



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1987-1988

Volume I

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of April 11, 1988

Additional information: Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at:
<http://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/14157>



The
Wichita
State University

Faculty Senate

April 4, 1988

To: All WSU Faculty
From: Ben Rogers, Faculty Senate President

Ben Rogers

In the fall of 1987, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate charged the Faculty Affairs Committee to begin an intensive review of the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines and T & P calendar. This charge was formulated in response to a number of concerns expressed to me by your senators in meetings I held with area and college groups last fall. After considerable investigation, the Faculty Affairs Committee is ready to make its initial report.

You are invited and urged to attend a special open meeting of the Faculty Senate at which the Faculty Affairs Committee will report on its work and give the Senate and other faculty an opportunity to express its concerns and judgments concerning the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines and Procedures. The present guidelines are in the Faculty Handbook. You may wish to review them prior to the meeting.

The Faculty Affairs Committee expects to have another open meeting in the early fall to present its preliminary recommendations, with final recommendations to come to the Senate in the late fall.

FACULTY SENATE OPEN MEETING

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 1988

3:30 209 HUBBARD HALL

1. Initial Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee on Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (See Attachment)

To: All WSU faculty
From: Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate
Subject: Open meeting on tenure and promotion guidelines and procedures, April 11, 1988

In response to its charge from the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Affairs Committee initiated a review of tenure and promotion procedures and guidelines last fall. The committee has gathered written documents from all academic units, and in addition to reviewing and comparing those documents, it has gathered information from the central administration and has met with present and past University Tenure/Promotion Committees, the academic deans, and Vice President Scott. The committee has also heard informally from a number of faculty members on various issues of concern; and now, as part of its charge, the committee invites the faculty at large to express its views on any and all matters of relevance. The committee is in the process of preparing a detailed report and interim response to the Senate's charge, but will make no firm recommendations without hearing the advice of the faculty. Those who are unable to attend the open meeting are urged to express their concerns in writing to the chair or to other members of the committee, as listed below.

There follows a brief list of the considerations suggested by the Senate, as well as a few generated by the deliberations of the committee:

1. The relationship of qualifications for tenure and promotion. (Must a candidate always qualify for promotion and tenure simultaneously?)
2. The adequacy of the present calendar. (The committee is inclined to recommend earlier deadlines for notification of candidacy, perhaps as early as April or May.)
3. The matter of consistent and realistic advice to candidates concerning expectations of performance and appropriate guidelines relevant to the various disciplines.
4. The role and influence of the deans in the decision process.
5. The importance and propriety of requiring a written statement of reasons for personnel decisions at all levels of the process.
6. The possibility of continuous appointments for qualifying faculty on soft money appointments.

Over

7. The proper role and function of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee. (The consensus of the Faculty Affairs Committee is that it serves a necessary purpose at this time, but its appropriate role and guidelines for its operation are still under discussion.)

8. University-wide policy and procedures for external review of faculty research and creative activities.

9. Consistency of guidelines for tenure and promotion qualifications across the university.

10. An efficient and reasonable format across the university for presentation of credentials in support of candidates.

11. A policy and guidelines for the implementation of role statements for faculty.

12. A policy and guidelines for mentoring or advising junior faculty.

13. The proper composition of tenure and promotion committees at all levels.

The faculty is invited to introduce any other issues of concern related to matters of tenure and promotion.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Dong Cho, Economics, Box 78

Gerald Hoag, English (Chair), Box 14

Everett Johnson, Electrical Engineering, Box 44

Arthur Rohn, Anthropology, Box 52

Phillip Thomas, Dean, LAS, Box 5

Betsy West, Instructional Services, Box 28

FACULTY SENATE
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of special meeting of April 11, 1988 (Vol. XXIV, No. 13).

President Rogers called to order the open meeting for a discussion of tenure and promotion at 3:34. As background, he explained that when he had met with senators last fall, tenure and promotion procedures were mentioned as areas of concern. For this reason, the Executive Committee gave a special charge to the Faculty Affairs Committee to review the current situation and make recommendations. This Committee began holding hearings in November and plans to make initial recommendations next fall. Today's open meeting is to provide an opportunity for faculty members to raise issues and express opinions about this topic. He then turned the meeting over to Dr. Gerald Hoag, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Mr. Hoag stated that the memo attached to the agenda spoke for itself and that the Faculty Affairs Committee was still open on all matters. He requested that anyone who had further comments send them to the Committee. He then suggested that there were four central issues to be addressed and that approximately fifteen minutes of discussion would be allotted to each of these areas:

1. The linking of tenure and promotion.
2. The role and function of the Tenure and Promotion Committee
3. The role and influence of deans and administration in general.
4. The consistency of guidelines across campus.

Discussion on the issues followed.

1. Linking of Tenure and promotion

Mr. Hoag: Some people feel the qualification for tenure and promotion should be identical.

