

Proposal 1, Attachment 2:

New Standard for Promotion and Tenure for all Faculty

The current standard for promotion is problematic as applied to all faculty, but in particular to non-tenure track faculty. Officially, promotions are allowed for non-tenure track faculty, but in practice it is difficult for most to satisfy the standard.

Section 4.1.6 (“Non-Tenure Track Faculty”) of the Faculty Handbook requires that non-tenure track faculty must at a minimum meet the requirements for the academic rank of instructor. In addition, non-tenure track faculty may hold a higher academic rank if they “meet the same criteria for academic rank as is required for tenure track faculty.” Accordingly, non-tenure track faculty may hold a rank above instructor (e.g., assistant, associate, or full professor) so long as they meet the “same criteria” required of tenure-track faculty holding such rank. Non-tenure track instructors are hired as “instructional, clinical, public service or research faculty.” As such, most are unlikely to be able to satisfy the criteria prescribed for tenure track faculty holding academic ranks above instructor. This is because tenure track faculty seeking a promotion must demonstrate “excellence” in either teaching or scholarship, or in some departments in both. But many CNTT faculty conduct no scholarship, while others do not teach. Thus, these faculty cannot satisfy the standard for promotion.

In thinking about a more appropriate standard for such promotion cases, we need to recognize that there are two distinct categories of faculty at the University, and it is difficult to evaluate the two categories according to the same standard—which is intended to reward excellence in scholarship and teaching. Tenure-track faculty are hired to conduct scholarship, teach classes, and perform service, while non-tenure track faculty are hired to perform specific specialized tasks—which usually do not include scholarship. We also must recognize that excellence in teaching, clinical work, funded research, and service is very different than excellence in scholarship. These are fundamentally different academic activities, and a single standard does not take into account these differences. That said, national research universities typically reserve promotions to the traditional academic ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor to those who are excellent in scholarship (broadly defined to include research, publications, artistic activity, etc.).

The goal is to treat all faculty equitably while at the same time promoting scholarship. Accordingly, we should adopt a more flexible standard that takes into account the different categories of faculty and the tasks they perform. Decisions on promotion and tenure should reflect a holistic judgment regarding the faculty member's academic activities, contributions to the academic mission of the University, and their department's unique requirements. We cannot adopt a one-size-fits-all rule or impose a single standard across the University throughout the various units where faculty pursue very different academic disciplines.

In place of the current standard, which focuses on scholarship, teaching, and service, candidates should be required to demonstrate “excellence in their academic endeavors.” Departments will provide the specific details in their documents as to what constitutes excellence in one’s “academic endeavors” in that department or the relevant academic discipline. For tenure-track faculty who are hired to conduct scholarship and provided with an administered workload and a research sabbatical, a promotion invariably will require demonstrating excellence in scholarship. Proficiency in teaching also may be required where tenure track faculty are assigned to teach. Other departments may require that candidates demonstrate excellence in *both* scholarship and teaching—or perhaps in some other academic activity relevant to that discipline. While service may be assigned to tenure-track faculty, and where it is, must be taken into account in annual evaluations and the distribution of merit pay, it will not be recognized as an “academic endeavor” for purposes of promotion or tenure.

The same standard will apply in promotions for CNTT faculty who are hired primarily (or exclusively) for instruction, clinical work, funded lab research, or public service. For example, in the case of non-tenure-track faculty who are hired for teaching, their “academic endeavors” would be their instructional activities (broadly defined), but it *could* include a scholarship component if the candidate performs such activity. Indeed, nothing should ever preclude continuing non-tenure-track faculty hired for teaching, clinical, research, or service from submitting evidence of excellence in scholarship. CNTT faculty could meet the standard for promotion by demonstrating excellence in their assigned specialized activities (e.g., teaching, clinical, lab research, or public service), **and** submit evidence of excellence in scholarship to strengthen the case for promotion. Evidence of scholarship should never be excluded when evaluating a candidate’s case for excellence in their “academic endeavors.”

Finally, junior faculty will be “grandfathered” under the current standard when they come up for promotion during the probationary period *or* they may elect to be evaluated under the new standard. That protection is already in the Faculty Handbook. The new standard will be mandatory only for new hires, who will have notice of what is required of them.

(revised 4/19/13)