

## Rank and Promotions Requirements

FSW 001.2

November 12, 1981

A meeting with the President and the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee produced some changes in and clarifications of the Rank and Promotion Requirements document (9-18-81.) The following attempts to present what appeared to me to be the highlights of our discussion.

First of all, the President indicated that the "and" in IA1C "demonstrated achievement in teaching effectiveness, research/creative activity, and university/public service" is a deliberate change to a greater emphasis on research. The exact proportions of the three areas of demonstrated achievement will be essentially a matter to be determined at the departmental and college levels.

The President suggested a change in the wording of IA2 to "Each dean of an academic unit has the responsibility in consultation with faculty representatives from each department and each department head etc." to accommodate the Senate's expressed concern at the failure of RPR to spell out specifically a significant role for departmental faculty in establishing college criteria for what constitutes "demonstrated achievement" for each rank.

As to the failure of RPR to provide for a faculty member's being given reasons when rejected for promotion, President Zacharias stated that a primary concern here was possible legal complication. There are, however, a number of ways, he pointed out, for a rejected candidate to get a pretty accurate understanding of the reason for rejection. First of all, such a faculty member has access to the file that has been built in considering the promotion. Second, a faculty member who has had regular conferences with the department head should have a fairly clear idea about any problems which may be impeding promotion. Third, a failure to provide a written reason does not preclude an oral communication of reasons.

The third area of concern was that the appeals process allowed only review of matters of procedure, not substance. As the President explained it, however, matters of procedure may include matters of considerable significance. For example, a woman faculty member might appeal to a

grievance committee on the ground that her reviewing committee was all male or a faculty member rejected for promotion might raise the procedural point that the method by which individuals had been chosen to evaluate the faculty member was unfair or that a committee had not made a conscientious effort in its evaluation or that outside individuals asked to comment on the candidate for promotion had been prejudiced. It seems clear from these examples then that a grievance committee could consider questions as to fairness and prejudice as procedural. It would not, however, be the province of such a committee to try to determine such matters as quality of research or teaching effectiveness.

At a meeting of Faculty Status and Welfare last Tuesday, November 10, Committee members discussed our meeting with the President. There was a consensus that the changed wording with regard to departmental faculty consultation in drafting a college RPR document, the statement that faculty rejected for promotion would have access to their files, and the interpretation offered by the President of matters which might be considered procedural in reviewing a negative recommendation, largely alleviated concerns in those areas. There was continuing concern, however, about the greater emphasis on research because of doubt that in some disciplines it would be possible at present teaching loads both to have time for significant research and to maintain a high quality of instruction, thus making promotions very difficult to attain. While this concern may be lessened to a certain degree by the President's statement that the exact mixture of the three areas of demonstrated achievement will be determined at departmental and college levels, the committee noted that there is at present no provision in the RPR document for a list of recommendations regarding this mixture to be drawn up in the departments as well as at the college level, and it suggests that perhaps a specific statement on that matter should be included.