

APB Tenure and Promotion Survey Results

July 27, 2007

Question 1 Is the composition of the APB adequate to perform its duties?

5 Yes

0 No

Question 2 If no, please explain

Question 3 Should a subcommittee of distinguished faculty review the distinguished professor applications?

4 Yes

1 No

Question 4 Were tenure and promotion criteria for each unit provided to the APB?

4 Yes

1 No

Question 5 Did these criteria provide adequate guidance in your decision making process?

4 Yes

1 No

Question 6 Did the board consider the faculty member's assignment in applying the tenure and promotion criteria?

5 Yes

0 No

Question 7 In deciding about a faculty member's candidacy was any unsolicited information considered, that was not referenced in the tenure and promotion packet?

1 Yes

4 No

Question 8 If yes please explain

My answer is probably no, but we did get clarifying information, as needed, from various Deans. In that sense, the information was "solicited." I don't recall anything else being put on the table, so my answer to No. 7 is more than likely "no."

Question 9 Are different expectations placed on individual's applying before the maximal 6 or 7 year limit?

1 Yes

3 No

1 NA

Question 10 Was the number of years prior to application for tenure a consideration in your decision?

3 Yes

2 No

Question 11 Did you make a final assessment for any candidate in which you were not present for the discussion of that candidate's packet?

4 No

1 Yes

Question 12 If yes please explain

I reviewed the packets and submitted comments to the Chair. Since the committee has multiple discussions on candidates whose cases were marginal or disputed, there was opportunity at least 1-2 times more to participate in the group discussions. So, one absence was not an issue at all.

Question 13 Is the number of current members sufficient to perform APB assigned duties?

4 Yes

1 No

Comment: Answer to No. 13 is "more or less." There are many packets to review [over 200 this year] and it helps to have opinions from APB members representing different parts of the campus. But not all parts of the campus are represented on the APB so in that sense, insuring representation from all of the major colleges [and perhaps one to represent the smaller units] would be helpful. This could result in perhaps 2 more members.

Comment:

The number of members is not an issue in that every member of the board reads every packet that comes before the board. The board discusses in detail every case for which any member of the board has a question or concern. In cases where a negative assessment is ultimately reached it is reached after the board reviewed the case on three separate occasions. The board in its deliberations is very concerned with the concept of fairness. Negative assessments are not made lightly, and every consideration is given to the candidate. I think it is fair to say that those who have served on the board are truly inspired and humbled by the breadth and depth of the University. We truly have an outstanding faculty.

Question 14 Do you have any other comments or concerns to share with the Senate Faculty Welfare council about the tenure and promotion process?

Comment: Recently, people have been much too critical, much too hard on candidates...teaching and service are almost ignored; publishing in high impact journals and receiving large externally funded grants seem to be 99% of the decision...it's time to back off on these incredibly high expectations and look at the entire packet and start respecting teaching quality and teaching load more as well as professional and especially community service more; and service/nurturing/rec letter writing for our students...so much more which is all being ignored these days. Thanks for inviting us to offer this feedback.