

Eastern Washington University Faculty Retention, Tenure and Promotion Review FINAL REPORT – [February, 2004]

Committee Membership

This ad hoc committee is comprised of two members each from the Faculty Organization, the UFE, and the university administration, and is supported by staff in Academic Affairs.
[Barb Alvin, Ron Dalla, Neville Hosking, Nick Jackson, Theresa Martin, Doug Orr, Ted Otto, Dana Parker]

Charge to the Committee

To review current policies and procedures related to faculty retention, promotion and tenure as described in the CBA and in College plans, and make recommendations for adjustments where appropriate. Specifically, the Committee was asked to address the concerns expressed in Recommendation #15 of the Fisher Report, March, 2002 that “Eastern should be more rigorous in its faculty promotion and tenure decisions.”

Fisher Report Concerns

- An insufficient number of evaluations of probationary faculty using “meritorious performance”, not years of service, as the primary driver – faculty should be assessed yearly leading to tenure.
- Time of service issue – “In fact, there should be no expected or normal time spent in any rank.”
- There are very modest expectations of faculty in the area of refereed scholarly productivity, often providing too many options to meet the “scholarly” expectations

Extracts from the EWU Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) related to Tenure/Promotion Standards and Procedures

Procedures for Evaluation of Probationary Faculty (Page II-24)

- Full-time faculty on probationary status will be evaluated annually . . . during the first three (3) years of full-time service.
- Each new probationary faculty member will have a third year review of progress toward meeting the expectations specified in the faculty activity plan...
- After the third year review, each new probationary faculty member who is renewed will continue on probationary status for a three-year period on a three-year contract [no reference is made to annual evaluations during this 3-year period]

Scholarly and Service Responsibilities (p. I-4). Tenure and tenure-track faculty are also expected to engage in scholarly research and/or creative activity and serve on departmental, college, and university committees and provide service to the community and discipline, in addition to instructional assignment. Specific activities and goals are a part of the faculty activity plan.

Survey of Peer Regional Institutions

With the assistance of the American Association of Colleges and Universities, Eastern surveyed over 30 regional comprehensive universities asking questions such as:

- Are Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor linked at your institution?
- To what extent are peer reviews an important component of the process?
- Do you use a set template for the development of a “performance” portfolio for reappointment, tenure and promotion?
- Does your institution have a Collective Bargaining Agreement?
- Do faculty present their portfolios to a committee/s of peers in person?
- Are you using solely a “performance-based” process, or do you also have length of time to promotion expectation? (See Appendix A for Summary of Responses)

An analysis of the survey responses revealed few areas of congruence in practice, especially related to whether tenure and promotion are linked or, if separate, which process is the more rigorous. Many institutions did indicate that they do not use a standard template for the development and presentation of the professional portfolios, and most institutions expect a combination of performance and time in rank for faculty to be eligible for tenure and/or promotion [the most common time in rank requirements of tenure was 5 years]. Nobody reported only using performance-based criteria for promotion.

Most respondents also indicated that “personal attributes”, while important, were usually assessed more informally. Most institutions require various forms of peer review of instructional practice to occur on a regular basis, but very few require or provide the option for external peer reviews. Few reported that candidates personally presented their portfolios to review committees. In summary, the survey results are helpful as they indicate that many institutions have deliberately taken different approaches to addressing the questions posed in the survey. From the respondents’ narratives it would appear that a number of institutions are reflecting on many of the same issues as Eastern, but few indicated any intentions to change current practice.

Selected Reviews of Department Plans and Faculty Activity Plans

Reviewing selected Department Plans and Faculty Activity Plans from various colleges, the Committee is of the opinion that in the majority of departments plans the focus is consistent with the EWU mission, and the CBA, as being first a teaching institution, supported by appropriate levels of professional scholarship/creative work, and service (See Appendix B for summary of expectations). Where some department plans lack specificity there is a need to clarify expectations to assist both the tenure-track faculty member and the faculty mentor in achieving their mutual goals. Having said this, the high level of success of faculty going forward for tenure and/or promotion suggests that, in the vast majority of instances, faculty are receiving clear career expectations that result in tenure/promotion at Eastern Washington University.

