

**GC Tenure and Promotion Taskforce Final Report**  
**April 13, 2017**  
**Timeline**

In spring 2015, President Dorman charged the Provost with creating a Tenure & Promotion Task Force to review a number items. This task force was formed (Appendix A – Committee Composition).

- ❖ October 2015
  - Taskforce given their charge from Dr. Dorman
- ❖ November 2015
  - Taskforce met and had representatives from the Office of ENGAGE and the Office for Institutional Equity and Diversity share information and ideas.
  - Discussed Dr. Dorman’s suggestion of finding out how the GC community felt in respect to each of the charges.
  - Determined to have a “listening tour” of the campus with a series of open forums, 2 for assistant professors; 2 for associate professors; and 2 for professors. They would be announced via front page and all were welcome.
- ❖ December 2015
  - Worked with IT to establish a website and taskforce email list serve.
- ❖ January 2016
  - Taskforce met to discuss the tenure and promotion documents of all the different academic units (Arts and Sciences; Health Sciences; Business; Education, Library)
  - Determined the dates and times for the open forums that would begin in the fall.
- ❖ July 2016
  - Dr. Griffin met with Drs. Dorman and Spirou with an update on the progress of the taskforce.
  - Dr. Griffin discussed the open forums and informed them that the listening tour would begin in August.
- ❖ August 2016
  - Dr. Griffin presented a quick update to the university community at the Welcome Back
- ❖ August 2016 – October 2016
  - A total of six open forums were established and the taskforce decided not to meet again until after the open forums:
    - 8/31 – 7 in attendance; 9/8 – 7 in attendance; 9/19 – 5 in attendance; 9/27 – 6 in attendance; 10/18 – 4 in attendance; 10/26 – 12 in attendance.
  - A total of 41 faculty attended one of the 6 open forums (headcount does not include the number of taskforce members in attendance)

- ❖ November 2016
  - A copy of all the responses from all the open forums (combined responses) were distributed to the taskforce.
  - A decision was made to send the same 11 points of the charge out to the community via a survey on front page...due to the low participant turnout for the open forums.
  - The survey was posted on front page.
- ❖ December 2016
  - There were 6 people who responded to the online survey and a copy of the responses was distributed to the taskforce via email.
- ❖ February 2017
  - The taskforce met to discuss and determine general consensus regarding the responses collected from the Open Forums held during the fall semester.
  - See **Appendix B** for discussion details of listening tour.
  - Next steps:
    - The committee will look at the promotion and tenure processes at aspirational universities (Appalachian State University; Miami of Ohio; Winthrop University; Longwood University; USC-Upstate; University of Mary Washington; College of Charleston; University of North Carolina at Wilmington), including:
      - Whether P&T are separate or together
      - University level P&T committees and/or university level P&T documents
      - Pre-tenure practices
      - Diversity recognition in documents
      - Scholarship Definitions
      - Best Practices & Tenure Decisions
      - External Reviews for P&T
      - Guidelines for Administration in reference to the P&T process
- ❖ April 2017
  - The taskforce discussed the findings from the aforementioned work using aspirational institutions.
  - The taskforce was informed that Drs. Dorman and Brown wanted to meet with us so we worked on writing recommendations based on the information we have garnered and the discussions we have had over the past two years.
  - This meeting took place April 27, 2017. The recommendations were discussed one by one with clarification requested by President and/or Provost.
  - Please see **Appendix C** for recommendations.