Mr. Britton: For people hired at lower ranks, this would not be as much of a problem as it might be for individuals hired at the associate level. In the latter case, tenure and promotion at the same time might not be a reasonable expectation.

Mr. Burdsal: The result will be to either raise the standards for tenure or lower the standards for promotion.

Ms. Mason: Has there been a tendency in the past three years to deny tenure because the Committee felt the standards hadn't been met for promotion?

Mr. Hoag: We don't have insights into the reason tenure was denied, but the majority of the cases in recent years involved people who went up for tenure and promotion. The matters have been treated as separate issues.

Mr. Hoyer: Aren't we usually discussing the promotion of assistant to associate level instead of associate to full?

Mr. Rohn: In the period between 1980-87, there were 71 cases that involved

tenure and promotion. Of these, 66 were granted tenure (93%) on the college level; of the 68 the University Committee considered, 65 (98%) were granted tenure. Of those same 71 cases, 75% were approved for promotion at the college level and 79% at the university level.

Mr. Lynch: One advantage to keeping tenure and promotion separate is to have a separate reward structure to provide motivation.

Mr. Blakeslee: Is it the feeling of the Faculty Affairs Committee that in some cases, promotion has been denied and tenure then given as a consolation prize?

Mr. Hoag: This feeling was not expressed.

Mr. Johnson: This issue is raised by the administration. As a member of the committee, I'm interested in whether this is a faculty issue...and how they feel about it.

Mr. Pizarro: I was tenured without being promoted and question the inconsistent patterns that seem to exist between departments and colleges.

Mr. Robbins: People should be aware that there is very little movement in the job market at the associate level.

Mr. Collison: What posture does the Faculty Affairs Committee have on this issue?

Mr. Hoag: No definite stance.

Ms. Mason: Would a straw vote be of interest?

Mr. Hoag counted approximately 10 in favor of linking tenure and promotion, a significant majority opposed to this issue, and a fair number abstaining.

2. Role and function of the University Committee

Mr. Christ: How is the Committee selected?

Mr. Hoag: It's composed of the chairs of the college committees...some are elected, some appointed.

Mr. Rogers: There are two at-large positions from the Senate.

Mr. Britton: In the past, when there were differences between the University Committee and a college committee, there was conversation back and forth; recommendations might be sent back and negotiated. This has not been true recently, so information is not always available.

Mr. Rogers: This connection was formally eliminated in 1983.

Mr. Hoag: There has been recent criticism that the University Committee has moved inappropriately into substance areas. What is the faculty's sense on this?

Mr. Greenberg: The A.A.U.P. position is that these issues should be subjected to peer review; perhaps the University Committee should be an appeal committee.

Mr. Christ: One problem now is that a person coming up for review receives different advice from all levels, which ends in frustration and confusion.

Mr. Robbins: A legitimate question that arises is whether the chair of the college committee represents the committee--or is an independent agent.

Mr. Britton: In my opinion, the chair should represent the committee and any other behavior is out of line.

Mr. Hoag: Should this be spelled out somewhere in the procedures?

General assent.

Mr. Blakeslee: The current calendar pattern is unreasonable, with the procedure taking almost the entire academic year. If the decisions on an individual are favorable all the way through the department and the college, why not skip the University Committee? Let it be an appeals committee for conflicts.

Mr. Childs: The University Committee could be called in whether the disagreement came from the lower levels or from the central administration.

Mr. Burdsal: The need for the University Committee would be related to whether there were similar standards enforced within colleges.

Mr. Gosman: There are two aspects of the tenure and promotion process: it goes through a faculty review and an administrative review. And these reviews are not necessarily parallel. The important thing is to have a place for an appeal.

Ms. Mays: One possible way to have across-the-university evaluation might be to have three areas and say that each candidate must have two out of the three.

Mr. Collison: Initially, the University Committee was created to deal with the notion that "other colleges" weren't as rigorous as whoever was making the complaint. It was the responsibility of the University Committee to apply equivalent standards; in order to do that, they became the current deliberative body. The question is, is there still a need for such a body to develop equivalencies across colleges which still give colleges unique standards. If so, the committee needs to remain and to be deliberative to some extent--although it may be appeals only.

Ms. Campbell: Our College does indeed have standards, and if they're not acceptable at the university level, we need to be told that so we can bring them into line.

Mr. Laptad: You cannot replace judgment with standards. The community looks to us for other things, like taste, and direction, and relevance.

Ms. Shriver: It is very difficult for someone in one area to define or evaluate performance in a completely different area.

Ms. Mason: I've heard requests from faculty members that University Committee members should meet the same criteria they are demanding from the people they are evaluating.

3. Role of deans and administrators

Mr. Britton: Deans have been looked upon differently in the past, sometimes as advocates and sometimes as people who present a detached overview of the college and the department. They should have some input because the detached view is necessary; such information needs to be available and go forward with a recommendation.

Mr. Hoag: Practice varies; should roles be specified?

Ms. Mason: Yes, and I would like to take that a step higher: would the faculty like to take a stand on whether the vice president should be present in University Committee discussions?

