

## **Five year Review of the Promotion and Tenure Policy at ISU**

When a new academic program or major is established it is standard practice to have a review of that major or program after five years. Although no such requirement was included in the promotion and tenure policy when it was passed, many feel that this policy should also have a five-year review. Since our current Promotion and Tenure Policy was adopted in 1999, it is now time to decide whether to have such a review. Accordingly, the Faculty Senate is being presented with a resolution calling for a joint Faculty Senate – Administration five-year review of the promotion and tenure policy. The goals of this review are to determine how this policy is being implemented in each department and in each college, and whether the implementation at each level (department, college, Provost, President) is in agreement with the expectations of other levels. The resolution calls for the establishment of a joint Faculty Senate – Administration five-year review committee to oversee this review.

### **Resolution by the Faculty Senate.**

**The Faculty Senate calls for a joint Faculty Senate – Administration five-year review of how the promotion and tenure policy has been implemented and is working in each department and college. The Senate proposes to President Geoffroy that a joint Faculty Senate – Administration five year review committee be established and be charged with preparing a plan for carrying out the review, with overseeing the review process, and with preparing a final report on the review. We also propose a target date for completion of this review be the end of the 2004 calendar year.**

### **Goals of the Review: There are two major goals of this review.**

**(1) To review how the promotion and tenure policy has been implemented by the different departments.**

**This includes determining the answers to specific questions about the implementation, such as:**

- **How does the department define and evaluate scholarship?**
  - **How does the department define scholarship?**
  - **How does the department evaluate a faculty member's scholarship?**
  - **What are the department's standards/expectations for scholarship for faculty members at different stages of their career?**
  
- **How does the department evaluate faculty accomplishments in PRS-specified activities that do not produce scholarship?**
  - **Does the department have a clear definition of activities included in the PRS whose outcome does not fit the department's definition of scholarship?**
  - **How does the department evaluate accomplishments in these activities?**
  - **What are the department standards for recognizing excellence in these activities?**
  - **How does the department weigh accomplishments in these activities in the P&T evaluation?**
  
- **How does the department establish and use the PRS?**
  - **How is a PRS established for each faculty member in the department?**
  - **How is the PRS and the concept of proportion of effort used in the evaluation of a faculty member's accomplishments?**
  - **What are the department's standards and expectations for faculty with different distributions of effort? For example, how would the expectations of a faculty member with a PRS calling for 70%**

teaching and 30% research differ from those of a faculty member with a PRS calling for 30% teaching and 70% research?

- Observations and comments.

- What general observations about the new policy can the department make?
- What general observations about how their P&T procedures have changed can the department make?

**(2) To review how the department policies and procedures agree with the college policies and with the expectations of the Provost and the President.**

The results of the review in each department will be summarized and these summaries will be forwarded to their college for review. The colleges will each review their own implementation of the P&T policy and will review the department's summaries to ensure they are in agreement. The department summaries and a summary of each college's review will be forwarded to the Provost for review. The Provost and the President will review the colleges' and the departments' positions. The goal of these reviews is to ensure that the policies, practices, and standards established at each level of the P&T process are understood and accepted at the other levels.

## **Discussion: Implementation of the P&T document**

ISU has been engaged in a debate about the appropriate way to evaluate and reward faculty performance for several years. This is a national/international debate in which renowned authorities, such as the late Ernst Boyer, have written and spoken extensively. At ISU faculty performance is central to all areas of our land grant mission. We define that mission as one of learning, discovery, and engagement. How well we as an institution succeed at fulfilling our mission depends on the quality of the teaching, research, and extension/outreach programs of the faculty. ISU seeks excellence in all aspects of faculty performance. To do this we need policies that encourage faculty efforts, and evaluation systems that reliably evaluate faculty performance and provide appropriate recognition and rewards for success. Even in times of financial constraint the question remains of how we can continue to encourage faculty excellence in all that they are asked to do at ISU. The key to faculty evaluation at a university must be found in the promotion and tenure policy and in the policies and procedures used by departments, colleges and central administrators to evaluate faculty for promotion and tenure. It can take years for faculty to develop their teaching, research and/or extension/outreach programs, and the P&T evaluation is the most important way to shape those programs. Those activities that are widely recognized and highly rewarded will be the activities to which faculty devote their best efforts. Alternatively, faculty activities that are under-recognized or under-rewarded by the P&T system will not receive the best faculty efforts. In today's world of intense competition few faculty can afford to devote their best efforts to activities that are, in reality, not critically evaluated in, nor highly valued in the P&T process.

