

To: Faculty Senate
From: Promotion Committee
Date: April 23, 2013
Subject: Final Report for 2012-2013

The University Promotion Committee met over the academic year to review, evaluate, and offer recommendations to the Provost with regard to eleven applicants for promotion to associate professor, one applicant for promotion to clinical associate professor, and three applicants for promotion to professor.

Additionally, the committee has compiled a list of recommendations (please see the attached document) for streamlining the promotion process in the future.

Additionally, the Provost requested that the University Promotion committee undertake a review of and make recommendations on developing a new policy pertaining to “conditional reappointments.” Please see the attached document for a summary of the committee’s deliberations on this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

2012-2013 University Promotion Committee Members:

_____ Dr. Ernest Hall (Chair)
_____ Dr. Karen Bonnell
_____ Dr. Robert Boostrom
_____ Dr. Julie Evey-Johnson
_____ Dr. Sangwoo Heo
_____ Dr. Martin Reed

Recommendations of the University Promotion Committee 2012-2013

In light of the deliberations of the University Promotion Committee throughout the 2012-2013 academic year the committee would like to propose the following modifications to the promotion process. The intent of these recommendations is to help clarify the process for the applicants and ensure a consistent and thorough review by the committee. Consistent with these goals, the University Promotion Committee would like to recommend the following changes/modifications to the promotion process.

- 1) All recommendations that are going to be implemented need to be disseminated to faculty and administrators as early as possible. In particular, the calendar of deadlines needs to be published in the spring semester so that everyone will be informed of the timeline. (This is to ensure that faculty will have the necessary time to assemble their dossier. Some faculty may want to work on their applications over the summer months.)
- 2) An absolute deadline for when the packets must be submitted. Once the packet is submitted to the department chair the applicant will not be allowed to add any additional information. This policy is to ensure that all chairs, committees, and deans are reviewing the same dossier. Therefore, the evaluations of the various bodies will be comparable and consistent.
- 3) All student evaluations should be put online (OPRA) for candidates going up for promotion. Make it available to department, college, etc. committee members. Privacy limited to necessary personnel.
- 4) Recommend that all applicants provide peer evaluations
- 5) Enrollment numbers needed on evaluations. Currently, only the number of responses is included on the student evaluations. Can OPRA include enrollment numbers on the evaluations?
- 6) Publications will be counted when they have been accepted without revisions during the review period (this means the paper does not need any revisions/modifications).
- 7) If a faculty received a research award they must submit a summary of the research that shows that it was completed (a final report of the FRCWA should be included in an appendix).
- 8) All of the appendices should be labeled to match the main points of the dossier. For example, the appendix that includes supporting documents for teaching should be contained in an appendix labeled appendix: teaching.
- 9) All materials included in the dossier should be of the same size. No papers should protrude past the tabs, so that the tabs will be easy to find.
- 10) All dossiers will consist of one 4-inch binder, excluding student evaluations (the student evaluations will be stored online). Supplemental information/documentation should be included on a jump/flash drive. Supplemental documentation may or may not be included in the evaluation.
- 11) All dossiers should include a reflection on teaching. In particular, the applicant should include a discussion of teaching assessment and changes that were made in response to what was learned from the assessment.

- 12) Provide a standardized template on Blackboard for applicants to follow.
- 13) All colleges should utilize the same forms to ensure consistency. As it currently stands, some Deans fill out the Likert scale and others do not. All forms must be signed by the appropriate committee members, department chairs, deans, etc.
- 14) Only include student evaluations since the last promotion.
- 15) Curriculum vitae should include complete citations for all published works (in particular, page numbers must be included).
- 16) Applicants need to clearly separate and verify peer-reviewed articles from non-peer reviewed articles. Also, newsletter or editor reviewed articles should be clearly differentiated.

Date: April 23, 2013
To: Dr. Ron Rochon, Provost
From: University Promotion Committee
Subject: Conditional Reappointment

After a thorough review and discussion of the conditional reappointment policies at various universities and the extant policies included in the University Handbook, the University Promotion Committee would like to make the following recommendations.

First, the committee does not believe that the University of Southern Indiana should add an additional formal policy to govern conditional reappointments. According to the current policy governing reappointments as it is contained in the University Handbook (pp. 52-53) reads:

B. Probationary Period and Reappointment/Non-reappointment Procedure

During the probationary period, the appointee is given sequential term appointments of two two-year appointments and a final appointment of three years.

4. During the probationary period, faculty members will be notified of weaknesses or evidences of unsatisfactory service or of any condition that might serve as a basis for non-renewal of their appointment at all levels of evaluation.

C. Dismissal for Cause

Termination for cause of a faculty member who has tenure or whose term appointment has not expired shall be upon the recommendation of the dean or director and the provost and vice president for Academic Affairs to the president for the University

The committee contends that since all non-tenured faculty are probationary (i.e. conditional) that there is no need for an additional policy to cover conditional reappointments as a separate and distinct category. The committee believes that the current policy for probationary faculty is more than adequate to cover the possibility of conditional reappointment. Based on the probationary reappointment policy, any non-tenured faculty member can be put on conditional reappointment.

Second, there is a greater need for more clear and direct communication between the university administration and the faculty member who is not meeting university expectations. In past cases, there were faculty who were placed on what amounted

to a conditional reappointment and they didn't even know it. In addition, in at least one case neither the department chair nor the dean knew their faculty had been given a conditional reappointment.

Third, the conditional reappointment has been viewed by faculty as a punitive measure to punish faculty, rather than as a vehicle to assist faculty in need of additional support and assistance.

Fourth, department chairs and college deans already review faculty on an annual basis via annual reports and therefore, should already include an assessment of the progress of all faculty on an annual basis. Identification of any faculty deficiencies should be addressed during the review of annual evaluations and discussed with the individual faculty members. This process is already in place and seems to be the appropriate venue for addressing such issues that pertain to a conditional reappointment.

Lastly, the committee does not believe that conditional reappointments are within the purview of the committee, since such decisions are not covered in the duties and responsibilities of the promotion committee. Since the promotion committee does not render recommendations on reappointments, the University Promotion Committee respectfully suggests that such matters fall within the auspices of the Faculty and Academic Affairs Committee.