

## Tenure and Promotion College Committee survey results 2008

54 responses

### Section: Survey

Description: *Survey*

---

#### Question No.: 1.

**Question Description:** What is your professorial rank?

Answer Choices:

- Full professor: 83%
  - Associate Professor: 4%
  - Distinguished professor: 7%
  - County Agent: 2%
  - Other : 4%
- 

#### Question No.: 2.

**Question Description:** If other, please explain

**Each item corresponds to a response by one student :**

- *librarians??*
  - *Associate Librarian*
  - *University Librarian*
  - *Associate Librarian (equivalent to professor)*
- 

#### Question No.: 3.

**Question Description:** Are you

Answer Choices:

- Tenured: 94%
  - Non-tenured, permanent: 4%
  - Non-tenured, non-permanent: 2%
- 

#### Question No.: 4.

**Question Description:** How were you selected for this committee?

Answer Choices:

- Elected by the faculty: 46%
  - Appointed by the administration: 47%
  - Other : 7%
- 

#### Question No.: 5.

**Question Description:** If "other" please explain

**Each item corresponds to a response by one student :**

- *volunteered?*

- *Not sure*
  - *I don't know.*
  - *Nominated by administration, and then approved by the faculty*
  - *I was appointed for my first term, then elected for my second term.*
- 

**Question No.:** 6.

**Question Description:** Were the tenure and promotion criteria for each department provided to the committee?

Percentage Yes : 78  
Percentage No : 20  
Percentage Unanswered : 2

---

**Question No.:** 7.

**Question Description:** Did the criteria for tenure in your unit include a definition of distinction?

Percentage Yes : 60  
Percentage No : 36  
Percentage Unanswered : 4

---

**Question No.:** 8.

**Question Description:** Did the committee consider the faculty member's assignments in applying the tenure or promotion criteria?

Percentage Yes : 93  
Percentage No : 7  
Percentage Unanswered : 0

---

**Question No.:** 9.

**Question Description:** Is peer evaluation of teaching used as one of your criteria?

Percentage Yes : 82  
Percentage No : 18  
Percentage Unanswered : 0

---

**Question No.:** 10.

**Question Description:** Are factors other than student evaluations used for critical assessment of teaching?

Percentage Yes : 85  
Percentage No : 13  
Percentage Unanswered : 2

---

**Question No.:** 11.

**Question Description:** If yes what are they?

**Each item corresponds to a response by one student :**

- *peer evaluations*

- resident evals peer evals national recognition as educator
- Peer evaluation of teaching
- peer evaluation
- publications, educational materials developed, national programs taught, books published
- We look at course designs and exams.
- peer review letters
- peer review and in class observation of teaching by two peer.
- Assessment by peers.
- peer classroom visits are written up and reported
- This is sometimes true, depending on whether or not the candidate's packet includes additional evaluation measures, usually peer reviews
- The peer evaluation of lecturing
- While some Librarians teach classes, more often Librarians teach workshops for which students are not registered and do not provide evaluations.
- Reviewed teaching philosophy statement. Considered teaching-related presentations and publications as well as enhancement activities (training).
- peer evaluations; annual evaluations from department chair; candidate's teaching statement
- a teaching statement and peer evaluations
- Peer review letters
- Peer evals, curriculum development, continuing medical education activities, teaching scholarship
- If available, peer review of teaching by another faculty member.
- peer evaluation, publications in journals about teaching, attendance at seminars, symposia, etc that provide information about teaching
- Peer evaluations
- Peer evaluations. Read your own question 9.
- Peer evaluation if it is available.
- Peer evaluation, amount of teaching, performance if data are provided
- peer evaluations, chair evaluations, teaching statement, course list
- information provided by the department
- Course development
- Peer evaluations.
- We have 2 peer evaluations of teaching (each evaluation is done by a colleague who visits a class twice per year) for each year.
- Teaching is part of the public service function, but evaluations are not often used in 1 hour classes related to information skills.
- Residents and Fellows
- Evaluation of teaching considered classroom teaching, graduate student mentorship and other advisement (e.g. high honors students, student society mentorship, and peer evaluation if provided)
- peer evaluations
- letters and on some rare occasions peer evaluations
- Teaching awards, syllabi and other examples that the applicant wanted included in the packet
- Peer evaluations were used by a few departments. The process is not well developed and considered "soft" by some. For example, when we see multiple peer evaluations which rate all candidates as a "5 out of 5" the process becomes meaningless.
- Peer evaluation (although there are few active programs across various depts, teaching awards
- peer evaluation
- Librarians, in general, are not teaching faculty.
- As noted, the peer evaluations are considered, as well as a teaching portfolio provided by the faculty member.
- peer evaluations, awards, publications, etc.
- Evaluations also based on: indicators of mentorship, joint publications with students, and number of graduate student committees (chair, member).

