**Faculty Affairs Committee Report on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines**

**General Findings**

* Departments and Colleges would benefit greatly from a template for the development of retention, tenure, and promotion guidelines.
  + Motion to recommend departments who are in need of significant revision of the retention, tenure, and promotion documents utilize the provided template to ensure that the department has all the necessary elements (April 5, 2018, Guell/Eberman, 4-0-0).
* Several documents fail to address retention, so the roles of instructor and assistant professor (and how to maintain the positions) are often not addressed.
* Departments should be explicit in deferring to College and University guidelines.
* Several documents failed to update direct language (quotes) from changes the University Handbook, Section 305.

**Specific Findings**

*College of Arts & Sciences*

The College of Arts & Sciences Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Document necessarily delegates much of the specification of the evaluative criteria to the level of the department or school. The document also focuses on “satisfactory” versus “unsatisfactory” performance in each of the three domains of faculty activity. The “satisfactory” evaluation aligns with the “substantial” level of performance in the alternative path to promotion to Professor, and the College calls for the departments/schools to specify the criteria to meet the designations of “excellent,” “substantial,” and “sustained” performance. This means that the College Committee will have to rely on departmental definitions of “excellence” and “sustained” for faculty choosing the alternative path for promotion to Professor.

The College’s document regarding retention and promotion for Instructors and Senior Instructors is complete.

In addition, the College should clarify:

* The College RPT document specifies “satisfactory” performance for Assistant Professors during their probationary period, but specifying retention expectations at the third-year review for faculty at this rank would better provide guidance to departments and faculty members about the degree of progress expected at this important benchmark.

*Art & Design*

The Department of Art and Design needs additional work on their document. It does not address retention of faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor, nor does it address the standards for Instructors or Senior Instructors. It also needs to address the standards for the alternative path to promotion to Professor, particularly the standards for “excellent” or “sustained” efforts in teaching, research/creativity, and service.

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* The amount of effort necessary to meet the standard for research/scholarship/creativity for promotion to the ranks of Professor and Associate Professor.
* How simply attending (rather than presenting at) a conference, workshop, or symposium should count as scholarly achievement.

*Biology*

The Department of Biology provided two documents: one for P&T of tenure-track and tenured faculty, and one for evaluating Instructors and Senior Instructors. The two documents combined include most of the required elements for promotion to Associate Professor and to Professor, and for evaluations of Instructors and promotion to Senior Instructor. But they do not incorporate criteria for Assistant Professor retention evaluations. The documents also do not adequately incorporate experiential learning: for non-tenured/tenure-track faculty, it is specified only for Senior Instructors, and for tenure-track or tenured faculty it is more implied than explicitly stated. This is surprising because as a lab science, Biology is inherently about experiential learning, so please be more explicit about this.

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* None for Evaluations of Instructors
* Fix double numbering in P&T document; also missing part of a sentence on p. 2 for “Scholarship”
* Specify what role student and peer teaching evaluations will play in evaluations for promotion (and for retention of Assistant Professors)
* Under teaching criteria for promotion to professor (Excellence), #3 (successfully and regularly incorporates mission, vision, values) says nothing concrete. If this is primarily about incorporating experiential learning in one’s teaching, then say that.

*Chemistry and Physics*

The Department of Chemistry and Physics has addressed the necessary elements for promotion to Senior Instructor, Associate Professor, and Professor. However, it needs to address the criteria for retention of Instructors and Assistant Professors.

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* Need to better specify the difference between “substantial” and “sustained” performance in the alternative path to Professor.

*Communication*

The Department of Communication has addressed the criteria for each rank, with the exception of the alternative path for promotion to full Professor, and clearly spelling out how all of the mission-based activities will be included in the criteria (particularly academic advising). The document also did not include Appendix A, which specified the required /evidence to be submitted, so that was not evaluated.

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* Last sentence in “Teaching Activity” (p. 1) needs to be completed.
* Word missing in paragraph on retention of Lecturers.

*Criminology and Criminal Justice*

The Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice has addressed the necessary elements for promotion (and tenure) to Senior Instructor, Associate Professor, and Professor, with the exception of fully addressing the “excellent” and “sustained” criteria for the alternative path to full Professor. It also still needs to fully address the criteria for retention of Assistant Professors and Instructors.