**Appendix A**  
**Tenure & Promotion Task Force Composition**

Dr. Stephen Auerbach, College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Karen Berman, College of Arts & Sciences (FAPC representative 2015-2016)

Dr. Alex Blazer, College of Arts & Sciences (FAPC representative 2016-2017)

Dr. Ryan Brown, College of Arts & Sciences (FAPC representative 2015-2016)

Ms. Shannon Gardner (ex officio), Academic Affairs

Dr. Douglas Goings (co-chair), College of Business

Dr. Lisa Griffin (co-chair), College of Health Sciences

Mr. Eric Griffis, College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. David Johnson, College of Arts & Sciences (FAPC representative 2016-2017)

Dr. Karl Manrodt, College of Business

Dr. Lyndall Muschell, College of Education

Dr. Craig Turner, College of Arts & Sciences

Mr. Edward Whatley, Ina Dillard Russell Library

Dr. Diana Young, College of Arts & Sciences

## **Appendix B**

### **Listening Tour Discussions**

- 1. Review the viability of a university-level tenure and promotion committee which would guide the decisions of the provost and president after the dean's assessment.**
  - The campus community generally felt this should be for process accountability only, not for decision-making. Some responders were against adding another level of review by inserting a university-level committee.
- 2. Review the viability of external review of dossiers.**
  - The campus community felt skeptical and wanted more clarification. What constitutes 'external'? Outside of the department? Outside of Georgia College? Would the entire dossier be reviewed or just samples? External reviews at each level or only to full professor?
- 3. Review the roles/expectations of department, college & university T&P committees.**

Some in the campus community were unsure of what each level (department, college) does. There was mention that there should be bylaws against double jeopardy. Another opinion was that serving and voting on both a department and college was acceptable when the committees have different roles as presently realized in College of Arts and Sciences.
- 4. Review the roles/expectations of department chairs and deans.**
  - The campus community felt that department chairs should write the most contextualized letters for those seeking promotion and/or tenure. Some felt that there needs to be better communication from the chairs to candidates.
- 5. Review the current use of a 'point system' in determining tenure and promotion decisions.**
  - The majority of the campus community does not want the point system for P&T. The quantitative component of the IFRs (primarily to assist chairs with proposing merit increases in annual salaries) and the P&T point system referred to in the President's charge are different. Many felt that the IFR should be better aligned to take people along the path to P&T.
- 6. Review the criteria for determining excellence for teaching, service, and scholarship for tenure, promotion to associate and promotion to professor.**
  - Scholarship of Engagement and Diversity need to be delineated in all levels of P&T documents. Many in the campus community felt this area needs to be more flexible to encompass different versions in different disciplines. Also, need clear definitions of excellence.
- 7. Review criteria and suggest ways for community engagement and undergraduate research artifacts and other high impact practices to be included in tenure and promotion determinations.**
  - Some in the campus community mentioned being told they were "doing fine" at yearly reviews, but then were told they hadn't done enough when it was time for P&T review. Clearly define excellence. The goal being to acknowledge engagement in these practices as a viable option in the realm of meritorious activity contributing to tenure and promotion.

**8. Review and remove any conflicts of interest embedded in the current system/structure.**

The campus community was concerned about double jeopardy/conflicts of interest by reviewers, though there was minimal articulation of their definition or examples of conflict of interest. One clear example was recusing from service on a review committee for a spouse or significant other. Another opinion was that serving and voting on both a department and college was acceptable when the committees have different roles as presently realized in College of Arts and Sciences.

**9. Review and suggest processes for improvement in university, college and departmental guidelines.**

- The campus community wants more communication and guidance regarding the pre-tenure process.
- The campus community feels the pre-tenure process needs structure.
- Pre-tenure has not been reviewed/modified since its inception in 1996.
- There were suggestions that pre-tenure review be less formative and more summative (colloquially “have more teeth”)
- Pre-tenure needs more consistency.

**10. Ensure that our tenure and promotion guidelines and practices are in alignment with best practice and with USG guidelines and polices; and that our guidelines and practices are used and adhered to throughout each stage of the process.**

- Some in the campus community feel that low salaries are driving the P&T timeline (to get faculty to more acceptable salary levels sooner by getting a promotion accompanied by its increment in salary). A contrasting opinion was that low salaries was a separate concern from promotion and tenure and that longer probationary windows (more than five years) should be considered, particularly for promotion from associate to full.
- Policies and procedures in place need to be followed until new changes can be vetted and policies revised or rewritten.
- Revisions should not be made to tenure and promotion policies and procedures unless recommended by faculty.
- Another opinion expressed in the forums was that associate professor promotion and tenure be separate decisions.

