

Guide to Chapter 4 Revisions April 10, 2008

The University Personnel Committee forwards the Chapter 4 revisions of April 10, 2008, to the Faculty Senate for its consideration. This document outlines briefly the proposed revisions and why they are proposed. Generally, the revisions occur in 6 categories:

1. Language clean up
2. Family friendly revisions; clarification of full and part-time leaves of absence
3. Sabbatical approvals
4. Changes to the provision for deans writing tenure recommendation letters
5. Clarification of language on appeals
6. Changes to criteria for faculty evaluation and for tenure and promotion

1. Language Clean Up

There are no substantive changes between 4.1 and 4.6.3. Everything contained in these 30 pages is language clean up or clarifications of language on appeals (see #5 below).

2. Family Friendly Revisions

Institutions that wish to hire and retain outstanding faculty members need to build some amount of flexibility into their regulations. Hard and fast rules that make it difficult for faculty members to have families make it difficult to retain outstanding faculty members who may want to do something as simple as be 5/8ths-time for 2 or even 5 years. Family-friendly policies lead to increased institutional loyalty, happier faculty, and better performance. Provisions are included that are more friendly to part-time positions and to leaves of absence.

4.7.1.a, p. 38. This section allows time beyond 6 years for a tenure decision, if some of the time was spent at part-time. This does not have to be granted. Basically, it's just a way for the University to keep a valued faculty member who just needs a little more time. Although no specific time limit is placed on the extension, the assumption is that UPC would be counting up fractional FTE and summing to, say, 6.5 FTE to figure out total years.

4.7.1.b, p. 38; 4.11.1.b, p. 47; 4.11.3.a, p. 50. Chapter 4 does not cover part-time leaves. We allow faculty members to take a yearlong full-time leave of absence, no questions asked. Why not a part-time leave?

4.11.3.a.1, p. 51. This allows, with permission, a second year's leave of absence.

4.11.3.a.2, p. 51. This section covers partial leaves at an FTE of 0.5 or greater.

3. Sabbatical Approvals.

4.11.1.e, p.48. The trustees pointed out that the by-laws do not have the trustees approving sabbaticals and asked that we change the provision. We changed it to approval by the Provost and President.

4. Changes to the provision for deans writing tenure recommendation letters

4.7.3.c, p. 40; 4.7.3.d, p. 41. Depending on the circumstances, the dean might want to write the tenure recommendation letter either before the college personnel decision or before the UPC decision or both. This recommendation is made, in part, because the dean's letter is written before discussion of tenure cases take place; people can and should have the opportunity to change their minds after hearing discussion. Here are some possible scenarios:

- The tenure case is marginal. The dean has information that would have bearing on the college committee's decision. Only information that is in writing may be considered. Clearly, that information needs to be conveyed in writing before the college committee makes a decision.
- The dean does not have special information to convey to the college committee. The college committee considers the case and makes a decision. The dean does not have a vote, but let's assume that the dean, after hearing and participating in the discussion, does not agree with the decision. The UPC may not take the dean's preference into consideration unless a recommendation is written. Thus, it makes sense for the dean to write a letter to the UPC.
- The dean writes a letter to the college committee, and a decision is made. Based on the discussion, the dean changes his/her mind. The dean should have the opportunity to express that change in writing to the UPC.

Also note that we clarified that the candidate needs to be given time to respond to the dean's letter.

5. Clarification of language on appeals

In the last revision to Chapter 4, we included the statement that faculty members always have the right to appeal adverse decisions:

4.6 Principles, second paragraph. "Faculty members shall have the right to request reconsideration of personnel committee decisions... ."

We also included the provision that faculty members have 10 university working days to submit a written appeal.

However, neither of these provisions was spelled out in many of the several sections on appeals. Those have now been included. Generally, faculty members may appeal personnel committee decisions on the grounds of substance or procedure or both. They may also appeal to the Faculty Appeals Panel on the grounds of procedure.

Finally, if there is an adverse decision that may be appealed, the faculty member should have the right to submit evidence in support of the appeal.

See: 4.5.1.c, p. 12; 4.5.3.d.5, p. 16; 4.5.9.d, pp. 23-25; 4.8.3.b, p. 45; 4.8.4, p. 46.

6. Changes to criteria for faculty evaluation and for tenure and promotion

By far, these are the major changes proposed. They scrap most of 4.6.3 Faculty Evaluation Criteria and replace it with sections that are meant to amplify and to clarify tenure and promotion criteria and procedures. Section 4.6.3 and following sections on tenure (4.7) and promotion (4.8) make it clear that the onus is on the candidate to demonstrate effective teaching, scholarship, and service. Further, all college personnel committees have faced situations where faculty members have presented scholarship in the areas of integration, application, and transformation of knowledge. In many of these cases, candidates have not presented peer-reviewed materials. The proposed changes make it clear that, no matter the Boyer category, scholarly work must have peer review.

