MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Donald W. Zacharias, President

FROM: Tom Coohill, Mary Ellen Miller, and Rich Weigel for the Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Promotion Document

We have gathered faculty responses to the proposed Promotion Document and would like to report the following views:

1. p. 3 - typographical error- "articles" is included twice under #1. Publication
2. p. 4 - "textbooks" should be moved from #6. Participation to #1. Publications
3. p. 5 - "Grants writing" should be added as subcategory #6.
4. An exception statement regarding promotion for superior merit in one category should be added. (See Faculty Handbook, p. 10, item I.A.1.)
5. A deans’ promotion document is regarded by several faculty members as an unnecessary addition between university and departmental promotion policies and as a violation of the Board-approved guidelines.
6. The verbal comments of many faculty are summarized in the points above. We would also like to submit for your consideration the attached written responses.

We would like to express our sincere appreciation for your concern for faculty views on this important matter and for the opportunity to submit our responses to you.
Memorandum

To: Tom Coohill, Faculty Senate Chair
From: Barry Brunson
Subject: Criteria for Promotion Recommendations

Overall, I support the criteria; but I have the following reservations and/or comments:

Teaching Effectiveness

10. An evaluation of the success of students on uniform examinations, in acceptance to graduate and professional programs, in winning awards, and other highly significant achievements.

Comment: This is a valid consideration, given a clear awareness of pitfalls in both directions. On the one hand, faculty should not attempt to rest on the laurels of good students, who on occasion may distinguish themselves in spite of, rather than because of, the faculty member. On the other hand, the mere absence of "significant achievements" by a faculty member's students does not necessarily reflect on the faculty member.

11. Documentation of direct assistance in helping students find employment in their major field of study.

Comment: This appears to be the weakest of the criteria. If I had an uncle Ned, and if Uncle Ned owned an engineering firm, and if I was able to persuade Uncle Ned to hire five of my former students, that would say little about my abilities as a teacher. The criterion seems to have the potential for abuse by rewarding some form of "good old boy" network.

Research/Creative Activity

5. Inventorship or Co-inventorship -- leading to U.S. and/or other patents.

Comment: A clause should be added stipulating some connection to the faculty member's field of expertise (of whatever is invented/patented).

8. Continuation -- of current research and other creativity not yet resulting in publication, performance, or display.

Comment: This is a very good and important consideration. The potential for abuse exists, but should be detectable, and avoidable, at the unit level.
To: Whom It May Concern

From: James Flynn

Subject: Deans' Promotion Document

May 2, 1984

A major problem with the deans' promotion document, as I see it, is that it has not been widely enough circulated for serious collegial review in light of its intended purpose. It was circulated during the interim period last August under the heading "Academic Deans' Criteria for Promotion Recommendations." Now it appears simply as "Criteria for Promotion Recommendations." I certainly feel that the academic deans have the right to set their own promotion guidelines and standards. But I don't believe that their guidelines should, with little review and discussion, automatically become, as is apparently intended, the "official interpretation of the University's promotion policy."

Moreover, the use of the academic deans' promotion document as the official interpretation of the University promotion policy seems to contradict the current University policy, which states, on page 10 of the Faculty Handbook, that "The department head and departmental faculty within each academic unit have the responsibility of drafting specific criteria for determining what constitutes 'demonstrated achievement' for each rank." The English Department, along with all other departments at the University I assume, did draft such promotion guidelines. The adoption of the deans' guidelines would, as I understand it, make these departmental guidelines meaningless, contrary to the clear intentions of the present policy.

I am also concerned about the extraordinary list of qualifiers that accompany the inclusion of curricular materials in item 6 under Research/Creative Activity. Not only is such material to be "innovative" but it must "break new ground and successfully advance concepts and approaches that transcend ordinary instructional material." While I applaud the insistence upon quality of curricular materials, the proposed statement, in its grandiose rhetoric, sets unrealistically high expectations by which such material is to be judged. In fact, the intent of this item is clearly to discourage individuals from undertaking such projects. But given the oft-cited vital link that exists between teaching and research/publication, we should be hesitant about discouraging faculty members at Western from producing good, solid, usable instructional materials. It seems to me, also, that there should be some attempt to distinguish such materials on the basis of whether they are used only locally or are distributed nationally. I admit that I feel strongly about the issue.
of textbooks because I have co-authored one. But I believe that the experience of writing the book was of immense professional value to me. At least, there should be a full discussion of this issue by the University community before the deans' policy is approved.

