



WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY 42101

Department of Management and Marketing

MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Don Bailey, Chair
Faculty Senate

FROM: Dr. Max Salem, Faculty Senate Representative for
the Department of Management and Marketing *M. Salem*

SUBJECT: University Guidelines for Promotion

DATE: February 10, 1981

In response to the letter from President Zacharias which you forwarded to me regarding proposed university guidelines for promotion, I took the liberty of soliciting responses from faculty members in both the Management and Marketing Department and the Finance and Quantitative Business Analysis Department.

Enclosed are samples of their responses. The points of concerns are:

- I. Need for more specific, less vague, requirements for promotion, so that the policy:
 - A. Can be more goal oriented - i.e., something the faculty can clearly identify and shoot for.
 - B. Can give greater consistency and comparability from department to department and college to college.

Here are some examples:

1. It should be stated explicitly that promotion from associate to full professor must require a level of achievement higher than that required to be promoted from assistant to associate, and so on.
2. It should be stated explicitly that to be promoted from one rank to another, there ought to be either the same degree of competence in all these areas of activity (teaching, research, community service) or that varying degrees of competence are acceptable if one has demonstrated overwhelming competence in one or two areas and maintained average (acceptable) competence in another area.

3. In the case of the instructor and assistant professor ranks, the requirements should specify that the master's degree and any advanced work beyond the master's should be taken in one's specific field of teaching responsibility (i.e., a master's degree in history should not be appropriate for teaching as an instructor or assistant professor in education of disadvantaged children or social work.)
 4. That professional organization activity should be explicitly covered.
- II. There seems to be a fundamental inconsistency between the concept of merit (demonstrated performance) and that of seniority (number of years in a particular rank). At any rate, the number of years required for promotion in this policy - 5 years - seems to be arbitrary.

The consensus seems to indicate, however, that if a minimum is necessary, then a limit of three years would be more reasonable and appropriate.

- III. Appeal procedure in case of a faculty member's desire for reconsideration is not clearly defined. Even when the president himself determines that proper promotion procedures were not followed, he is not obligated to order reconsideration. For, according to the stated policy, he only "...may refer the promotion application to the appropriate administrative level for reconsideration."

Please consider this document for the Senate's records as a formal representation of our faculty's opinion, and kindly bring it to the attention of the Senate's memberships when the matter comes up for consideration.

Our faculty hopes that their opinion would contribute to a clear, just, and truly motivating promotion policy.

Thank You.

MS/jsm

Enclosure

cc: President Donald Zacharias
Dr. James Davis, Vice-President
Dr. Robert Nelson, Dean of the College of Business
Mr. Jim Oppitz, Assistant Dean and Acting Department Head