-----  
**Question No.:** 12.

**Question Description:** Is service an important factor in your evaluation of the candidate's packet?

Percentage Yes : 56

Percentage No : 44

Percentage Unanswered : 0  
-----

**Question No.:** 13.

**Question Description:** If yes, how do you assess the value of service?

**Each item corresponds to a response by one student :**

- *depends on how the faculty member puts together their packet to show what they have done.*
- *chairman's annual evaluation, letters of recommendation, experience of T&P committee members.*
- *Not important for Asst to Assoc. Important for Assoc to Full and Full to DP: looked at dept and national impact of service*
- *regional, state, national and UF committees, leadership, program development*
- *difficult to assess service unless it is a major facet of duties and in that case it is well documents, usually most faculty go up for tenure/promotion with teaching and research as major components*
- *We look at both professional service and service to the state and university. In terms of professional service, we look for participation at the national level with an emphasis on committee work directly relevant to the librarian's assignment. Election to office is also valued. In terms of public service, we look for professional involvement in state library organizations and participation with colleagues in library related activities. We also encourage and value service to the campus and community.*
- *More important for promotion to Professor than for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor*
- *The Libraries' Career Development Handbook provides examples useful in assessing service activities.*
- *There is no one metric as the type of service, particularly outside-the-university service, varies.*
- *looked for on-going activities and engagement in the life of the unit and the institution from junior candidates; looked for evidence of leadership from candidates for promotion to senior rank*
- *quantity and quality of committees in the dept., college, university, and the profession. Relative time commitment and importance to the unit.*
- *By percent of assignment*
- *Some faculty have service as one of the two major categories for evaluation. Peer faculty review of service is usual assessment.*
- *Statements in letters from candidates supervisor or from colleagues in the college.*
- *It depends since we evaluate both clinical and basic science faculty. We look at clinical service when appropriate, but also service with department, college, university, and external duties.*
- *In different ways, depending on the individual situation.*
- *professional service is usually correlated with the level of scholarship and recognition by the community*
- *If a candidate has not shown up for meetings or has not done the service requested of him/her it is noted, but successful service is not particularly praised or evaluated*
- *Usually in terms of professional organizations...offices held.*
- *It is for me but I don't think it is for many of the other members of the committee*
- *Mostly for promotion to full professor rank. Professional service at national and international levels. University service (Dept, college, and University) was considered a must. However, it was expected that assistant professors had more limited service assignments.*
- *Yes, but not as important as teaching and research. We look at service to the department, the college, the university, professional service.*
- *some clinical service but in reality - this is more a formality Service to the university is only really considered if there is none listed - research out ranks all*
- *Evidence of clinical work if clinically trained, journal reviews, professional organization activity above & beyond membership-*

*leadership roles*

- *committee activity is reviewed as well as chairs letter that address this aspect*
  - *Job assignments (position description), letters of evaluation, and other letters of support.*
  - *It can be depending on the faculty member's assignment. Since service is part of certain positions in our College, we must consider that. Also, service to national academic and professional associations are noted and considered important. (At least that's true for me. I'm not sure some other faculty members/ administrators consider it as important as I do*
  - *Given the diversity of activities and expectations across units, the cover letter from the chair, and input from committee members in the unit, provided guidelines to assess service activities.*
- 