Mr. Rogers: Present practice at the University Committee: when the Committee has a question about a candidate, they may invite the Dean to comment. Problems arise in two areas: this does not happen with all candidates, so the practice is not consistent. Also, the candidate has no record of the conversation nor chance to respond. This is part of the procedural concern. A model that might serve with the vice president issue is the procedure used in the LAS committee: at least one round of discussion must be made without the presence of the Dean and the vote takes place without the presence of the Dean.

Mr. Hoag: The Faculty Affairs Committee would like a sense of how the faculty feels about whether discussions should be reported in writing at each level of decision making...and in how much detail.

Mr. Gosman: This is tied to an earlier issue: if the University Committee is an appeals committee only, it's not apropos unless there's a conflict--in which case, information must be presented by both parties.

Ms. Mays: If a review is to be genuinely independent, then there should not be any passing along of data because it might create a bias.

Mr. Hoag: It's my understanding that the written reasons would go to the candidate, not to the subsequent committee.

Mr. Greenberg: What possible reasons would there be for not giving the candidate written reasons?

Mr. Hoag: There's some question of liability.

Mr. Wherritt: Is the issue of the written statement to protect the University in court--or is it in fairness to the candidate? What impact would it have?

Ms. Scott: The model was specifically designed to provide written reasons at each stage which would be shared with the candidate who would be given an opportunity to know the reasons and to respond in writing. As for the legal issues, I'm not concerned about those but about better information for all concerning the process.

4. Consistency of guidelines

Mr. Snyder: There have to be rules, there have to be standards, they have to be fair, and everybody has to know what they are. The criteria, we say, are teaching, research, and service. We all know what teaching is, but we don't judge it very well. In addition to student ratings, we should use some ratings by people who have graduated, peer evaluation, and observation of classes. Perhaps the term "research" should be replaced by "scholarly activity," because it's different for a chemistry professor than it is for an artist or a P.E. instructor or an engineering instructor. You can't have the same standards, but you can have some sort of equivalents...and everybody has to know what they are. Also, in addition to our present system, I think it would be a good idea to have renewable tenure in order to prevent deadwood from developing.

Mr. Robbins: It's important to think of consistency in larger terms. For junior members of the faculty, it's important to clarify the process from the beginning. As it is now, annual reviews are conducted by administration but tenure and promotion becomes a matter of peer review. What we should do, in short, is to make the process consistent all the way through; let there be peer review and external review early on, perhaps in the annual review.

Mr. Rogers: Perhaps the Faculty Affairs Committee could make the recommendation for a university wide policy to have annual reviews made by the department tenure and promotion committees.

Mr. Wherritt: Another policy that might be helpful to junior members would be to have them excluded, in general, from university committee work so they could focus on research.

Mr. McDougall: There's an important consistency coming up and that would be consistency across types of programs--master's level, doctorate, etc.

Mr. Snyder: I wasn't pleading for consistency but for standards. And they should be known and recognized by the candidates and by the committees responsible for enforcing them.

Mr. Blakeslee: It's been said that people with part-time administrative assignments do not necessarily get a fair shake.

Mr. Hoag: This issue hasn't been addressed by the committee. It's similar to how much service should count.

Mr. Zoller: Along the same line, we've often considered the quantity of service without any attempt to determine whether the service was actually worthwhile. Administrative service can be judged as easily as research and teaching. It would be nice if the committee could figure out what it meant by

service, and also how to judge it.

Mr. Graham: I firmly believe that these decisions are in the purview of the faculty and peers. The discussion on standards has been, so far, primarily procedural. I think it's important for us as a faculty group, in our departments, to ask what are our expectations, how can we raise those expectations, are we being fair with those expectations? I think we need to encourage each other to struggle with some of these issues and address the issue of accountability.

Ms. Mason: The problem is that even if departments--or colleges--arrive at consensus, the University Committee might differ. And this can change from year to year.

Mr. Pizarro: Clarity is the issue. If credentialing was my problem when I came up for promotion, I should have known about it earlier.

Mr. Blakeslee: What has the thrust of your discussion been so far on external review?

Mr. Hoag: It's still under discussion. Some points: it should be optional, it's likely to be favorable. What we've attempted to do is set up some procedures so that there are models. Somebody mentioned calendar: it's burdensome on everyone, so we thought maybe by putting the deadline in May or June, the candidate wouldn't have to hang in the balance so long.

Ms. Scott: The Regents' action will not occur until mid-April.

Mr. Kahn: Fair accountability concepts are important. The university should, in advance, spell out the proper procedures. It's very important to have an opportunity, at each level, to know what statements were made, with an opportunity to reply. Finally, by and large, in a university, scholarship should be a very significant factor in terms of promotion along the way and should retain emphasis for most areas.

Mr. Burdick: You can't have optional external review. You can say it's not mandatory, but as soon as it becomes an option, people who don't have it are penalized.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00.