Finally, the document seems to be fuzzy about the evaluation of candidates' teaching effectiveness. According to the document, "It is the responsibility of the candidate seeking promotion to provide promotion committees with the appropriate evidence on which to base a decision." Does that mean, then, that the candidate should provide the committee with "evidence" that he or she has held office hours and has returned "materials in a timely fashion," as cited in item 4 of this category? What kind of evidence would one present? The same questions come to mind about the evaluation of the "effectiveness of presentation" in item 2. How is the committee to judge this? And what is the role of the department head in these evaluations? In large departments, such as English, if the department head is expected to carry out all of the suggested evaluations, there will need to be adjustments in load or additional assistance in order to make these detailed evaluations possible. In sum, has any consideration been given to the actual administrative implementation of this policy?

I believe that there are enough questions surrounding the proposed promotion guidelines to warrant a delay in their approval so that a thorough review of the policy can be undertaken by the University community.

JF/pn
In general, I think the provisions of the document are fine, though the expectation that everyone be equally effective in teaching, research, and service strikes me as unrealistic and probably wasteful. If everyone complies, the contributions of people gifted in one or two of these areas will suffer from the effort to do things for which they may not be well suited. Some flexibility might keep a gifted researcher from feeling he has to spend a lot of time suffering through committee meetings or an excellent committee member from struggling to produce bad articles. A degree of specialization may be necessary if everyone is to do his best work.

A particular point of concern with me as a textbook writer is the way the document treats (or doesn't treat) textbooks. I can't tell where they go. A textbook might count under teaching (but only if you use it in your own class?) or it might come under publication: after all, it is a "book." Or it might go under "participation in developing instructional materials" as a research/creative credit, but only if in someone's view (whose?) it somehow transcends "ordinary instructional materials" or is "innovative." I think this extraordinary waffle comes from a reluctance to give textbooks any kind of credit at all, but it is hardly a good solution to include them everywhere. A reasonable person reading this document might feel that textbook-writing is the most valuable achievement there is. A textbook seems to be a teaching credit and also to count twice under research/creative activities. The whole treatment is hopelessly confused and will lead to many headaches as an administrative policy.

The second thing that concerns me is the way the document was created and the official role to which it aspires. It has been described as a synopsis of the departmental promotion criteria called for in the current FACULTY HANDBOOK. A single document, one heard, was necessary to bring all these specific promotion criteria into a central statement. But this document also claims to supersede any other criteria, supplanting rather than summarizing the departmental work on promotions. To the extent that it does so, it is in plain violation of the existing policy that departments, not deans, be responsible for "drafting specific criteria for determining what constitutes 'demonstrated achievement' for each rank."

At one time, I believe, the document was titled "Deans' Guidelines on Promotion," a title that still fits. Not much later it appeared again as a proposed official University
interpretation of the FACULTY HANDBOOK criteria. In this guise it came very close to being adopted by the regents until it was withdrawn at the last minute for further work. It doesn't look greatly changed to me. I still don't think it is a very accurate reflection of the departmental guidelines I know about, and if it isn't, as I said earlier, it is in violation of existing policy.

These, in short, are still the deans' guidelines. They were developed with no direct faculty involvement, and they have never been systematically reviewed by the faculty. My department head had never even seen a copy of the latest version until I posted the one I received through the Senate just two days ago.

I think it's fine for the deans to have guidelines of their own. They make promotion decisions and ought to have something to go on if they choose not to be guided by existing departmental criteria. But deans' guidelines, if that's really what these are, should not be represented as the result of some broad collegial process, and they ought not to replace the departmental documents called for in the current official university policy on promotions.

We worked hard to create a department document to represent our best thinking on what should count toward promotion in English. The statement we came up with was based on a real process of consensus and compromise. It was specific and demanding. It did not contain tangles like the deans' treatment of textbooks. It was our attempt to conform to the official policy on promotions in the current HANDBOOK. The document we're considering is none of these things. It should be presented as a policy originating with the Council of Deans and serving their needs. It should not replace the departmental criteria already in place and it should certainly not be presented to the regents as an expression of faculty opinion.
MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Thomas P. Coohill, Chair
Faculty Senate

FROM: John P. Russell, Associate Professor
Industrial and Engineering Technology

SUBJECT: Criteria for Promotion Recommendations

May 2, 1984

With regard to the document "Criteria for Promotion Recommendations" developed by the academic deans and provided for reaction, I wish to make the following comments:

1. The policy of the Board of Regents with regard to rank and promotion places the responsibility for the development of specific criteria as to what constitutes "demonstrated achievement appropriate for this rank in teaching effectiveness, research/creative activity and university/public service" with the departmental faculty and department head. The department heads, academic deans, Academic Vice President and the President are to recommend those criteria for approval by the Board of Regents. This procedure should allow the fundamental differences between departments to be addressed while maintaining a consistent and uniform rigor in promotion actions.