ISU took a leadership position on this issue when we adopted our current P&T policy. It has been praised by many as being at the forefront and is viewed with envy and respect by other institutions. This policy contains several key factors. First, it establishes that all faculty are expected to be scholars, but it recognizes that scholarship may take different forms. It contains new definitions of scholarship based on the work of Ernst Boyer ("Scholarship Reconsidered – Priorities of the Professoriate" Princeton, New York, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching). The policy provides considerable discussion and explanation as to what these definitions mean and which types of activities might fall under each definition. However, it is understood that each discipline has its own standards and will differ in its interpretation. Second, the policy adopts a system of position responsibility statements (PRS) in which the university and the faculty member agree on how faculty effort is to be apportioned among the different faculty activities. It also establishes the principle that faculty accomplishments will be evaluated in light of the proportion of effort. Clearly there are different expectations of a faculty member who devotes 30% effort to teaching and 70% to research compared to another who devotes 70% to teaching and 30% to research. However, the expectation is that excellence in both cases will be recognized and rewarded, and will be the basis for promotion and/or tenure.

The adoption of the P&T policy was not the end of this discussion at ISU, but in many ways was the beginning. ISU now faces the problems of implementation. How can the principles of the P&T policy be used to create working systems to evaluate the scholarship of an individual faculty member? What standards should be set for faculty with different percentage effort in their PRS? How should faculty accomplishments in activities that do not lead to scholarship be assessed and evaluated in the P&T process? Faculty spend a significant amount of time and effort on such activities that are often of great importance to the success of ISU. If the P&T decision is to be only based on a faculty member's scholarship accomplishments then why would any faculty member be expected to give their best efforts in such activities? If such activities are to count then how can faculty performance be assessed and what contribution should this make to P&T decisions? Faculty and administrators throughout ISU have been grappling with these and other questions for the past four years. At the 2003 Spring Faculty Conference faculty from across the university had a discussion on assessing the nature of scholarship in the P&T context. The Provost later had a discussion with the faculty from each college on the questions of how the P&T policy is working or should work. The time appears ripe for these discussions to be continued at the department level. Departments are the key point in the P&T process. This is where the process begins, and where peers are the most qualified to evaluate a faculty member's accomplishments. The department is also where faculty seek guidance in shaping their programs.

The Faculty Senate is being asked to consider a resolution calling for organized discussions of how the P&T policy is being implemented in each department and each college. Each department will discuss how it is implementing the new policy. This discussion should include answers to specific questions about implementation. The P&T document already calls for each department's promotion and tenure document to state, in writing, as clearly and specifically as possible the criteria by which probationary faculty are evaluated for tenure. Thus answers to these questions may already have been produced by the department. If not, this may be an appropriate time to revise the department document. In addition, the resolution calls for each department to prepare a written summary of its implementation of the new policy and submit it to their college for review. Colleges will review their implementation and will review the department summaries to decide if they agree/support the department's position. The colleges will pass the department and college summaries to the Provost for review. The Provost will pass the department, college, and provost position to the President for review. The goal is to have the policies and practices of the P&T process clarified so that faculty can have confidence that the department's policies and practices are understood at all levels of the process and can be relied on when planning career decisions.

Jack R. Girton, President  
ISU Faculty Senate