April 27, 2015

TO: Faculty Senate

FR: Jeff Matthews, Chair of the Faculty Advancement Committee

On behalf of Bill Barry, Monica DeHart, Jeff Matthews, Doug Sackman, Alexa Tullis (Fall), Stacey Weiss (Spring) and Kris Bartanen


The Faculty Advancement Committee this year will have completed 59 evaluations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review</th>
<th>Number and Status of Evaluations</th>
<th>Used Moodle Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>7 (5 open, 2 closed)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and promotion to associate</td>
<td>4 (3 open, 1 closed)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to associate</td>
<td>5 (2 open, 3 closed)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to professor</td>
<td>12 (6 open, 6 closed)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 year assistant/clinical assistant</td>
<td>6 (4 open, 2 closed)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 year associate/clinical associate</td>
<td>6 (2 open, 4 streamlined)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year professor</td>
<td>16 (4 open, 1 closed, 11 streamlined)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 year instructor</td>
<td>3 (2 open, 1 streamlined)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee has forwarded evaluations for tenure, tenure and promotion, promotion to associate, and promotion to professor to the President. Some of these cases were considered by the Board of Trustees at the February 2015 meeting; some will be considered at the May 2015 meeting; one will be considered at the October 2015 meeting.

The Advancement Committee met for a total of 27 hours from October through December 2014 (2, 3, or 4 hours per week depending upon schedule conflicts), and will have met 37 hours (3 hours each week) for the Spring 2015 semester. FAC members estimate that they spend roughly 15 hours per week reading files and preparing evaluation letters.

While we still have files and letters to complete, the Committee offers the following observations:

- The Committee reminds head officers that the deliberative letter – informed by individual colleague letters and deliberative discussion – should address “the needs of the department, school, or program and the university” as a criterion for tenure reviews (see Faculty Code, Chapter III, Section 3.d). The Code calls for “demonstrated need” for the position.

- Sixty percent of evaluation files this year were submitted electronically. The Committee has found these files to be relatively easy to access and time-saving to review. We are encouraged that Educational Technology colleagues have made further refinements for next year, such that Moodle evaluation sites will be much more like Moodle course sites and, thereby, easier to use by evaluees and evaluators.

- The Committee encourages evaluees to include in their files copies of scholarly materials (publications, conference papers, proposals, letters from editors, etc.) that they are citing as evidence of professional growth.
• The Committee appreciates that many head officers have this year provided a chart of class visits at the beginning of deliberative summary letters (who visited what classes and when) in order to document clearly all class visits conducted by colleagues; we encourage this practice by all head officers as we still struggle in some files to discern accurately the ongoing pattern of class visits.

• The Committee observes across a number of files calls from evaluators for evaluatees to make clear their roles in co-authored or collaborative work. Department, school, or program head officers can also assist the FAC in understanding how “author order” for collaborative work is treated in the specific field.

• The Committee encourages colleagues to attend to revised Interpretations of the Faculty Code regarding solicitation and submission of external letters; this information will be included in the 2015-2016 Faculty Evaluation Standards and Guidelines (“the buff document”).

The Advancement Committee recommends the following:
• The Committee observes in some files where teaching responsibilities include lecture and laboratory sections that colleagues express hopes for Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms tailored for administration in laboratory sections. The Committee suggests that Professional Standards Committee invite faculty input on this topic.

• The Committee observes that some departmental evaluation guidelines are dated, perhaps creating uneven expectations across areas of the university, particularly in the area of professional growth. We encourage the Professional Standards Committee to consider implementation of a periodic review process for department, school, and program evaluation guidelines.

• The Committee observes lack of clarity about the meaning of “distinguished service in addition to sustained growth . . . in teaching, professional growth, advising, university service, and community service related to professional interests and expertise” (Faculty Code, Chapter III, Section 3.e, p. 11) and recommends that the Professional Standards Committee consider a Code interpretation to clarify university-wide expectations.

The Advancement Committee, upon recommendation of the University Enrichment Committee, will recommend to the Dean candidates for a junior and senior research award to be presented at the Fall Faculty Dinner.

The Faculty Advancement Committee will discuss other ideas after it finishes with the 2014-2015 evaluations and reserves the opportunity to provide an addendum to this report to the Faculty Senate at or after semester’s end.