

A professor wrote the following:

Proposal: the following should be added to the Promotion and Tenure policy:

"When P&T is proposing a decision that conflicts with a DEC recommendation it should meet with that DEC for consultation."

The P&T response is as follows:

This has been addressed in the Faculty Senate's Promotion and Tenure policy, Section IV.C, which states: In the case of disagreement at a higher level, consultation shall occur with the previous level before the recommendation is forwarded. That is, if a Dean disagrees with a Department recommendation, that Dean shall meet with the Department Evaluation Committee and Department Chair before forwarding a recommendation to the Promotion and Tenure Committee; if the Promotion and Tenure Committee disagrees with a Dean's recommendation, the committee shall meet with that Dean before forwarding a recommendation to the President. Finally, if the President (or designee) disagrees with the Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation, the President (or designee) shall meet with that committee before issuing a final decision. *In the case of disagreement with or need for clarification from any other level, consultation is permitted.*

A professor wrote the following:

#### 1) Appearance by Candidates Before the P&T Committee

Candidates, peer faculty, department chairs, deans, P&T chairs, and P&T committee members generally think that candidates for promotion or tenure must appear before the P&T Committee, or that it is customary for all candidates to do so. However, appearance is not required, as most candidates assume it to be or are told it is. The e-mail sent by the Provost's office in early January to candidates states:

"...you are entitled to appear before the Promotion and Tenure Committee to summarize your case and/or present any new data that may help this committee to arrive at an appropriate decision." (See e-mail note from Courtney McDavid, dated 4 January 2010, shown below).

If a candidate is satisfied with the summary presented in his or her portfolio, or if there are no new data to present since the portfolio was submitted, then he or she should be explicitly told that he or she does not have to appear before the P&T Committee. Candidates should also be explicitly told that not appearing before the P&T Committee will have no effect (e.g. formulation of a negative view) on their application for promotion or tenure.

Also, the same e-mail sent in early January to candidates has the subject line of:

"Interviews with Promotion and Tenure Committee," and the word "interview" is again

used in the body of the e-mail. Candidates are not interviewing with the P&T Committee. The words "interview" should be removed from this and any other communication because it results in ambiguity and creates false impressions. It would be more accurate if the subject line of the e-mail simply read: "Promotion and Tenure Committee Meeting."

Finally, the letter states:

"The Committee members welcome this opportunity to speak with you in person and hope that you make an appointment."

The P&T Committee should not want or have this expectation of candidates. This sentence can be interpreted as coercive, or suggest that not appearing before the committee may result in the formulation of an unfavorable view of a candidate.

To the extent possible, P&T committees should not meet with any candidate so as to avoid the introduction of possible bias. Candidate's portfolios should constitute the entire basis of evaluation, unless the committee has a bona fide reason for wanting to meet with a candidate (see item 2, below). The need to meet with a candidate face-to-face must far exceed any unfavorable bias that could be introduced by having such a meeting.

The P&T response is as follows:

This was addressed in the 2010-11 P&T report. There is no need for a new response.

A professor wrote the following:

## 2) P&T Committee's Request to Meet with Candidates

The P&T Committee may wish to meet with selected candidates to answer certain questions. In this case, the P&T Committee should provide the candidate with its questions in writing (e-mail) 2-3 working days prior to the requested meeting date. The candidate should be given the option to respond to the P&T Committee's questions in writing (e-mail), in-person, or both, as desired by the candidate. Receiving questions in writing ahead of any meeting will allow candidates to do the best possible job of answering the P&T Committee's important questions. It is my view that candidate's response to any questions from the committee should be solely in writing.

The P&T response is as follows:

There has virtually never been a situation in which a candidate was unaware of potential questions by the P&T that were not already addressed by the DEC or the Dean of the school. The P&T takes a minimum of two full days—typically 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.—to meet with the candidates. Prior to this meeting, each member of the P&T becomes completely familiar with all of the work of generally four professors. Each member of

the P&T reads, and becomes familiar with the “Summary Folder” of each candidate. The P&T members read, very carefully, all comments made by the DEC and the Dean. This work takes most of the month of January—probably 40 hours of work. On several occasions in the past the P&T has asked for a clarification of some issue from a candidate. This would address the concern of the professor submitting this question.

A professor wrote the following:

### 3) Candidate Denied Tenure or Promotion

Currently, the P&T Committee provides the candidate with a letter citing the section(s) of the contract in which the candidate was deficient. This limited feedback is insufficient for performance improvement and faculty development. In addition to citing the relevant section of the contract, the P&T Committee should cite the specific reasons for the deficiencies. They should be as specific as possible. A rubric such as that used by the graduate school for evaluating M.S. theses or applied research projects might be useful as a mechanism to provide more specific and actionable feedback.

The P&T response is as follows:

This question has come up before. The P&T virtually never identifies a situation of which the candidate is unaware. The members of the P&T are unaware of any situation in which the candidate is “caught off guard”. The candidate is always aware of the concern of the P&T. The members of the P&T represent a cross-section of the university faculty, and serve as a recommending body to the Provost—as do the DEC and the Deans. It is the aggregate of the comments of each component in the P&T process on which the Provost makes a decision. The present notification process works very well.