**11. If guidelines and processes change, advise on processes and procedures to protect and guide faculty who entered under the previous system.**

- A majority of the respondents in the campus community is concerned about how changing P&T processes will affect those already working on P&T and want them to be grandfathered in.
- Need clarification if promotion and tenure are separate or together and if this is consistent with current written policy.

## Appendix C Final Recommendations

1. Review the viability of a university-level tenure and promotion committee which would guide the decisions of the provost and president after the dean's assessment.
  - A. **The task force could not reach an agreement with deliberations.**
  - B. **There was debate among the task force members as to the opinion of the GC community based on feedback received in open forums and survey data. Attendance at the forums was very low, as was survey response rate.**
  - C. **Upon examining aspirational institutions, the task force was able to determine that three out of the eight had university level oversight committees for tenure and promotion.**
  
2. Review the viability of external review of dossiers.

**Recommendation:**  
**Empower colleges to provide the option of instituting external reviews of dossiers when seeking promotions.**
  
3. Review the roles/expectations of department, college & university T&P committees.

**Recommendation:**  
**No recommendation provided.**
  
4. Review the roles/expectations of department chairs and deans.

**Recommendation:**  
**Chairs should be tasked with writing highly contextualized letters for candidates seeking promotions and tenure.**
  
5. Review the current use of a 'point system' in determining tenure and promotion decisions.

**Recommendation:**  
**A point system should *not* be used in determining tenure and promotion decisions.**
  
6. Review the criteria for determining excellence for teaching, service, and scholarship for tenure, promotion to associate and promotion to professor.

**Recommendation:**  
**The departmental levels should determine the criteria for excellence - complete with examples of specific performance indicators.**
  
7. Review criteria and suggest ways for community engagement and undergraduate research artifacts and other high impact practices to be included in tenure and promotion determinations.

**Recommendation:**  
**Promotion and tenure guidelines should clearly indicate that the following are valued but not required:**

- a. **Faculty interactions and engagement with communities outside the traditional scholarly community when such interactions and engagement are scholarly, creative, or pedagogical activities for the public good - directed towards persons and groups outside GC.**
  - b. **Outputs and impacts of faculty members' efforts to promote equity, inclusivity, diversity, and respect.**
  - c. **Mentoring undergraduate research.**
  - d. **Quality teaching and assessment of high-impact practices and Essential Learning Outcomes (LEAP).**
8. Review and remove any conflicts of interest embedded in the current system/structure.  
**Recommendation:**  
**If there is a conflict of interest with any candidate (previously reviewed dossier, related to candidate, etc.), a reviewer must recuse themselves from the review committee.**
9. Review and suggest processes for improvement in university, college and departmental guidelines.  
**Recommendation:**  
**Revamp the pre-tenure process to be a more formalized practice that would include official reviews of materials from both the chairs and the deans.**
10. Ensure that our tenure and promotion guidelines and practices are in alignment with best practice and with USG guidelines and polices; and that our guidelines and practices are used and adhered to throughout each stage of the process.
11. If guidelines and processes change, advise on processes and procedures to protect and guide faculty who entered under the previous system.  
**Recommendation:**  
**When university, college or departmental guidelines and processes directly related to the promotion and tenure process change, the portfolios of faculty *within close proximity* of submitting materials for tenure and/or promotion shall be reviewed under the "old" promotion and tenure guidelines and processes. The task force has not yet reached consensus on an operational definition for *within close proximity*, yet does agree that an operational definition for *within close proximity* is essential.**

**April 27, 2017:** Final recommendations presented to President & Provost; President thanked committee for its diligent work during past two years and asked that the Provost move forward with recommendations made by the task force.

**August 15, 2017:** Tenure & Promotion Task Force Recommendations shared with ECUS by Provost

**September 2017:** Final Report placed on Office of Academic Affairs website and shared with all Deans and Department chairs