**Question No.:** 14.

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

Percentage Yes : 5

Percentage No : 93

Percentage Unanswered : 2

---

**Question No.:** 15.

**Question Description:** If yes, please explain

**Each item corresponds to a response by one student :**

- *I don't recall.*
  - *committee members knowledge of the candidate from interaction with him or her*
  - *Sometimes, citations and other indicators of journal quality were brought up by committee members.*
  - *Sometimes things about a candidate come up in discussion, but unless there is hard evidence, that information plays no role.*
  - *One candidate had difficulty working with peers. This was discussed but I don't remember it being referenced in the packet.*
  - *Not that I can remember, anyway.*
  - *No. Although, on occasion, additional information was solicited from the department in order to clarify an ambiguity in the packet.*
- 

**Question No.:** 16.

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

Percentage Yes : 9

Percentage No : 89

Percentage Unanswered : 2

---

**Question No.:** 17.

**Question Description:** If yes, please explain

**Each item corresponds to a response by one student :**

- *Two people went forward who were not reviewed by the committee. Votes were taken based on committee members reviewing packets without discussion.*
- *I was out of town for one meeting - reviewed packets (vote of others was given to me). None of the packets from that meeting had split votes and I agreed with the assessment after reading the packets.*
- *No.*

- *Recent special appointment required instant tenure.*
  - *I was out of the country and sent comments in writing to all other committee members*
- 

**Question No.:** 18.

**Question Description:** Did the dean charge the committee regarding the tenure and promotion process prior to the review of the packets?

Percentage Yes : 84  
Percentage No : 15  
Percentage Unanswered : 2

---

**Question No.:** 19.

**Question Description:** Did you attend one of the University Tenure and Promotion Workshops?

Percentage Yes : 35  
Percentage No : 64  
Percentage Unanswered : 2

---

**Question No.:** 20.

**Question Description:** Would you have benefited from any formal training prior to performing these duties?

Percentage Yes : 31  
Percentage No : 62  
Percentage Unanswered : 7

---

**Question No.:** 21.

**Question Description:** Please list your college

**Each item corresponds to a response by one student :**

- *PERCIVAL*
- *Public Health and Health Professions*
- *medicine*
- *Medicine*
- *Health and Human Performance*
- *CLAS*
- *medicine*
- *Business*
- *pharmacy*
- *Engineering*
- *Libraries*
- *college of pharmacy*
- *COE*
- *Journalism and Communications*
- *Dentistry*
- *Pharmacy*
- *Libraries*

- IFAS
- CLAS
- Journalism & Communications
- Law.
- CLAS
- College of Medicine
- *The guidelines and criteria for review of each packet were well-explained by the chair of the committee.*
- Medicine
- Law
- College of Dentistry
- Medicine
- CLAS
- engineering
- Engineering
- Public Health and Health Professions
- Engineering
- law
- Medicine
- Engineering
- Journalism and Communications
- PHHP
- Public Health & Health Professions
- College of Dentistry
- Horticultural Sciences
- Dentistry
- CALS
- Pharmacy
- University Libraries
- College of Journalism and Communications
- Journalism and Communications
- CLAS

-----

**Question No.: 22.**

**Question Description:** Do you have any other comments or concerns to share with the Faculty Senate Welfare Council?

**Each item corresponds to a response by one student :**

- *more education is needed for the department chairs so that they develop better skills in developing that packets*
- *the process is fair .I have served on the personnel board for UF for 1 term and have seen our College implement many procedures that make clear to faculty what is required for tenure, including a midterm evaluation. In my opinion, the College is very proactive in helping faculty.*
- No
- *It seems that the bar has been raised, so that faculty members now have more difficulty earning tenure. Faculty can be reviewed favorably by the college's T&P committee, which knows best the work they have done, but still be turned down by the university committee. This is frustrating both to the candidates and to the college T&P committees.*
- *I believe that the current system, at least in my college, works well and that deserving candidates are treated fairly.*

- There was a lack of consistency in the packets sent to the committee in terms of both structure and content. Annual evaluations also lack consistency. The Libraries would benefit tremendously by having one person designated to review faculty personnel materials. As it is, materials come from three libraries and numerous departments without prior review and no effort is made to correct problems. I would also clarify my answer to question six. Although we are tenured in departments, criteria for T & P comes from one libraries-wide governance unit, not the departments. Whether this actually works, and whether this causes some of the problems mentioned earlier, are questions that cannot be answered in a survey box.