The rank and promotion policy adopted by the Board of Regents and published in the Faculty Handbook has not been implemented. The specific criteria were developed by the departments and were recommended by deans and the vice president but have not been presented to the Board for approval. I contend that if we wish to implement the adopted policy as the document in question purports to do, that the departmental criteria must be approved by the Board and used in rank and promotion actions. It is my understanding that the only document which is intended to be presented to the Board is the one in question and, thus, it will provide the basis for the criteria for rank and promotion. If that be the case, then I contend it is a subversion of the Board of Regents policy and should not be permitted.

The document in question is purposely vague in presentation and does not describe the differences between departments. No weighting is given to the various activities described while the experience on campus is that there are activities preferred by the academic deans. The document describes no minimum level of achievement necessary to earn promotion and, in fact, represents no substantial change from the "criteria" which have been previously applied. In fact, if this
document becomes the only statement of approved criteria, the promotion actions will continue to be based on arbitrary judgements and a basis for contention between the faculty and administration.

The document in question should not be presented to the Board until and unless the specific departmental criteria are approved. The Faculty Senate and Faculty should strive to gain approval of the departmentally-developed criteria.

2. The criteria presented are not a sufficient description of faculty performance related to rank and promotion. There are no minimal levels described nor are there weightings given to various activities. Far more serious, the criteria as described call for productivity in teaching effectiveness and research/creative activity and university/public service which is beyond the capability of most to accomplish. In addition, there is apparently no recognition given to the institutional responsibility to provide a reasonable opportunity to achieve the performance levels described.

If productivity in research/creative activity is expected, then there should be reasonable resources (release time, equipment, library resources, etc.) available to accomplish that productivity. If participation in professional meetings is desirable and contributive to the institution, then resources should be made available to reasonably allow a faculty member to participate. In the absence of sufficient resources then it is unreasonable to expect or demand the same level of productivity which could occur with adequate resources.

3. The experience with promotion action at Western would indicate that they are often bases for contention. The Board of Regents policy, if implemented, should overcome this adverse feature and provide uniform and equitable actions to be taken. However, based on experience, I believe it should be required that the academic deans describe specifically how a candidate does not meet the departmental criteria. A simple statement that the criteria are not met is easily made, provides no substantiation of the judgement, and provides no guidance to the individual involved. Such statements are useful in camouflaging arbitrary and capricious judgements.

4. I think promotion actions should be positive in nature. Promotion should be a recognition of accomplishment and service and judgements for promotion should be based on the accomplishments of the individual. At Western currently, it appears that the process is negative in that reasons are sought not to promote rather than reasons to promote. If it is desired to encourage productivity at Western, then I suggest that we should have a positive process for promotion rather than one which is negative.

I appreciate the opportunity to react to the deans' document.

cc: Mary Ellen Miller
CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION RECOMMENDATIONS

General

Promotion decisions at Western are made at six levels: recommendations from peer review, the department head, the academic dean, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President and approval by the Board of Regents.

Review at the academic dean's level will apply the standards for promotion set by the university and establish and preserve for the various disciplines of achievement levels which equalize the rigor with which candidates from different departments are judged. The standards developed by each academic department must be in compliance with the standards expressed here and should serve to state explicitly the requirements for promotion within a specific department.

University policy requires the following for promotion at every rank:

- Demonstrated achievement appropriate for this rank in teaching effectiveness, research/creative activity, and university/public service.

Demonstrated achievement will be considered only as it is relevant to the individual's area of professional competence. Only contributions since the last promotion will be considered for the next promotion. It is the responsibility of the candidate seeking promotion to provide promotion committees with the appropriate evidence on which to base a decision. Departments will develop specific criteria appropriate to their disciplines, but evaluation of all areas, both at the departmental and at the academic deans' levels, will take into consideration both quantity and quality.
ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

1. See University Rank and Promotion Requirements

2. In some areas professional certification and the related license to practice may be required.

AREAS OF PERFORMANCE

Teaching Effectiveness

Evidence in this area may include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. An evaluation of both the systematic organization of appropriate materials for presentation and communication to students of course objectives, plan of study, and means of student performance evaluation.