4.6.3, p. 31, paragraph 1. Clarifies that tenure and promotion require acceptable performance in all 3 categories. Every college has had confusion about whether very strong performance in one category can make up for marginal or non-performance in another category. All college personnel committees believe that every category must meet minimum standards.

4.6.3, p. 31, paragraph 1. Highlights that “effective” teaching is what is required, not “excellent” teaching. If we applied the current “excellent” teaching criterion in every case, a lot fewer faculty members would have tenure. It is completely unreasonable to say that every faculty member has to be an excellent teacher. Changing “excellent” to “effective” was also done for 4.7 and 4.8.

4.6.3, p. 31, paragraph 1. Highlights that promotion to professor requires that faculty members meet a high standard in all three categories.

The next 6 items address Teaching

4.6.3.a, p. 31 and 4.7.2.c.12, p. 39. Clarifies that teaching each year from the same notes is not acceptable. Faculty members must also stay current in their fields and incorporate new pedagogies.

4.6.3.a.1.a, p. 31 and 4.7.2.c.11, p. 39. Faculty members must ensure that their teaching is evaluated. Supervisors are required to provide feedback, but we should not allow faculty members coming up for tenure or promotion to say that they have not been evaluated. This is important because the Northwest Commission has told us in the past that we rely too heavily on course evaluations for judging teaching.

4.6.3.a.1.c, p. 32. Oftentimes, faculty members do not include sufficient information to judge rigor. Putting the onus on the faculty member to make the case will ensure that sufficient materials are submitted to be able to make that judgment.

4.6.3.a.1.e, p. 32 and 4.7.2.c.11, p. 39. The Northwest Commission’s recent reaccreditation report said that we needed to develop a universitywide assessment plan. That plan will include the need to evaluate learning outcomes for overall assessment. This new section address that.

4.6.3.a.2, pp. 32-33. The language here on pedagogy borrows heavily from Boyer. Using effective pedagogy is important.

4.7.2.c.13, p. 40. Part of the educational process involves having students present their work. We have added a provision that explicitly states the need for faculty members to help students find such opportunities.

4.6.3.b, Scholarship, pp. 33-36. This section describes scholarly and creative work and has been completely rewritten. Three main issues were addressed

1. Boyer category descriptions. The current section lists the Boyer categories but does not describe them. In the past, not having descriptions has led to confusion. The proposed revisions describe the categories, borrowing heavily from Boyer.

2. The need to make the case. Current language does not state directly enough that tenure and promotion candidates must make the case in one or more of the Boyer categories—using peer-reviewed materials—that their scholarship is substantive. The following are included in the first and last paragraphs:

Regardless of the category, however, Pacific University expects faculty members seeking tenure or promotion to present evidence of a body of quality work that has been presented to external peer audiences.

Faculty members undergoing reviews must demonstrate continuing scholarship that carries recognition by peers beyond the limits of the campus and local region. For tenure and promotion, evaluations must include some measure of “blind” external peer review of scholarship and creative work.

3. The need to clarify/amplify “quality” and “quantity.” The current section states:

No exhaustive or precise statement of the required quantity or type of achievements can be given, because quality is the decisive factor. The expected number of publications, formal research presentations, continuing education lectures, art exhibits, participation in the professional community outside the University, performances, or other scholarly and creative products may vary among disciplines.

We have eliminated this statement because it gives no guidance whatsoever. We have replaced it with the following 6 statements:

(first paragraph) Colleges, schools, and departments will develop lists of what constitutes acceptable types of scholarly and creative work and the quality and quantity levels required for tenure and promotion.

(under Discovery of Knowledge) Each college will develop means to evaluate work in this area.

(under Integration of Knowledge) Each college will develop examples of what constitutes integration of knowledge in its disciplines and will develop means of evaluating this area. Some examples include: ...

(under Application of Knowledge) Each college will maintain a list of what constitutes application of knowledge in its disciplines and will develop means of evaluating this area. Some examples include: ...

(under Transformation of Knowledge through Teaching) Each college will develop examples of what constitutes transformation of knowledge in its disciplines and will develop means of evaluating this area.

(last paragraph) To aid faculty members in understanding the level of scholarly or creative production expected for tenure or promotion, each college will set guidelines that take into account generally accepted practices at peer institutions.

4.6.3.c, Service, pp. 36-37 and 4.7.2.e.7, p. 40. There has been confusion about whether contributing one's professional expertise—e.g., serving as an officer in a professional society—constitutes service or scholarly activity. In the proposed revision—in keeping with Boyer—we define this as service and add a section on using professional expertise in service to the profession, to the University, and to other audiences.

Also in keeping with Boyer, this section states that faculty members must use their professional expertise in service:

To obtain tenure and promotion, faculty members must demonstrate some level of quality engagement in service, using their professional expertise. The expectation in this regard for promotion to professor is higher than for obtaining tenure.