- Actually faculty assignments should be clearly defined and used for T and P assessment

- The role of dept chairs in the process is critical. Some chairs know how to be very supportive such as what is important to include in the letter of support, other chairs don't. Consequently candidates from depts with chairs who are not educated on what it means to write a supportive letter such as reasons for what could be perceived as weaknesses, for example, are at a distinct disadvantage.

- Although no information was shared with the committee concerning recommendations from the college, it appears that only approximately 1/2 of the committee recommendations were followed. Such a large discrepancy brings into question the purpose and usefulness of the committee/process.

- service on college committee is very demanding but members were conscientious.

- I was impressed with the dedication of the committee members and the seriousness with which they took this critical assignment.

- Particularly as files work their way through the higher levels in the review process, more care might be given to disciplinary and college expectations. In other words, humanities files need to be evaluated differently from science files, and law files need to be evaluated differently from engineering files. Assumptions that expectations for external funding or that work with graduate students should be comparable or uniform across disciplines and across colleges are misguided and profoundly unfair. Finally, I believe that college tenure-and-promotion committees might meet with members of the APB for brief discussions of standards and expectations. Both committees would benefit from such a discussion.

- 1] The University does not announce promotions until well past Spring semester, even though they receive our material no later than December. Treating faculty in this manner is totally unacceptable. Shame on central administration. 2] We read the candidate's work; too bad political issues can intervene once it leaves our hands.

- keep on doing this survey

- With reference to question 19 - I believe that I completed an online exercise on this (can't remember). I was given a packet detailing promotion and tenure at the College of Medicine. I felt that our promotion and tenure deliberations were fair.

- None

- Chairs should carefully review the packets of candidates before they are submitted to check for clarity and completeness.

- Quite a few questions in this survey are poorly phrased. A yes/no answer to some of the questions is meaningless.

- P & T process is lagging behind times. The process is not taking realities of time into concentration.

- I believe our T&P process is fair.

- Our P&T File Committee at the College of Law does not vote or evaluate candidates. That is done by the entire faculty in a committee of the whole. Thus, the evaluative questions you ask should be asked of the entire college faculty. Being on the committee simply means you help obtain external reviews, and shepherd the candidate through the college process.

- NO

- Not broke, don't fix.

- Questions 6 through 10 of the survey should allow for comment also because in some cases the answer is not a simple yes or no. It is not clear whether Department criteria or faculty assignment should be considered by the College committee.

- perhaps new deans and chairs should go to promotion and tenure workshops. My experience has been that the dean and chair play key roles shepherding candidates through the process.

- IFAS conducts these matters in a very professional manner with numerous training and peer review opportunities for faculty.

- Related to question #20: I have served on Tenure & Promotion Committees for many years. It may be that some faculty would appreciate "workshops"; however, I believe understanding the department, unit and dean's expectations/ rules are most important for committee members AND FOR THE FACULTY MEMBER GOING UP FOR TENURE & PROMOTION. Over the years, changes in deans and/or unease with what was expected have made a crucial differences for more than a few of our faculty

*members. One person was not granted tenure because of a Dean change (many years ago) and another person accepted a position at another university because that faculty member "assumed" he/she would not be promoted & tenured because of his/her "fear" of the dean's (and/or provost's) expectations -- even though the T&P committee was very supportive.*

*- no*

*- 1) Teaching and service contributions, while important to the mission of the university, do not seem to carry the weight that they should during tenure and promotion deliberations at all levels. 2) I hope that the college committee members will be invited to the University T&P workshops. This would be of benefit to all committee members.*

*- The absence of any feedback from the Academic Personnel Board isolates the college level of evaluation and hinders the process.*

*- Candidates for Distinguished Professor should be evaluated by a different committee, presumably comprised of individuals who received the award.*

-----