2. An evaluation of the effectiveness of presentation whether by lecture, discussion, assignment and recitation, demonstration, laboratory exercise, practical experience, consultation, field trips, computer-assisted instruction, reading lists, filmed or video taped materials, simulations, and games.

3. An evaluation of assessment procedures such as tests, grading practices, and clinical performance.

4. An evaluation of professional responsibility such as in meeting classes; holding office hours; returning materials in a timely fashion; making clinical assignments; supervising of students; and treating students in a fair, impartial, and respectful manner.

5. An evaluation of the effectiveness with which students are stimulated to develop critical and/or creative abilities and intellectual curiosity by such means as independent study or thesis projects, for example.
6. An evaluation of the knowledge of recent discoveries and literature in the field; the use of the latest scientific/technological innovations; and participation in professional activities, such as training programs, technical seminars, and self-study programs.

7. Self-evaluation through course evaluations; departmental exams; and comments from peers, students, and alumni.

8. An evaluation of cooperation in developing, scheduling, and teaching general undergraduate and graduate courses on and off campus.

9. An evaluation of the development of textbooks, workbooks, manuals, tapes, slides, and other print and nonprint learning resources developed primarily for classroom use.

10. An evaluation of the success of students on uniform examinations, in acceptance to graduate and professional programs, in winning awards, and other highly significant achievements.

11. Documentation of direct assistance in helping students find employment in their major field of study.

Research/Creative Activity

Evidence in these areas may include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Publication--of books, monographs, articles, maps, bibliographies, indexes, catalogs, articles, and papers in professional journals; production or direction of nonprint media work; reports to federal, state, or local agencies; and cases.
2. Presentations-- papers, cases, media productions, etc., at professional and other scholarly meetings.

3. Participation-- in studies, programs, creative activity supported by extramural funds.

4. Production and Display-- of musical compositions, paintings, sculpture, ceramics, weaving, photographs, graphics, and other works of art; recitals, choreography, stage design and construction, costuming, direction; and production of film and video taped materials.

5. Inventorship or Co-inventorship-- leading to U.S. and/or other patents.

6. Participation-- in the development of innovative curricular materials, such as curriculum guides; computer assisted instruction; lab equipment; video tapes; films and film strips; and textbooks, manuals, workbooks, tools, or models which break new ground and successfully advance concepts and ideas and approaches that transcend ordinary instructional material.

7. Invitations-- to conduct research at other universities or research oriented agencies; to prepare questions for professional examinations.

8. Continuation-- of current research and other creativity not yet resulting in publication, performance, or display.
Evidence in these areas may include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Service-- on departmental, college, and university committees, councils, and senates; in appropriate professional organizations as officer, editor, and referee; to local, state, and/or national governmental boards, agencies, and commissions; to business and industry or private citizens as technical expert or member of a policy advisory committee; and as organizer/director of seminars, workshops and/or other conferences.

2. Participation-- in meetings, symposia, conferences, and workshops; in radio and television by developing and presenting materials for public awareness; and conducting or performing.

3. Work with Schools-- through contact with teachers, administrators, and students; through participation in science fairs, college day programs, lectures, performance, and in-service programs; and through advice on curricular matters, pedagogy, and the like.

4. Direction-- of internships, cooperative education, and practica; learning laboratories; professional clubs; and other organizations.

5. Advisement-- academic; to student organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>Promotion to Full Professor</th>
<th>Promotion to Associate Professor</th>
<th>Promotion to Assistant Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>consistently above the average level of performance according to departmental standards</td>
<td><strong>Research/Creative Activity</strong></td>
<td>a record of significant and high quality productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University/Public Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>tangible evidence of high quality productivity</strong></td>
<td><strong>tangible evidence of high quality productivity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion to Full Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Promotion to Associate Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>attainment of at least the average level of performance according to departmental standards</td>
<td><strong>Research/Creative Activity</strong></td>
<td>potential is evident by departmental assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University/Public Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>tangible evidence of high quality productivity</strong></td>
<td><strong>potential is evident by departmental assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion to Assistant Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Research/Creative Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>must be fully acceptable by department's standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>potential is evident by departmental assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>