

Committee Survey

Number of Respondents: 44 out of 149 committee members

1. What is your professional rank?

Full Professor: 30

Associate Professor: 8

Distinguished Professor: 1

County Agent: 1

No response: 3

Other: 1- Associate University Librarian

2. Are you:

Tenured: 41

3. How were you selected for this committee?

Appointed by administration: 23

Elected by the faculty: 18

Other: 1 (Comment: I believe I was selected by my department head)

No response: 2

4. Were the tenure and promotion criteria for each department provided to the committee?

Yes: 25

No: 16

N/A: 3

5. Did the criteria for tenure in your unit include a definition of how distinction is measured?

Yes: 31

No: 10

N/A: 3

6. Did the committee consider the faculty member's assignments in applying the tenure or promotion criteria?

Yes: 36

No: 4

N/A: 3

7. Are different expectations placed on individual's applying before the maximal 6 or 7 year limit?

Yes: 8

No: 24

N/A: 11

8. Was the number of years prior to application for tenure a consideration in your decision?

Yes: 17

No: 25

N/A: 2

9. In deciding about a faculty member's candidacy was any unsolicited information considered that was not referenced in the tenure and promotion packet? If yes, please explain

No: 22

No response: 11

Comments (listed below): 10

- telephone calls made to clarify issues and/or questions specific to some packets.
- Other T&P committee members, and in some cases I had personal knowledge of a candidate's history. In very rare cases the knowledge was considered, but always to the benefit of the candidate.
- In one department, it was clear that support for P&T is based on popularity and the road to success was to do favors for the senior faculty, regardless of the credentials. The P&T committee became aware of this and voted in favor whereas the department had not supported the candidacy. The dean asked the candidate to withdraw. Mentoring is a joke in this college.
- I've heard that was the case before I was on the committee. Often, faculty vote on their peers without even reviewing packets. I would suggest that all faculty who vote would have to sign out the packet to at least make the effort to review it. Of course, the voting process would remain confidential. Also, I think the voting process needs to be beefed up to ensure confidentiality. I.E., packets dropped in a secure anonymous way with a third party, not

a dept. leader or secretary. That should be university policy so packets can't be "checked" as they come in. I'm not saying this happens, but it can intimidate faculty unless a fail safe method becomes policy.

- In some cases, T & P committee members were colleagues of the candidate being discussed and knew him/her well. When this situation occurred, sometimes a committee member would offer some unsolicited information about a candidate they knew. This info was most likely considered by at least some of the other committee members when they made their decision.
- Members from one dept. was asked why dept. vote did not support one candidate who had clearly met dept. criteria.
- Yes, In one or two cases questions arose which were explained by a committee member's personal knowledge of a candidate's physical limitations or illness.
- Yes. On occasion the candidate's Department Chair was called in to answer questions the Committee had about the application or applicant.
- Perceptions shared of those on the tenure and promotion committee based on working relationships with the candidate for tenure
- No, occasionally a member of the P & T committee who is from the applicant's discipline will help to clarify the significance of an issue or observation, based on his/her knowledge of the field, but we do not consider unsolicited information
- Although we generally did not consider faculty load, one faculty member did describe how a faculty member under consideration had been assigned a very heavy teaching load. In some ways, an unfair load compared to others in her department.
- I was traveling on the date that we met to discuss one candidate; I sent my comments to the chair of the committee over e-mail who presented them to the group. I was not part of the actual discussion, and therefore was present when the final decision was made.

10. Did you make a final assessment for any candidate in which you were not present for the discussion of that candidate's packet? If yes please explain.

No: 21

- Comment: No final assessment. I have provided input before, but would not vote without having heard the discussion

No response: 11

Yes: 12

- Comments:
 - I sent all of my comments of review of the candidate's packet to the chairman for consideration by the committee when I knew I was not going to be able to meet with them.
 - Yes - I was out of town during the time of the meeting. I provided the chair of the meeting my written assessments of each candidate - the decision on the all the candidates by the committee were in total agreement to my assessments

11. Did the dean charge the committee regarding the tenure and promotion process prior to the review of the packets?

Yes: 33

No: 8

N/A: 3

12. Did you attend one of the University Tenure and Promotion Workshops?

Yes: 16

No: 24

N/A: 4

13. Would you have benefited from any formal training prior to performing these duties?

Yes: 13

No: 27

N/A: 4

14. Your college

28 Responses, 1 comment

- Department Chairs are too autonomous and not accountable to anyone. They need training
- CALS
Engineering - 2
COE

Liberal Arts and Sciences
CLAS - 2
Pharmacy - 4
COMM
Agriculture and Life Sciences - 2
Public Health and Health Professions - 3
Education - 2
Health and Human performance-1
College of Dentistry
PHHP - 3
IFAS
Veterinary Medicine - 2
Medicine - 5
Law
Libraries- 2

No response: 6

15. Do you have any other comments or concerns to share with the Senate Faculty Welfare Council about the tenure and promotion process?