Depending upon the departments surveyed from the other Washington State regional universities, the reports are mixed. Some departments appear to require additional publications

than do their EWU counterpart. In other instances, the promotion and tenure requirements appear to be less rigorous, more subjective, and on a more individual basis.

The review indicates there is little evidence to support the allegation that Eastern does not have comparably high standards for faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion. Furthermore, the Committee is not in agreement with the statement in the Fisher Report that “there are very modest expectations of faculty in the area of refereed scholarly productivity” (p. 16) often providing too many options to meet the scholarly productivity requirements. Instead, the Committee would advocate for expanding the types of “scholarship” that directly benefit Eastern (e.g the scholarship of teaching), since many would argue that they are as good a reflection of scholarship as are the more traditional forms of journal article submissions and the like. Related to journal publication, the “value” of publication in widely read regional journals as compared to very content specific national publications that may be less widely read also remains a controversial matter for some. The Committee believes that providing flexibility allows individuals to demonstrate and pursue strengths that collectively may create a stronger and more dynamic department.

Although the individual faculty activity plan requirements vary in their levels of specificity from department to department, and from person to person, all address the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The issues that seem to arise stem not so much from the content of the plans, but revolve more around interpretation and procedures pertaining to:

- The need to provide latitude regarding what constitutes service and scholarship;
- The determination of whether additional contributions in service or scholarship can compensate for reduction in another area; and
- The description of the criteria that determines “quality” or “value” of scholarship.

Eastern has national accreditation for many of its academic programs and, without exception, these accrediting boards find Eastern’s faculty, including those seeking tenure/promotion, to be well qualified and making substantial professional contributions. In addition, the number of Eastern faculty presenting professional papers at national and international conferences is viewed by this Committee as exemplary for a regional comprehensive university of this size. The summary report of the 2001-02 Faculty Survey Institutional Profile, conducted by UCLA and in which Eastern participated, provides compelling evidence that Eastern faculty levels and types of scholarship are comparable with the national sample of public 4-year universities (See Appendix C). In addition, this year Eastern is considering participation in the expanded Delaware Program Cost Study that addresses areas of academic scholarship and service as part of the expanded qualitative data collection.

Recent successful national accreditations of a number of Eastern’s degree programs [e.g., Urban Planning, Dental Hygiene, Technology, Teacher Education, School and Mental Health Counseling] provide documentation that Eastern faculty collectively meet and exceed the scholarly and service expectations of these national accrediting organizations.

The Tenure and Promotion Review Process

The Committee believes that the foundations of the current promotion and tenure process as described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement are sound; however, it also agrees with the findings of the Fisher Report that suggest steps that can be taken to improve the rigor and quality of the review process. The Fisher Report identified the lack of formal annual reviews of all probationary faculty members as a weakness in the process, and the Committee agrees. The Fisher Report also emphasized the need to focus on “meritorious performance” and again the Committee concurs. Academic Affairs has provided written guidelines for Department and College Personnel Committees for exercising their responsibilities to ensure comprehensive and equitable reviews.

Extracts from memo to Academic Deans from the Provost – 11/16/2000

“At each level of the review process, there should be an independent critique, and the recommendations should clearly describe evidence of the work record of candidates’ accomplishments in scholarship/creative work, teaching, and service. What are the expectations as outlined in the faculty activity plan? How are the criteria met relative to the plan, and what are the evidence and examples for meeting the criteria? If the criteria have not been met, to what extent have they not been met, and what must be done in order to meet them? How will your department establish a mentoring program or other means of working with candidates to help them improve and excel?”

“For tenure-track faculty, I ask specifically, that you write a paragraph describing and defining the particular discipline of study and field of practice, and a second paragraph describing the candidate’s area of scholarly interest, investigation, or emphasis within the discipline. . . . These two paragraphs should be followed by a constructive, analytical narrative and review of documented publication/creative work and other professional growth activities with comments on the importance and potential of the work . . .”