*Earth and Environmental Systems*

The Department of Earth and Environmental Systems has included all of the required elements for retention and promotion for Assistant Professor through full Professor ranks, but it still needs to add the criteria for retention and promotion for the ranks of Instructor and Senior Instructor. It also needs to specify the standards for “excellent” and “sustained” performances within the alternative path to Professor.

In addition, the Department should clarify:

• Typo in Paragraph A under Principles of Academic Performance (p. 3).

*Economics*

The Department of Economics has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the exception of:

* Describing the expectations for the rank of Professor with respect to substantial/sustained performance in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service.
* Detailing that the general expectations for tenure track faculty achievement and relative weight of teaching, research and service will be specified at time of initial appointment
* Detailing the process for setting performance goals during annual review

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* The guidelines do not explicitly state the expectations to retain the ranks of Instructor and Assistant Professor.
* For excellence in service the faculty member must demonstrate a decade of service. This is in contradiction with eligibility to be promoted in the 4th year.
* The Tenure decision indicates that tenure and promotion are not linked. This is no longer possible.

*English*

The Department of English has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the exception of:

* Clearly articulating expectations for retention of Instructors and Senior Instructors

*History*

The Department of History has included the required elements regarding promotions, but still needs to address the criteria for retention of Instructors and Assistant Professors. There is a general statement that the departmental document operates under the guidelines of the College of Arts and Sciences Retention, Tenure, and Promotion document and the University Handbook, but if this is intended to mean that the department uses the College-level and University-level criteria for retention, then this should be stated more clearly.

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* National recognition as part of the criteria for “substantial” performance in scholarship/research
* That at least one published monograph is required for promotion to Professor (either at tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, or at promotion to full Professor)

*Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics*

The Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics has not addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the following areas needing improvement:

* Criteria/expectations for rank of Professor in respect to excellence, substantial and sustained teaching, service and scholarship
* Required criteria/criterion for rank of Instructor with respect to all domains
* Description of documentation and evidence required to demonstrate all three domains.
* Providing additional clarity to the criteria used to determine rank of Associate Professor and Professor in all three domains.

*Mathematics and Computer Science*

The Department of Mathematics and Computer Science has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the exception of:

* Clearly adding the required inclusion of community engagement criteria/criterion or deferment to college guidelines
* Clearly adding the required inclusion of experiential learning criteria/criterion or deferment to college guidelines
* Clearly adding the required inclusion of undergraduate advising/mentoring criteria/criterion or deferment to college guidelines

*Multidisciplinary Studies*

The Department of Multidisciplinary Studies has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the exception of:

* Describing criteria/ expectations for the rank of Assistant Professor with respect to service, teaching and scholarship.
* Describing criteria/expectations for the rank of Senior Instructor with respect to teaching and service.

*Music*

The Department of Music has not addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the following areas needing improvement:

* Required inclusion of community engagement criteria/criterion or deferment to college guidelines
* Required inclusion of experiential learning criteria/criterion or deferment to college guidelines
* Required inclusion of undergraduate advising/mentoring criteria/criterion or deferment to college guidelines
* Criteria/expectations for rank of Professor in respect to excellence/substantial/sustained teaching, service and scholarship
* Required criteria/criterion for rank of Senior Instructor with respect to all three domains.

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* “Pattern of active and significant” definition in regards to the three domains.

*Political Science*

The Department of Political Science has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the exception of:

* Clearly articulating expectations for retention of instructors

*Psychology*

The Department of Psychology has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the exception of:

* Additional detail pertaining to the criteria/expectations for rank of Professor in respect to excellence, substantial and sustained teaching and scholarship
* Clearly articulating expectations for rank of Assistant Professors and criteria used with respect to teaching, scholarship and service.

*Theatre*

The Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics has not addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the following areas needing improvement:

* Clearly articulating expectations for rank of Assistant and Associate Professors and criteria used with respect to teaching, scholarship and service.
* Required criteria/criterion for rank of Instructor with respect to all domains

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* Consider the use of the term “unimpeded communication” as that is then contradicted by the statement that the reviewing bodies are separate and provide for checks and balances. Their communication about personnel evaluation is impeded by the process to protect the faculty member.
* The department includes community engagement and experiential learning within the criteria, but the ways in which these activities are measured remains unclear (and in the case of experiential learning ONLY within the excellence in teaching for promotion to Professor).
* It is unclear in the teaching, creativity and research, and service sections of the document, whether the department is stating the expectations for the rank of Associate professor or Assistant Professor. This requires clarification.
* There are no references to retention and promotion of instructors and senior instructors.

