teaching but I think as faculty we need to answer if our scholarship is supposed to generate new knowledge in the field or our scholarship and work is supposed to generate new knowledge for our students. This survey itself thinks it is appropriate to actually ask if the new 5 course per year limit should make the scholarship portion of the review of the newer faculty larger than the teaching portion.

- The role of external reviewers—how they should be selected. The methods of evaluating teacher–student evaluations, peer evaluation, solicited student feedback, portfolios of teaching growth, etc. What are the best ways to evaluate teaching.

- I believe that the standards for retention and promotion should be set by the Department/Program; if the candidate has met those requirements, the URC should not have the power to decline an application?.
- There's a lot of talk about Bucknell providing the premier undergraduate experience in the USA. Three questions arise. (1) How do we propose to enable the faculty to make that possible for students, since, presumably, that "experience" will eventually have to become more than a mere campaign slogan; (2) what can that experience consist of if not, at least mainly, scholarly learning? and (3) how do we make that happen if we do not require, cultivate, and support high scholarly standards and productivity among the faculty?
- faculty work is not always in teaching, scholarship or service. How about independent studies and undergraduate research? outside grants? program bulding?