“ . . . give careful and sensitive focus to strengthening your review of professional growth and development, professional practice, and/or creative performance; and to linking your review to the expectations contained in faculty activity plans.”

In addition to the guidelines provided to reviewers by the CBA and by Academic Affairs, monitoring of tenure track and promotional faculty evaluations conducted over the past few years has revealed some committees, especially some college personnel committees, are unclear as to their evaluative role in relation to the roles of the department personnel committee and the department chair. Compounding this issue is the rotational nature of these committee memberships, where often the committee that approved a faculty member’s activity plan has no common membership with the committee who reviews the candidate’s promotion and/or tenure portfolio. Some faculty members have also expressed concern that the reviewing committees do not fully understand the significance of some of the examples cited in their portfolios and would like the opportunity to appear before the reviewing committees.

Since the focus on student learning is central to Eastern’s mission, the importance of assessing faculty instructional competence is essential. One of the instruments used for assessing a faculty

member's instructional capabilities and quality of the course curriculum, from the students' perspectives, is the "end of course" evaluation form. At present these end of course evaluations lack any type of consistency and are often less than helpful in the assessment process. Yet, these student assessments often play a pivotal role in the portfolio presentations of probationary faculty. There is also variance in the amount and consistency of the instructional reviews conducted by peers in departments across campus.

The onus falls to peers and administration to ensure that thorough evaluations are conducted of tenure track faculty, and those seeking promotion from associate to full professor rank. It is equally important to ensure that the faculty members' activity plans are achievable and that support structures are in place to assist the faculty member to achieve his or her goals. Part of this support structure needs to address ways to help tenure track faculty focus on achieving the expectations of their plans, and not to get sidetracked. Over the past five years the faculty, with few exceptions, have experienced success as they progress through the promotion and tenure process.

In its publication Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation (2002), the American Council on Education suggests that tenure track and faculty seeking promotion receive:

- A clear explanation of the requirements for reappointment and tenure, including any criteria specific to the department or school.
- Periodic evaluations of his or her progress in meeting the requirements.
- Candor in all evaluations that are explained in plain English.
- Specific examples that illustrate the quality of his or her performance.
- Constructive criticism outlining any potential areas for improvement.
- A review covering the entire evaluation period, not just the recent past.
- Practical guidance for future efforts to meet the requirements, without promises or guarantees that the institution may not be able to honor.
- An understanding of how a review (or reviews) during the probationary period differs from a later tenure review.

Recommendations

Policy

The Committee recommends:

- The continuation of the policy linking tenure with promotion to Associate Professor
- The continuation of flexibility concerning eligibility for early consideration for tenure and promotion based upon demonstrated exceptional performance that significantly exceeds the faculty activity plan
- In the event of a negative recommendation from a peer review committee, the faculty members should be given the opportunity to present in person their portfolios to the Department and College Personnel Committees, and should receive copies of all written progress reports and evaluations of their reviews
- A standardized end of course evaluation form, that has a core set of both quantitative and qualitative components, should be designed and be of compulsory use for all faculty
- Every college/school/department/library needs to ensure there are clear and explicit expectations stated in the unit plans for faculty retention, tenure and/or promotion

- The criteria for determining whether standards have been met for teaching, scholarship, and service need to be clearly defined and described in the department plan
- All faculty working towards retention, tenure and/or promotion should be assigned a faculty mentor
- Regular peer reviews of instructional practice should be a required component of each probationary faculty member's assessment
- Annual written reviews should be conducted at the department level during the 4th and 5th year for all probationary faculty

Content

The Committee recommends:

- Faculty activity plans may reflect flexibility in the amounts and types of activities teaching, scholarship/creative works, and service, such that the candidate can demonstrate and pursue strengths that collectively create a stronger and more dynamic department. Furthermore, departments should take steps to outline a process that ensures compliance with the flexibility described above.

