MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 30, 2017
TO: PTE Working Group and Deans
FROM: President Kennedy and Provost DiLorenzo
RE: Input on draft PTE

We have reviewed the draft PTE recommendations, and are supportive of moving forward with them, as there is important work to be accomplished for implementation. We believe that the current draft moves the university forward, elevates expectations, and articulates quality better than our current document. In addition, the draft creates a framework for aligning workload with expectations and evaluation. We offer the specific comments to the draft below.

It is not clear if there is a comprehensive pre-review at midpoint for probationary faculty (p.3).

We believe that there should be a more explicit list of expected content in dossier (p.3).

The timing for assembly of the file and reviews should be standard across campus (p.3).

The scholarship definition should be up front in the document.

On page 4, we believe that promotion is not just summative. Further, expectations for promotion should be based on outstanding performance (p.4).

Special appointments are “teaching” positions. They should not carry an expectation for research (p.7).

On page 7, make sure scholarly impact is demonstrated (i.e., published in tier one journals).

Creative contributions should be evaluated by knowledgeable peers from at least equal reputational universities (p.8). Indeed, external reviews should be required of all individuals from at least equal reputational universities.

An indication of quality direction of graduate studies and/or contributions to curricular design would be publication of results in peer reviewed outlets (p.9).

Make sure student input is provided in undergraduate, graduate and professional education instruction. Also, provide for use of tools like Starfish and Blackboard (LMS) (p.9).
We are not sure why administrative duties is split from service (p.10).

We are not sure why the terms and conditions would be in a contract OR letter of understanding. We would suggest only including the “contract” language (p.11).

In general, we do not support the award of tenure credit as we believe that it unduly limits a person’s opportunity for promotion and tenure (p.11&13).

Renewal of contracts should be based on a formal annual evaluation (p.12).

Getting a contract returned by August 15th appears to be too late to find a replacement (p.12).

There appears to be a presumption of nonrenewal if we don’t get contracts back.

Annual reviews should also be based on quality of work and probability of promotion and/or tenure (p.12&13).

Faculty orientation to the P&T guidelines should be a university responsibility (p.14).

Tenure plans should be written and signed by both parties (p.14).

We certainly advocate Performance Improvement Plans, when necessary. And we should explicitly state that termination is possible if individual’s do not show improvement as outlined in the plan (p.15).

Make sure the leave language is clear and implications for “time to P&T” should be explicit (p.15).

We recommend that a person who is hired in January should have his/her probationary period begin in the fall of the next year (p.15).

Early tenure review should be rare. Exceptional circumstances should be defined (p.15).

Why not state “3rd year” for the mid-point review of probationary faculty (p.16)?

External reviews should be used at all levels of review including committees, Provost and President (p.18).

External reviewers’ identity should not be disclosed to candidates (p.18).

External reviewers should come from peer or better institutions (p.18).

External reviewers should be given department and university standards for their reviews (p.19).

A candidate should be discouraged from obtaining additional external review letters (p. 19).

Promotion of special appointees should require adoption and application of appropriate departmental and University standards (p.19).
We believe that there should not be overlap in the committee formation (i.e., a person should not vote twice)?

According to SBHE policy, the Provost can hold a tenured appointment (p.21).

Use of early alert systems (e.g., Starfish), a LMS (e.g., Blackboard) and Digital Measures should be required of annual reviews.

Essential Elements department guidelines must be kept up-to-date and approved at all levels.

There should be a consistent application of the Page 2 across campus.

We should acknowledge and promote interdisciplinary work and internationalization and diversity of the curriculum. Further, we should promote the use of Open Educational Resources and significant service as expressed and documented in Page 2s and annual evaluations.