EFC P&T Committee Final Report

Committee Members: Albert Ratner, Chair
Asghar Bhatti
Charles Stanier

Summary:
The specific charges for the committee include (1) revising the P&T process flowchart, (2) reviewing the existing college post-tenure review procedures and monitoring implementation of the new university-directed process, and (3) discussing the possible inclusion of student support letters in P&T dossiers. The last charge is to recommend any specific tasks for the P&T committee for next year.

Current Progress:
The committee met multiple times and created a draft flow chart (see attachment). The committee did not have the opportunity to seek input from Dean Hornbuckle and other administrators on the draft, and so recommend the EFC forward it to the Dean’s Office for review. Aesthetic changes should be handled by the Dean’s office while substantive revisions should be included in the charges for next year’s committee.

For the second charge, committee discussions indicated that there exists significant confusion among the college faculty as to the exact nature of the review and what type of recommendations the EFC can or should give to the Dean concerning an under-performing faculty member. The committee urges the EFC to obtain more clarity on this issue of whether a departmental DCG group can or should provide recommendations to the Dean, and whether those should include specific issues to address and/or specific recommendation for an action plan. The P&T committee was unable to draft any guidelines or procedures due to these uncertainties, and this should be given as a charge to next year’s committee only if there is a clear understanding of how the process should work.

For the third charge, the committee examined the university’s P&T guidelines and found that if student letters are to be allowed, the college must in fact make them a requirement for all faculty (page 2 of the University’s Promotion and Tenure Procedures) and develop procedures for soliciting them in an unbiased manner (Appendix D, I.B.(3)(f) “The college’s written policy governing promotion decision making should specify the items required and apply the requirement evenhandedly to all candidates.”). The committee concluded that the negative aspects of such a policy would far out-weight the positive benefits. The existing university policy does not restrict individual faculty members from soliciting such letters for inclusion in their own dossier (as they are free to include any material of their choosing).

Charges for next year should including completion of the P&T Flowchart (as needed) and devising post-tenure review procedures (if clear policy is in place to guide such efforts).
Sequential Development of Promotion Record through Decision-Makers:

1. Candidate and DEO compile dossier
2. Peer evaluation of teaching
3. Internal peer evaluation of scholarship
4. Peer evaluation of service
5. Candidate’s opportunity to respond
6. External peer evaluation of scholarship
7. Departmental Consulting Group’s vote and report
8. Candidate’s opportunity to respond
9. DEO’s letter to Dean
10. Candidate’s opportunity to respond, if DEO’s recommendation is negative
11. Collegiate Consulting Group’s vote and summary report, if any*
12. Candidate’s opportunity to respond*
13. Dean’s letter to Provost
14. Candidate’s opportunity to respond, if Dean’s recommendation is negative
15. Provost’s recommendation to the Board of Regents

*If recommendation is negative and contrary to DEO or DCG recommendation