*Scott College of Business*

The Scott College of Business has not addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the following areas needing improvement:

* The guidelines do not address changes from the 2017 revisions of the University Handbook Section 305 whereby there are multiple paths to the achievement of Professor. The guidelines indicate only one path to seeking promotion to professor and does not account for the expectations for sustained, substantial, or excellent performance.
* There are no references to retention and promotion of instructors and senior instructors.

*College of Technology*

The College of Technology has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the exception of:

* Including mission-based activities throughout the document.

In addition, the College should clarify:

* Rank of Associate Professor does not specify recognition at the regional or national level.
* Exclusion of eligible faculty to serve on performance evaluation committees because they are doing 50% or more administrative assignment seems incredibly prescriptive and not in line with the spirit of the Handbook.

*Applied Engineering and Technology Management*

The Department of Applied Engineering and Technology Management has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure.

The Department should clarify:

* Although not explicitly stated, the Scholarly Accomplishments imply recognition at regional and national levels.
* The expectations for outside work are inappropriately included as requirements for retention and promotion. If work experience is required for the position, it should be applied at hiring, as expecting people to work outside the position is 1) a potential violation of University Handbook (if not approved by the Provost) and 2) counterintuitive to the purpose of the institutional role of a faculty member (working for the institution).
* Exclusion of eligible faculty to serve on performance evaluation committees because they are doing 50% or more administrative assignment seems incredibly prescriptive and not in line with the spirit of the Handbook.

*Aviation Technology*

The Department of Aviation Technology has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure.

The Department should clarify:

* Although not explicitly stated, the Scholarly Accomplishments imply recognition at regional and national levels.
* The expectations for outside work are inappropriately included as requirements for retention and promotion. If work experience is required for the position, it should be applied at hiring, as expecting people to work outside the position is 1) a potential violation of University Handbook (if not approved by the Provost) and 2) counterintuitive to the purpose of the institutional role of a faculty member (working for the institution).
* Exclusion of eligible faculty to serve on performance evaluation committees because they are doing 50% or more administrative assignment seems incredibly prescriptive and not in line with the spirit of the Handbook.

*Built Environment*

The Department of Built Environment has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the exception of:

* Including undergraduate advising and graduate student advising/mentoring.

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* Although not explicitly stated, the Scholarly Accomplishments imply recognition at regional and national levels.
* The expectations for outside work are inappropriately included as requirements for retention and promotion. If work experience is required for the position, it should be applied at hiring, as expecting people to work outside the position is 1) a potential violation of University Handbook (if not approved by the Provost) and 2) counterintuitive to the purpose of the institutional role of a faculty member (working for the institution).
* Exclusion of eligible faculty to serve on performance evaluation committees because they are doing 50% or more administrative assignment seems incredibly prescriptive and not in line with the spirit of the Handbook.

*Electronics and Computer Engineering Technology*

The Department of Electronics and Computer Engineering Technology has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the exception of:

* Including community engagement.
* Describing the rank of Assistant Professor with respect to teaching.
* Describing the documentation/evidence needed to demonstrate teaching, research/scholarship/creativity, and service performance.

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* The expectations for sustained, substantial, and excellent teaching are not very clear.
* No examples of evidence of what should be included are detailed. Although not explicitly stated, the Scholarly Accomplishments imply recognition at regional and national levels.
* Without stating the necessary evidence required it is difficult to know whether the guidelines align with the Standards of Achievement by Rank.

*Human Resource Development and Performance Technologies*

The Department of Human Resource Development and Performance Technologies has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the exception of:

* Describing the rank of Instructor including the expectations for teaching and service

*Bayh College of Education*

The Bayh College of Education has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure. The document is in alignment with the Standards of Achievement by rank, leaves the authority of the department to indicate what that looks like, but the detailed list of evidence provides the necessary evidence to be retained, tenured, or promoted.

In addition, the College should clarify:

* May need to make revisions about the Biennial Review based on anticipated changes.

*Department of Educational Leadership*

The Department of Educational Leadership has not addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the following areas needing improvement:

* The guidelines do not address changes from the 2017 revisions of the University Handbook Section 305 whereby there are multiple paths to the achievement of Professor. On page 3, the guidelines indicate one path to seeking promotion to professor and does not account for the expectations for sustained, substantial, or excellent performance.
* Guidelines for Instructors and Senior Instructors were not included.

