

CFA Final Recommendation on the 2016 Reappointment and Promotion Document

TO: Steering Committee
FROM: Committee on Academic Programs
RE: Final Recommendation on Graduate Certificate Programs
DATE: May 15, 2016

Background

On February 19, 2014, CFA received a charge from the Steering Committee asking CFA to ‘consider whether the processes for tenure and promotion to associate professor should be joined into a single process and decision’. CFA was also asked to consider whether the College Promotions Committee should become a College Tenure and Promotions Committee and propose a timeline for the joint tenure/promotion process. CFA completed this charge in the 2014-2015 academic year and its recommendations were approved in fall 2015.

CFA continued its work to fulfill an open charge it had received from the Steering Committee on October 24, 2011. That charge asked CFA to review the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Document, considering a) the definition of teacher-scholar, b) the policy on Disciplinary Standards and c) the March 2011 memo from the Faculty Senate.

Testimony

The presenting of testimony is central to the concept of shared governance, and the sharing of information with all stakeholder groups is essential in keeping the community updated in a timely fashion. CFA has regularly posted detailed minutes on the Academic Affairs website, and produced several reports to Steering and to the entire College Community. In addition, CFA conducted two Open Forums in 2014-2015 to gather information on many aspects of the reappointment and promotion process, and one Open Forum in February 2016 to communicate the recommendations that were being considered and gather further input. An earlier version of the proposed 2016 PRD was emailed to the entire faculty for comment and feedback. The February Open Forum was very lively and produced valuable suggestions. Among them was a change to the title of the document to reflect the normal process that faculty experience (reappointment first, then promotion). In addition to helpful feedback on CFA revisions of teaching and service, a significant change that was proposed regards providing more time for a faculty member to prepare a response to an evaluation by the PC, Dean and Provost. Another important proposal was to review the language regarding the role of teaching, research, and service to mirror the more holistic approach reflected in the promotion section of the document.

Recommendation

The most obvious changes to the 2015 PRD regard the new title of the document and its restructuring. The length of the document was reduced by one third, and the text is now organized in five parts rather than in three articles plus appendices. Please note that the page numbers presented in the Table of Contents of the Word document correspond to the pages of each section when the text is viewed in ‘Simple Markup’ mode. The restructured changes to the organization of the text were not preserved under ‘Track Changes’ since there were literally thousands of changes, from the text moved around, to font and size changes, to paragraphs converted into tables, to running headers and footers, and to countless other format changes.

The changes that are 'tracked' in the attached document pertain to substantive changes that CFA is proposing. These substantive changes include dates and other material issues, as summarized below. Note now that page numbers referenced in the following list pertain to page numbers when the document is viewed in 'Full Markup' mode.

1) Proposed date changes

- a) two dates that were missing in the 2015 PRD in the modified calendar for applicants with a QLE (page 63) are now proposed (page 25 of the 2016 RPD)
- b) the dates for applicants to reply to evaluations by the PRC, Provost, and President are modified in order to allow seven days for a candidate to prepare a response (pages 19-22)
- c) the entire reappointment calendar for applicants with a QLE is extended by about 2 months (pages 24-25). The current calendar determines action by the Board of Trustees (BOT) by Dec 21 of each year; it was pointed out by Academic Affairs that the closest meetings of the BOT are in early December and in late February. Thus, applications would necessarily be in 'bureaucratic limbo' for two months with no purpose. The newly proposed calendar offers two additional months for a candidate with a QLE to meet reappointment standards.

2) Other material changes proposed

- a) there are several proposed changes to the criteria to evaluate teaching, as noted in the document (pages 2-4); a reference to signature experiences is now part of bullet statement #6 (page 2)
- b) new language is proposed for the role of teaching, research, and service in the evaluation process for reappointment (Pages 2, 8, and 27); the proposed language mirrors the current language in the overview section of the promotion process (page 1 of the 2015 PRD or page 26 of the 2016 RPD)
- c) the document flow of the reappointment process is modified so that the documentation produced at each stage of the process is forwarded to the next stage without delay (pages 19, 21, 22); this will allow greater time for an applicant to reply to an evaluation at a given stage without shortening the evaluation period for all applications at the next stage. CFA decided not to propose at this moment an interim date by which a candidate would inform the next stage whether a reply to the previous evaluation is being prepared
- d) there are several proposed changes to the criteria to evaluate service, as noted in the document (pages 29-31 and 64-65)
- e) there are several proposed changes to the language describing the professional development essay, as noted in the document (pages 58-59)
- f) peer observations of teaching should be completed by the 12th week rather than by the 10th week of the semester (page 49)
- g) a sentence making it explicit that the identity of external reviewers should not be available to the applicant is added (page 54)
- h) a number of word changes are proposed, as 'tracked' in the document