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Charge to the Committee from Provost and Faculty Senate President

To consider the criteria and the procedures for tenure and promotion, and to recommend new or revised criteria and procedures for consideration.
Charge to the Committee from Provost and Faculty Senate President

Include consideration of the following:

- Look at comparable institutions
- Recommend processes that affirm the University’s mission
- Develop possible ways to simplify the review processes
- Define the role of instruction and research and creative activity and their criteria or standards
- Consider and define the role of service
- Consider guidelines for recommending tenure and promotion that are consistent with the University’s mission
- Define the role of Colleges and Depts/Divisions and the various Personnel Committees
- Consider whether tenure and promotion should be linked
What the Committee Has Done

- Met six times
- Discussed, clarified the charge
- Looked at criteria and processes from approximately 15 comparable schools
- Looked at the criteria used by many UWF departments/divisions
- Developed a working agreement on a number of points
The Planning Process

An Inclusive Process among:

- Administration
- Faculty
- Faculty Senate
- College Councils
- Development of criteria from faculty and the T+P Task Force
- Questionnaire distributed to the faculty to obtain input
- Analysis of questionnaire by committee
- Preliminary recommendations are developed and shared with faculty and administration
- Feedback obtained by all stakeholders
- Final recommendation submitted to Provost and Faculty Senate
- Distribution to faculty
- Conclusion of the process by the end of next academic year
Framework for Decisions

- We need to survey faculty, chairs, and other evaluating bodies concerning their tenure and promotion process.

- Behavioral criteria would produce more sound judgment.
Framework for Decisions

- Boyer’s views of what constitutes scholarship (e.g., discovery, application, integration, teaching/learning) will help us broaden legitimately what can be considered as scholarship.

- Service definitions may need retooling to help us set expectations for excellence that are consistent with regional comprehensive rather than research universities.
Framework for Decisions

- Departments, within university guidelines, should have the authority to set the standards by which faculty are evaluated.

- If departments have clear criteria, it could lead to a reduction in layers of Review.
Future Considerations

- What layers of review are truly needed?
- Should “t” and “p” be linked?
- Should we explicitly address faculty/student relations/collegiality/ethics in the criteria?
- How shall we explore the practice of submitting a portfolio early for T & P?