Procedures

The Committee recommends:

- Spring quarter workshops be conducted annually by Academic Affairs for Department and College Personnel Committee members/chairs related to conducting comprehensive portfolio reviews, including clarification of roles and expectations of the committees
- The act of mentoring should be recognized as professional service in the mentor's personal faculty activity plan with the expectations clearly outlined.

References

Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators (2000). A joint project of The American Council on Education, The American Association of University Professors, and United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group. Washington: DC.

Appendices

Appendix A:

Survey of Academic Affairs Faculty Tenure/Promotion Policies and Procedures –
January, 2003

Appendix B:

Professional Scholarship Expectations in Selected Department and Individual
Faculty Activity Plans – Assessment Tool -- 2003

Appendix C:

Summary Table: EWU Departmental Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

Appendix D:

2001-02 Faculty Survey Institutional Profile -- University of California, Los Angeles

August 1, 2003

Appendix A:

**Survey of Academic Affairs Faculty Tenure/Promotion
Policies and Procedures – January, 2003**

**Eastern Washington University
Survey of Academic Affairs Faculty Tenure/Promotion Policies and Practices**

January/03

1. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor are linked at our institution. Yes No
If separate processes, which, in your opinion is more rigorous? Tenure Promotion

Comments:

2. To what extent are peer reviews an important component of the process?

Very important 5 4 3 2 1 Not important

Do you have a common format that peers use for these reviews? Yes No

Comments

3. Do you have a set template for the development of a “performance” portfolio for reappointment, tenure and promotion? Yes No

Do faculty present their portfolios to a committee/s of peers in person? Yes No

Comments:

4. Are you using solely a “performance-based” process, or do you also have length of service requirements

[e.g. eligible for tenure and/or promotion only after specified probationary service period]?

Solely performance-based Performance + Service

If you have a service requirement, what is the minimum number of years in rank before a faculty member is eligible to apply for:

a) Tenure/promotion (if linked) ____

b) Tenure ____

c) Promotion ____

Comments:

5. To what extent are personnel “attributes” [e.g. collegial, collaborative, etc.] an important part of the considerations when faculty go forward for tenure and/or promotion?

Very important 5 4 3 2 1 Not important

If moderate to very important, what processes are used to capture these less tangible qualities?

6. Does your institution have a Collective Bargaining Agreement? ___Yes ___No

Other Comments:

=====
We would greatly appreciate receiving copies of any policies, guidelines, or templates that you feel might be helpful and that would further explain the policies and procedures at your institution.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this short survey. Would you like to receive a copy of the summary data we collect? ___ Yes ___ No

Contact Person completing this survey:

Name: _____
Position: _____
Email address: <_____>
Work Phone # () _____

Appendix C:
Summary Table: EWU Departmental Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

Questions:	Arts & Letters (5)			Business & Public Administration (3)			Education & Human Development (2)			Science, Math & Technology (11)			Social & Behavioral Science (8)			Social Work (1)			
	Yes	No	Neither	Yes	No	Neither	Yes	No	Neither	Yes	No	Neither	Yes	No	Neither	Yes	No	Neither	
Teaching Expectations																			
Is there evidence that:																			
Faculty meet or exceed a described numerically-scaled performance level?	5				2	1	2				5	4	2	3	3	2		1	
Faculty undergo some form of classroom peer review of teaching performance?	5			1	1	1	2				9		2	6		2	1		
End of course student evaluations are conducted and are part of the assessment?	5			2		1	2				9		2	6		2	1		
Scholarship and/or Creative Activity																			
Is there evidence that:																			
Faculty have a clearly prescribed listing of expectations?	5			3			2				10		1	5		3	1		
Faculty have a list from which they may select to complete?	5			3			2				10		1	4		4	1		
Service																			
Is there evidence that:																			
Faculty have clearly defined expectations for committee service/leadership?	5			3			2				10		1	5		3	1		
Faculty have a stated expectation for external service to community, Professional organizations, and the like?	5			1		2	2				7		4	4	1	3	1		
Service is broadly defined with extensive opportunity for variation?	5			3			2				10		1	5		3	1		