No response: 21

No: 4

20 Comments (listed below):

- None! The committee procedures used were very fair! I was very impressed with the professionalism displayed by the T&P Committee members.
- There needs to be equity in deciding how promotion from associate to full professor occurs. There also needs to be pay equity for females and males. As a full female professor, I earn only 2/3 of what my full male colleagues earn. This female/male pay gap is an unfair labor practice!
- "Tenure when ready" is an excellent policy. Our committee accepted it wholeheartedly. Nonetheless, we saw that some departments are reluctant to follow it.
- The committee worked very hard to be fair and to evaluate candidates in ways that reflected their assignments and the unit's expectations and demands.
- It seems to me that the criteria are clear and that separate criteria from each dept. are unnecessary. I was very impressed by a number of the candidates' packages - clearly the college has done an excellent job of recruiting new faculty.
- The process is flawed from establishing mentoring committee to department head's role and accountability. If department head's were penalized when their junior faculty do not succeed, it would improve the process.
- Often, faculty vote on their peers without even reviewing packets. I would suggest that all faculty who vote would have to sign out the packet to at least make the effort to review it. Of course, the voting process would remain confidential. Also, I think the voting process needs to be beefed up to ensure confidentiality. I.E., packets dropped in a secure anonymous way with a third party, not a dept. leader or secretary. That should be university policy so packets can't be "checked" as they come in. I'm not saying this happens, but it can intimidate faculty unless a fail safe method becomes policy.
- The requirement of 5 letters can be problematic especially for faculty in areas a little out of the mainstream. This requirement may mean we request letters from faculty working in institutions where the work load, or nature of assignment are significantly different from ours and the authors provide a critique that may be out of line with the work of the candidate. In addition, it seems the letters have become so significant that one letter takes on tremendous power. That concerns me.
- Dept. Chairs must also be held responsible for charging the dept. committees and/or faculty regarding use of dept. criteria.
- I think attendance at a TA and P workshop should be STRONGLY encouraged for all chairs at least every couple of years and for all faculty ready to go through the process.
- Candidate was recruited as a full professor despite the fact that the tenure promotion committee had found the candidate not qualified for a full professor status according our tenure/promotion document.
- I am very concerned with the shared governance in the make-up the committee -- In a small college like Phhp there are not enough full-professors to have an equitable representation of the faculty - tenured asso professors should be allowed to serve on the college committees with them
- I believe it is essential that the P & T committee have representation from sufficient numbers of faculty to ensure that there is a diversity of backgrounds on the committee. We need faculty who are clinical and research faculty, as well as both Associate and Full professors to ensure that we have the interests of all of the College faculty represented. It is completely inappropriate and unfair to only allow tenured, Full professors to serve. In our

college, that means that we will have people evaluating faculty who have no really clear concept of what their work and/or discipline is all about. A few of your questions weren't easily answered "yes" or "no". For example, the Dean doesn't charge us each and every time we meet, but he has charged us as a committee and we have an ad hoc representative from the Dean's office who makes sure we understand the charge, so I've answered "yes". Also I checked "no" to whether we receive a copy of departmental criteria because there are no formal departmental criteria. We have historically had all departments represented on the committee, however, to help clarify anything unique to that discipline.

- Department-specific criteria were not considered resulting in response of No on Questions 7 and 8 above. However, the College of Medicine has a detailed promotion and tenure document that was the foundation of the committee's decision making process. My greatest concern for my College is that the mechanisms for faculty assignment by the Chairs and the College compensation plan are not compatible with the criteria for achieving promotion and tenure. The problem is acute in certain clinical Departments.
- I have concerns that criteria are not applied uniformly across departments. It seems far more difficult to secure tenure or promotion to full in one department than the others. Additionally, I do not think chairs are doing a great job thinking about how to support faculty through the tenure and promotion process and then promotion to full. Some faculty seem better supported than others, and the reasons for this are unclear.
- These questions are so vague, and the responses so limited (yes or no), that it is, from my point of view, unanswerable. I'm sorry, but I stopped giving responses when I felt a simple YES or NO check would be misleading.
- I don't know whether I would benefit from such a workshop, since I don't know the formal training entails. The dean's charge and written instructions were fairly comprehensive.
- Yes. According to recent requirement changes (full professor), I, the only representative from my department can no longer serve on the committee (I am at the associate level). This has serious implications for those seeking tenure through my department, since there will be no one to provide insight to the status of science in my field (e.g., top journals, how candidates from my department compare to those obtaining tenure in my field at other universities. I would not want to be coming up for promotion in my department without a representative from my discipline.
- #8...The answer is YES for me; but NO for dept and college committees...in other words I believe people's teaching and service are very important; they take time and dedication...research is the ONLY thing people care about these days.
- The criteria have changed in recent years that have made it more difficult for clinical faculty in college of medicine to become tenured in tenure track. I believe that has led to some confusion and consternation since expectations changed and some individuals promoted under the old rules would not be promoted under the new rules. Prospective candidates for tenure may wonder about the fairness of the system. I am not sure what to do about this, but I pass it along.