

**Report from the Task Force to Address Issues with Department/Unit RTP Criteria and Standards
Formed per Academic Senate Resolution #03-11/12 – EX, passed October 19, 2011
December 5, 2011**

Task Force Members:

John Powell, CAHSS College Personnel Committee
Brent Duncan, CPS College Personnel Committee
Joseph Szewczak, CNRS College Personnel Committee
Charles C.D. Hoyle, Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Claire Knox, University Faculty Personnel Committee
Colleen Mullery, AVP Faculty Affairs

Supporting Documents:

Resolution to Establish a Task Force to Address Issues with Department/Unit RTP Criteria and Standards, #03-11/12-EX, passed October 19, 2011
University Faculty Personnel Committee March 4, 2011 letter to Provost Robert Snyder
University Faculty Personnel Committee 2010-11 Annual Report, dated May 4, 2011
Appendix J, Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for RTP, Amended and Approved, Spring 2009

The task force met on November 7 and November 28. All members agreed to stay focused on the 4 issues specified in the Academic Senate resolution and listed below:

1. *Clarity, or lack thereof, of the approval process of department/unit criteria and standards (see Task Force Recommendation #5)*
2. *Value of a periodic review of department/unit criteria and standards (see Task Force Recommendation # 2 and 3)*
3. *Standards that may be overly complex and/or prone to misinterpretation (see Task Force Recommendation #2 and/or #4)*
4. *Consistency across department/units or lack thereof. (see Task Force Recommendation #4)*

(Senate Resolution #3-11/12-EX)

After considerable discussion and review of supporting and relevant documents, the committee concluded that the following constituted two reasonable alternative recommendations which could be voted upon by the General Faculty:

1. Evidence suggests that the new Appendix J requirement that all departments have written and approved criteria and standards has proven to be unsuccessful. **Recommend** that the language in the previous version of Appendix J that simply encouraged the development of department criteria and standards be reconstituted. Specifically, the previous version of Appendix J stated the following: *“Departments are encouraged to develop discipline-oriented criteria within the framework of this definition.”* [Note: The definition being referred to is Appendix J’s definition of scholarship and creative activities.]

OR

2. Recommend a periodic review of department/unit criteria and standards that would occur every x years (the committee discussed three to five). Begin this review process immediately, using the original approval date for each department as the starting point. E.g., if a department's standards were approved during AY 2010-11, then the standards would be up for review in AY 2013-14 (if the periodic review were to occur every three years.)

The committee recommends #1 above. If recommendation # 1 is accepted, then issues #1 through 4 are moot.

If recommendation # 1 is not approved by the faculty and a periodic review of department criteria and standards is adopted (#2 above), then the task force recommends the following:

3. Current Appendix J states that department/unit criteria and standards are subject to approval by the College/Library Dean, the UFPC, and the Provost. The UFPC contends that it does not have sufficient time to serve in this approval capacity. **Recommend** that a new Faculty RTP Criteria and Standards Review committee be formed composed of former UFPC members who would replace the current UFPC as the faculty reviewers for the periodic review of department RTP standards and criteria.

AND/OR

4. Form a committee made up of former UFPC members and one administrator who would immediately begin a review of all department standards and criteria to (1) check for consistency across departments/units and (2) check for standards that are overly complex and prone to misinterpretation (see our task force charge #3 and 4).

If recommendation #1 is not approved by the faculty, then the task force recommends #5. This recommendation could be implemented by either the new committee described in recommendations #3 and #4, or it could be implemented by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

5. Below is the section of Appendix J that addresses Department/Unit RTP Criteria and Standards. Highlighted are words that create confusion regarding the approval process (e.g., "subject to ratification ...," "Once approved ...," "to be vetted ...," "subject to approval by the ...," "disagrees with assessment ...".) The committee described in # 3 or # 4 above should revise this section of Appendix J with the intent of clarifying the approval process.

From page 16 of Appendix J:

1. Department/Unit RTP Criteria and Standards
 - a) Each department/unit shall establish the criteria and standards by which it will evaluate performance for retention, tenure, and promotion. The standards shall be designed to evaluate faculty performance for which they were hired and/or to which they are assigned.
 - (1) The department/unit standards simplify and add specificity to the University's policy on RTP (Appendix J).
 - (2) The departments shall establish clear requirements for documenting the quality and significance of faculty achievements.
 - b) Department/unit criteria and standards do not substitute for the University's policy on RTP (Appendix J).

- b) Department/unit criteria and standards do not substitute for the University's policy on RTP (Appendix J).
- c) Department/unit criteria and standards are subject to ratification by a majority of tenured and probationary department/unit faculty members voting. Once approved, the criteria and standards shall be used at all levels of review.
- d) Departments/units shall, beginning Fall 2007 through Spring 2009, submit criteria and standards to be vetted by an ad hoc university review committee. The committee shall be comprised of two probationary or tenured faculty from each college (appointed by the Senate Appointments Committee in consultation with the UFPC) and the college deans (or designees).
- e) Beginning in 2009/2010, departmental/unit criteria and standards will be subject to approval by the College/Library Dean, the UFPC, and the Provost.
- (1) If a department/unit disagrees with the assessment of its criteria and standards provided at any subsequent level of review, the department/unit may request that the next higher level of review investigate. In the case of the UFPC/Provost, the request to investigate shall be submitted to the General Faculty President and the University President or designee for consultation and disposition. In the event that the University President's recommendation differs from that of the General Faculty President, the University President shall give reasons that are specific to the individual department/unit and sufficient to persuade any reasonable, disinterested person that the General Faculty President's recommendation should be overruled.
- (2) All such requests shall be in writing with copies to all review levels.
- f) The University's policy on RTP (Appendix J) shall serve as the guideline for development and interpretation of department/unit criteria and standards. For departments without approved standards, the University's policy on RTP (Appendix J) shall be the basis to evaluate faculty performance.

Report prepared by Colleen Mullery
December 5, 2011