Promotion and Tenure Workshop
Spring 2020

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
PURPOSE OF WORKSHOP

• Review Extension Policy Change and Board Memorandum
• Answer questions about P&T process
• Review Board Policy BT0006
• Review Board and University criteria statements
• Review dossier requirements
• Review timeline and workflow
CHANGE TO BOARD EXTENSION POLICY

- New provision for extensions for “a significant disruption of University operations that has impeded the faculty member’s opportunity to conduct required research or other scholarly activity, teaching, and/or service”

- COVID-19 provisions
  - No rationale necessary—automatically granted unless faculty member requests a two-year extension.
  - Deadline to choose and extension is December 31, 2020
  - Can be chosen and you can still go up on schedule without penalty

- Process
  - To come, but we will recommend a simple e-mail to the department head, who then forwards it to the college. Colleges will send provost a spreadsheet with names
CHANGE TO BOARD EXTENSION POLICY

• Difference between extension and suspension
  • Extension adds one year to probationary period. Limited by Board Policy to two years total
  • Suspension stops probationary period. No limits in Board Policy to the number of suspensions a faculty member can have during a probationary period

• Questions in chat
“Tenure is granted after a thorough review which culminates in the University acknowledging a reasonable presumption of the faculty member's professional excellence, and the likelihood that excellence will contribute substantially over a considerable period of time to the mission and anticipated needs of the academic unit in which tenure is granted. Professional excellence is reflected in the faculty member's teaching, research, and service including the faculty member's ability to interact appropriately with colleagues and students. The relative weights of these factors will vary according to the fit between the faculty member and the mission of the academic unit in which he or she is appointed.”
BOARD POLICY ON PROMOTION AND TENURE

• Your must provide
  • evidence of professional excellence in all three major categories of faculty effort

• The university must provide
  • Transparent requirements / criteria defining excellence in your discipline
  • Clear communication of progress during the probationary period through retention reviews and annual evaluations
  • Adequate mentoring and support during the probationary period
  • Fair and equitable process
“Professional excellence is reflected in the faculty member’s teaching (which includes advising and mentoring), research, and service or other creative work in the discipline, participation in professional organizations, willingness to contribute to the common life of the university, and effective work with colleagues and students, including the faculty member’s ability to interact appropriately with colleagues and students. It is the responsibility of departments and colleges to define professional excellence in terms of their respective disciplines.” §3.11.4.
UTK / UTIA FACULTY HANDBOOK CRITERIA

- **TEACHING**: “become good, solid teachers who work enthusiastically with students, try new approaches to pedagogy, and contribute to the development of departmental programs.”
- **RESEARCH**: “establish an independent record of accomplishment in scholarly work, normed to the standards of the discipline, which can be documented and validated by peers.”
- **SERVICE**: “develop first as teachers and scholars, leaving serious involvement in service until after a sound academic record is established.” §3.11.4
CRITERIA – FROM THE HANDBOOK TO THE DEPARTMENT

• Criteria vary from college to college and from unit to unit, normed to disciplinary standards.
• You need to know standard of excellence in your discipline.
• You should work with department head and mentor to address any questions about what constitutes excellence.
• Most frequent complaint about tenure and promotion processes is uncertainty about criteria.
TIMING OF APPLICATION FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

• Six-year probationary period.
• P&T review in year six.
  • After unsuccessful application, candidate granted seventh and final year
• Early consideration
  • Requires approval at all levels
  • Granting of tenure requires Board action
• Extension / suspension of standard probationary period
  • Extension (year added on): for good cause due to procedural error or failure of the university to perform a promised action
  • Suspension (year suspended, not counted): usually granted under the university’s Family Care Policy. May also be granted when the faculty member takes a leave of absence for non-educational reasons
TIMING OF APPLICATION FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

• Typically, five years should pass between promotion to associate and promotion to full

• With sufficient justification and consultation with department head, interval can be shortened

• Review process focuses primarily on work completed since promotion to associate professor
PREPARATION OF MATERIALS

• Understand dossier requirements: Provost’s Website

• Schedule peer evaluations of teaching
  • First evaluation should be in 3rd semester
  • Second evaluation no later than spring semester before tenure year

