

Revised: April 4, 1994
(Textual revisions are printed in bold type.)

Task Force on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Procedures:
Recommendations
(to be implemented by May 1, 1995)

Demystification of the University Review Committee

1. We recommend that the URC prepare and distribute a written statement that describes its operation as a university committee. The URC also should provide an illustrative "case" for a second year, fourth year, and sixth year review.

Department Review Committee (DRC) Procedures

Items (1) and (2) require amending the Faculty Handbook (Personnel Policies, III, J, 1)

passed

1 (a) We recommend that DRCs be constituted of at least four tenured members of the full-time instructional faculty. Departments (or programs) that lack a sufficient number of tenured members shall consult with the appropriate dean to constitute a DRC from tenured faculty members from within the relevant academic division.

passed

1(b) Untenured members of the faculty are not eligible to participate in or observe the deliberations of a DRC.

passed

2. We recommend that DRC statements of procedures be reviewed every five years by the department and the Committee on Academic Freedom & Tenure and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. DRC procedures should be dated to indicate the most recent revision date. Each member of a department is to be provided a copy of the DRC statement currently in use by the department chairperson.

passed

3. DRC procedures must include a schedule for any intermediate/internal dates for reviews including all submittal dates and differences between requirements/dates for different reviews (2, 4, and 6 year and promotion reviews).

passed

4. Departmental expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service shall be clearly stated. Departmental review documents shall specify the expected content, length, and format of the candidate's self-evaluation statement, as well as the supportive materials to be provided.

passed

5. Departmental review documents shall clearly indicate the criteria and procedures to be used for the selection of external reviewers for tenure and promotion reviews. The external reviewers will be informed of the details of their selection and the use of their letters. No prospective external reviewer shall be contacted prior to consultation with the appropriate dean.

Department Review Reports

passed
passed
passed

1. If necessary, department reviews should be prefaced with a statement that informs the URC of unique disciplinary contexts and how they may pertain to a candidate being reviewed.
2. Department reviews shall indicate the bases for the recommendations and, in so doing, provide the URC with a statement that clearly presents an evaluation as well as an analysis of the candidate in each of the review areas.
3. If department reviews do not result in a unanimous recommendation, the report shall clearly indicate the bases for agreement and disagreement and the relative support for differing conclusions. This provision does not preclude the submission of minority reports.

Student Contributions to DRCs

passed
as revised

1. We recommend that a student evaluation form (or perhaps alternate forms) be devised by the Committee on Instruction, ~~in consultation with a student representative from Veritas~~, that separately assesses (1) the course and (2) the instructor. We further recommend that a minimum number of common questions be included on these forms; departments may add additional questions as appropriate.

Sp '97
↑
Fall '97

2. We recommend that each department/program develop procedures for informing students of the purpose(s) of the evaluation forms and for distribution and collection of evaluation forms. ^{2b} The person being reviewed shall not be responsible for either the administration or the collection of these forms.

Note:
(2b) Failure

3. We recommend that departments/programs devise methods to involve students in the DRC evaluation of teaching (including advising) beyond the completion of written course evaluations. Such methods might include the presentation of an evaluative report by a Student Review Committee constituted by the DRC. Other approaches might include systematic interviews of students or letters systematically solicited from alumni.

Promotion

passed

1. We recommend that departments/programs adopt and make available written statements that detail clearly procedures to be followed for candidates who wish to be considered for promotion beyond the rank of associate professor (which is normally awarded upon conferral of tenure). These procedures are to be reviewed every five years by the department, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Composition of the University Review Committee

Item (1) requires amending the Faculty Handbook (Governance, II, 5)*

failed

1. We recommend that the number of tenured faculty members of the URC be increased from five to six. One member is to be elected from each of the four usual divisions (humanities, social sciences, natural sciences/math, and engineering) and two are to be elected at-large from different divisions. One of the at-large positions would be designated the alternate member of the committee. The three current administrative positions would remain. Thus, the voting membership of the URC for any case would ordinarily be made up of five faculty members and three administrators.

passed

2. In accordance with the already existing Post-hiring Affirmative Action Plan of the University, the Faculty Council should make every effort to ensure that nominations for faculty membership on the URC be reasonably representative of the faculty as a whole. Further, it is suggested that members of the Faculty Council consult individually with department/program chairs to solicit prospective nominations for the URC, in addition to soliciting nominations from the floor of the faculty.

University Review Committee Recommendations

passed

1. When the URC believes that a faculty member would benefit from mentoring or that a faculty member and DRC are not clearly communicating about important expectations, the dean of the appropriate college (or his/her designee from the faculty membership of the URC) should follow up to ensure that steps are taken to remedy the situation.

Item (2) requires amending the Faculty Handbook (Governance, II, 5)*

failed

2. We recommend that a two vote margin be necessary to reverse a DRC recommendation.

* NOTE: A proposed amendment to the governance system must be referred to the University Council for its comments prior to voting on the amendment by the faculty. A majority vote of the faculty is required for approval, as is the agreement of the university's president.