**Appendix D:
2001-02 Faculty Survey Institutional Profile -- University of California, Los Angeles**

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
2001-2002 FACULTY SURVEY INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE**

Eastern Washington University Full-time Undergraduate Faculty	# Res- pondents	Your Institution			Public 4-yr Colls			All 4-year Insts		
		Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
HOW MANY OF THE FOLLOWING HAVE YOU PUBLISHED?										
Articles in academic or professional journals										
	93									
None		10.4	20.0	15.1	13.0	22.3	16.5	11.8	21.6	15.2
1 to 2		14.6	22.2	18.3	16.1	22.2	18.4	13.1	20.9	15.8
3 to 4		14.6	24.4	19.4	16.1	19.7	17.4	12.6	17.0	14.1
5 to 10		22.9	13.3	18.3	21.7	20.6	21.3	18.8	20.4	19.3
11 to 20		22.9	13.3	18.3	17.5	9.5	14.5	17.0	11.2	15.0
21 to 50		10.4	4.4	7.5	11.3	4.8	8.9	16.1	6.8	12.9
More than 50		4.2	2.2	3.2	4.3	0.8	3.0	10.7	2.1	7.8
Chapters in edited volumes										
	86									
None		43.2	73.8	58.1	50.8	56.9	53.1	41.8	52.3	45.4
1 to 2		27.3	14.3	20.9	28.5	26.8	27.9	25.1	25.9	25.4
3 to 4		18.2	7.1	12.8	11.3	9.9	10.8	14.5	11.5	13.4
5 to 10		4.5	4.8	4.7	6.6	4.9	6.0	11.3	7.0	9.9
11 to 20		4.5	0.0	2.3	2.1	1.1	1.7	4.6	2.3	3.8
21 to 50		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.4	2.2	0.8	1.7
More than 50		2.3	0.0	1.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.4
Books, manuals, or monographs										
	87									
None		31.2	61.5	44.8	53.2	63.6	57.1	48.6	60.7	52.8
1 to 2		43.7	33.3	39.1	30.2	25.4	28.4	29.7	26.8	28.7
3 to 4		12.5	5.1	9.2	10.1	6.9	8.9	11.2	7.7	10.0
5 to 10		10.4	0.0	5.7	4.4	3.1	3.9	7.2	3.7	6.0
11 to 20		0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.7	1.1	2.2	0.8	1.7
21 to 50		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.7	0.1	0.5
More than 50		2.1	0.0	1.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2
How many exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts have you presented?										
	94									
None		81.6	82.2	81.9	80.3	80.9	80.5	81.0	80.1	80.7
1 to 2		2.0	4.4	3.2	3.8	4.4	4.0	3.7	4.4	3.9
3 to 4		0.0	2.2	1.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.5	2.3
5 to 10		4.1	4.4	4.3	1.9	2.9	2.3	2.0	2.6	2.2
11 to 20		0.0	6.7	3.2	1.7	1.9	1.8	1.4	1.8	1.5
21 to 50		2.0	0.0	1.1	3.3	2.9	3.1	2.8	3.1	2.9
More than 50		10.2	0.0	5.3	6.9	5.0	6.2	7.1	5.5	6.5
How many of your professional writings have been published or accepted for publication in the last two years?										
	93									
None		31.2	35.6	33.3	32.2	36.3	33.7	27.8	35.1	30.4
1 to 2		29.2	33.3	31.2	35.4	36.7	35.9	29.6	33.1	30.8
3 to 4		22.2	22.2	21.7	20.5	18.5	18.8	22.2	18.8	22.1
5 to 10		10.4	11.1	10.8	11.3	11.1	10.8	11.3	11.1	10.8
11 to 20		1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
21 to 50		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
More than 50		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0