• Prepare for Enhanced Retention Review—Year 4
  • Mini-dossier, with statements on teaching, research, service
  • By spring semester before the tenure consideration year, you should have discussed with your head timing of submission of materials and lists of appropriate external reviewers
RULES GUIDING SOLICITATION OF EXTERNAL LETTERS

• Reviewers must be able to give objective, “arms-length” assessment of candidate’s scholarship
• Must be above the rank of the person being reviewed
• Should be prominent in field and from peer institution
• Department Head must request at least eight letters
• No more than half of those requested can come from scholars on the candidate’s list
• Dossier must have five letters
• Department head is responsible to ensure that the requirements governing external letters are met
WHAT EXTERNAL REVIEWERS ARE ASKED TO APPRAISE

• External reviewers are asked to give a frank appraisal of the following, based on a review of the candidate’s scholarly outputs.
  • research abilities and creative achievements
  • quality of work
  • reputation or standing in the field
  • potential for further achievement
  • whether candidate would be ranked among the most capable and promising scholars in area
• Also asked to compare candidate to others at the same stage of professional development.
CONTENTS OF THE DOSSIER

• Candidate’s responsibility
  • Section A: Education & Employment History, Responsibilities, Criteria Statements, English certification
  • Section B: Evidence of Excellence in Teaching
  • Section C: Evidence of Excellence in Scholarship
  • Section D: Evidence of Excellence in Service
  • Section E. Candidate Signature Page

Sections B, C, and D begin with a statement and continue with a list of appropriate accomplishments
CONTENTS OF THE DOSSIER

• Head’s responsibility
  • Section F: Letters from external reviewers
  • Section G: Evaluative Documents
    • Retention Reviews (forms and narratives)
    • Annual Reviews (forms and narratives)
    • Tenure and Promotion evaluations from tenured faculty

Although the candidate is expected to provide reliable information, the department head is responsible for seeing that the dossier is presented in good form
ACCESS TO EXTERNAL LETTERS

• You have a right to review letters from external reviewers
  • To review external letters, you must request to do so in writing to the department head
• Why read the letters?
• Why not read the letters?
TIMELINE AND WORKFLOW – CANDIDATE’S PREPARATION

3RD SEMESTER -- SCHEDULE PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

6TH SEMESTER -- ASSEMBLE PRE-DOSSIER FOR ENHANCED TENURE-TRACK REVIEW

10TH SEMESTER – MEET WITH DEPARTMENT HEAD TO DISCUSS LIST OF EXTERNAL REVIEWERS AND TIMELINE FOR DOSSIER SUBMISSION; SCHEDULE 2ND PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

11TH SEMESTER -- FINALIZE AND SUBMIT DOSSIER
TIMELINE AND WORKFLOW – DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW

1. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW (NOVEMBER OF 11TH SEMESTER)
2. DEPARTMENT HEAD REVIEW (DECEMBER OF 11TH SEMESTER)
3. DISSENTING STATEMENTS
4. CANDIDATE NOTIFIED THAT DOSSIER COMPLETE AT DEPARTMENT
5. CANDIDATE HAS TWO WEEKS TO RESPOND TO DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
TIMELINE AND WORKFLOW – COLLEGE REVIEW

1. COLLEGE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE (JANUARY OF 12TH SEMESTER)
2. DEAN (FEBRUARY-MARCH OF 12TH SEMESTER)
3. CANDIDATE NOTIFIED THAT DOSSIER COMPLETE AT COLLEGE
4. CANDIDATE HAS TWO WEEKS TO RESPOND COLLEGE RECOMMENDATIONS
TIMELINE AND WORKFLOW – UNIVERSITY REVIEW

PROVOST (APRIL OF 12TH SEMESTER)

CANDIDATE NOTIFIED THAT PROVOST REVIEW COMPLETED

CANDIDATE HAS TWO WEEKS TO RESPOND TO PROVOST REVIEW

CHANCELLOR (MAY OF 12TH SEMESTER)

CANDIDATE HAS TWO WEEKS TO RESPOND TO CHANCELLOR REVIEW
VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND STUDENT SUCCESS (MAY OF 12TH SEMESTER)

IF ON TIME, ENDS WITH PRESIDENT'S APPROVAL

IF EARLY CONSIDERATION, ENDS WITH BOARD APPROVAL (END OF JUNE AFTER 12TH SEMESTER)