Four Tenure Track Process Resolutions

Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty
Background

Most of the recommendations advanced by the AFPSF as part of the Tenure Track Project fall into the “advice, best practices” bucket.

However, the Committee feels that some of its recommendations warrant formal university-wide adoption and would like to see if the Senate agrees.

In this spirit, resolutions have been drafted that are concerned with

1. The Visibility of College TT Documents
2. The No-contact list
3. The Visibility of the Chair’s Summation Letter to Dean
4. The External Reviewer Selection Process
Visibility of College TT Policy Docs

Current:

While general policy is provided by the university through the Faculty Handbook, implementation details tend to the colleges.

Sharing college tenure processes is somewhat difficult because most colleges have chosen to store their procedure documents on local intranets that prevent public viewing.

CALS and Engineering are exceptions.
Proposal

Require the colleges put all their tenure policy docs online because

• It helps demystify the process.
• It minimizes the chance for procedural missteps.
• It fosters clarity
• It guarantees that all the players are working off the same version.
• It creates an opportunity for the colleges to learn from one another.

More details on the resolution webpage.
No-Contact Lists

Reasons for candidate to place Dr. X on the no-contact list:

• candidate had a professional fight with Dr. X.
• candidate worries that Dr. X might steal research plans.
• candidate competing with Dr. X in some external funding venue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>What the College Says</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAP</td>
<td>Allowed and optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>Allowed and optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Allowed and optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Allowed and Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVM</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILR</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCB</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The candidate can place in the dossier a no-contact list with a brief explanation next to each name.

The department can request a letter from a no-contact individual but then it must produce a justification that becomes part of the dossier.

More details on the Resolution Webpage.
Visibility of the Chair’s Letter to the Dean

Typically, this letter is NOT shared with the voting faculty.
Proposal

Require making the letter visible to the voting faculty for review before it is sent to the Dean. Reasons:

• insures accurate reporting of the deliberations
• supports the principle of transparency
• reinforces the idea that the decision is more than just the Chair’s decision.

More details on the Resolution Webpage.
The External Reviewer List Selection Process

Typical Method

• Department receives the candidate’s list C.
• With that in hand it produces the final list F by augmenting some subset C with its own chosen reviewers.
• The dossier indicates which of the reviewers are candidate-chosen and which are department-chosen.

Encourages the candidate to play second-guessing games with their selection choices.
Process

The candidate list and a preliminary department list are independently created with the charge being “produce the list that you would like to be used.” Both lists go into the dossier.

The department then uses the two lists to produce a final list with rules about using some minimum number of candidate names.

The dossier indicates which of the reviewers are candidate-chosen, department-chosen, or both.

More details on the Resolution Page.

Less “gaming” of the system.

Encourages the candidate to think broadly about external reviewers.

Instead of “list a few reviewers who are familiar with your work” it’s “list a compete set of reviewers who collectively are familiar with your work and its broader impact.”
These matters will be discussed in detail in a later meeting.

Discussions with chairs, deans, and the provost office in the meantime.

Remember that approval involves all these players.