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* May need to make revisions about the Performance Pay Reviews/Biennial Review based on anticipated changes.
  + On p. 5, this should read biennial, not biannual.
  + These procedures are inconsistent with the electronic methods currently used.
  + Page 6 describes a mechanism that is inconsistent with the current system.
* Strongly suggest the document be written in gender-neutral language.

*Department of Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology*

The Department of Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure.

* These are exemplar guidelines for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

*Department of Teaching and Learning*

The Department of Teaching and Learning has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure.

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* In alignment with College and University guidelines, the department recognizes a path to Professor through sustained, substantial, and excellent performance. The detailed list of evidence is helpful in identifying what should be submitted. It is not entirely clear how one would meet the expectations for sustained, substantial, and excellent performance in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. This may need more clarification.

*College of the Library*

The College of Technology has not addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the following areas needing improvement:

* Clearly establishing the criteria/expectations for rank of Professor in respect to excellence/substantial/sustained teaching, service and scholarship

*College of Health and Human Services*

The College of Health and Human Services has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure. The document is in alignment with the Standards of Achievement by rank, leaves the authority of the department to indicate what that looks like, and there are examples of evidence to be retained, tenured, or promoted.

In addition, the College should clarify:

* It may be helpful to explicitly state that the College delegates the responsibility of outlining the specific standards and documentation required for retention, tenure and/or promotion, specific to sustained, substantial, and excellence for the promotion to Professor, to the Department. This is stated broadly on pate 3, but could be more explicitly stated.

*Department of Baccalaureate Nursing*

The Department of Baccalaureate Nursing has not addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the following areas needing improvement:

* Detailing the criteria/expectations for the rank of Senior Instructor

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* Suggest more clarity in the standards of achievement for Assistant Professor, specifically to identify qualifiers for the required examples of teaching achievement.

*Department of Baccalaureate Nursing Completion*

The Department of Baccalaureate Nursing Completion has not addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the following areas needing improvement:

* Detailing the criteria/expectations for the rank of Senior Instructor

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* Department document does not address experiential learning, although it is inherent in the discipline.
* Suggest more clarity in the standards of achievement for Assistant Professor, specifically to identify qualifiers for the required examples of teaching achievement.

*Department of Advanced Practice Nursing*

The Department of Advanced Practice Nursing has not addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, with the following areas needing improvement:

* Detailing the criteria/expectations for the rank of Senior Instructor

In addition, the Department should clarify:

* Suggest more clarity in the standards of achievement for Assistant Professor, specifically to identify qualifiers for the required examples of teaching achievement.

*Department of Applied Medicine and Rehabilitation*

The Department of Applied Medicine and Rehabilitation has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure.

However, the Department should clarify:

* The use of “should” throughout the document is problematic in establishing minimal expectations.
* The criteria for the rank of associate professor is detailed at mid-tenure, but the expectations at the onset of the position are not provided.
* In reference to how the department describes documentation/evidence for demonstrating research/scholarship/creativity performance, the review indicated several serious flaws.
  + “indexed-e.g.” If the design of the bullet for scholarship in a peer-reviewed journal is intended to use indexing as the prima-facie screen to cull illegitimate articles, then the indexes should be named with an “i.e.” Using “e.g.” (for example) invites an argument because it allows for predatory publishers to self-index whereas “i.e.” (that is) allows the department to specify the list of indexing entities it will respect.
  + “Other” allows for anything the faculty member considers to be scholarship to be included within the list of elements in scholarship.
* “Abstracts” invites the assertion of a very low bar if the standard is one-per year and a member of the department can meet it with only that element.
* “Accreditation self-study documents” are a questionable form of scholarship.

*Department of Applied Health Sciences*

The Department of Applied Health Sciences has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure.

The Department should clarify:

* The use of “should” throughout the document is problematic in establishing minimal expectations.
* The criteria for the rank of associate professor is detailed at mid-tenure, but the expectations at the onset of the position are not provided.
* There are no references to retention and promotion of instructors and senior instructors.

*Department of Social Work*

The Department of Social Work has addressed all the necessary elements of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure.

The Department should clarify:

* The expectations for scholarship do not acknowledge the expectations for professional recognition at the national level for the promotion to professor.