

College of Arts & Sciences Meeting Fairfield University

Friday, March 22, 3:30-5:00 PM
Alumni House

AGENDA

- I. Approval of Minutes
https://files.fairfield.edu/Departments/Faculty%20Bodies/CAS/website/CAS%20MINUTES/2012/2012_11_14.html
- II. Elections [appendix A, calls for nominations]
 - Arts & Sciences Planning Committee, At-Large Representative
 - Arts & Sciences Planning Committee, Interdisciplinary Programs Representative
 - Faculty Secretary, College of Arts & Sciences
- III. Report from Subcommittee on Rank & Tenure language for CAS governance document and related motions [appendix B]
- IV. Dean's remarks and Q&A
- V. Adjourn to refreshments

A&S Planning Committee

Ex officio

Robbin Crabtree, Dean
Sally O'Driscoll, Chair (2012-2014)
Scott Lacy, Secretary (2011-2013)

Elected (4 members)

Bob Epstein (2012-2014)
Dave Crawford* (2012-2014)
*Rick DeWitt, Sabbatical Replacement, Spring 2013
Marti LoMonaco (2011-2013)
Glenn Sauer (2011-2013)

APPENDIX A

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

ARTS & SCIENCES PLANNING COMMITTEE (TWO POSITIONS)

- At-Large Representative, 2-year term (Fall '13-Spr '15)
- Interdisciplinary Programs & Humanities Representative, 2-year term (Fall '13-Spr '15)

Eligibility: All CAS faculty are eligible for the at-large nomination. Faculty from an Interdisciplinary Program and Humanities are eligible for the second nomination.

Description: Attend ASPC-CAS Planning Committee meetings, set CAS meeting agendas, advises Dean

FACULTY SECRETARY, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

- CAS Secretary, 2-year term (Fall '13-Spr '15)

Eligibility: All CAS faculty are eligible for nomination.

Description: Take minutes at CAS Faculty Meetings, maintain CAS Faculty Website, attend ASPC-CAS Planning Committee meetings (ex officio)

HOW TO SERVE

Please consider nominating yourself or a colleague to one or more of these positions. Prior to the February 22nd meeting of the CAS, you may email your nominations to Prof. Driscoll (CAS Chair) or Prof. Lacy (CAS Secretary). Nominations will also be taken from the floor during the February 22nd CAS meeting.

APPENDIX B

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON RANK & TENURE PROCEDURES

Report
Subcommittee on College Rank and Tenure Procedures
College of Arts and Sciences
Fairfield University
March 15, 2013

Report, Subcommittee on College Rank and Tenure Procedures

Formation of and Charge to the Subcommittee

The subcommittee was proposed by the A&S Planning Committee in September 2012 in order to:

- 1) review University-wide Rank and Tenure guidelines
- 2) consider whether any College-level procedures and guidelines are needed
- 3) draft recommendations for consideration by the CAS faculty.

The subcommittee was to consist of four tenure-track faculty members from the College, including at least one from each rank (Assistant, Associate, Full), and with at least two members having prior experience on the Rank and Tenure Committee.

At the CAS faculty meeting of 10/9/12, the College faculty created the subcommittee and elected Professors Rick DeWitt, Anita Fernandez, Laura Nash, and James Simon to be members. At the subcommittee's first meeting on 10/22/12, the members elected Professor DeWitt as chair.

Background Information

In the procedures for initial appointment of faculty and in the policies governing promotion and tenure, Fairfield's *Faculty Handbook* and the *Journal of Record* reference "appropriate faculty" and the appropriate faculty's involvement in appointment, tenure, and promotion decisions. For example, the *Handbook* requires that appointments be made upon the recommendation of the appropriate faculty, and the *Handbook* also specifies that each school is responsible for defining "appropriate faculty" in adequate detail.

In keeping with this requirement, the CAS Governance Document specifies how "appropriate faculty" is to be interpreted; however, questions have arisen recently regarding the adequacy of the characterization of "appropriate faculty" in the CAS Governance Document, as well as questions concerning the College process for promotion and tenure applications. The current dean has addressed such issues, in consultation with chairs, on an as needed basis, but she proposed creation of this subcommittee, in part, to provide consistent, transparent and predictable guidelines for handling such issues.

The subcommittee has been asked to make recommendations on the following questions and related concerns. Please note that when we refer to department Chairs, this represents either the department Chair or, where relevant, the head of the curriculum area.

1. Should the characterization of “appropriate faculty” in the CAS Governance Document be modified?
2. Which members of a department write letters for a Rank and Tenure case? Are there department members who must write? Department members who are not required to write but who should write? Who, in a department, may write?
3. With respect to Question 2, above, how are these letters solicited?
4. When the Chair is the candidate, who writes the “chair letter” and how is that person selected?
5. When the Chair does not hold the rank sought by the candidate, does the Chair still write the chair letter and, if not, what is the procedure for identifying another person to write that letter?
6. Regarding tenure and promotion standards specific to the CAS and/or specific to particular departments:
 - 6.a. Should there be tenure and promotion standards specific to the College of Arts and Sciences concerning teaching, advising, scholarship, and service?
 - 6.b. Should there be tenure and promotion standards specific to particular departments, with benchmarks established according to disciplinary expectations? If so, how would they be vetted and approved at the College level in order to ensure commensurability and consistency with the *Faculty Handbook* and the CAS Governance Document?

During the time the subcommittee was working, the following additional questions arose:

7. In writing letters for tenure and promotion applications:
 - 7.a. Should the appropriate faculty have access to the letters from the outside reviewers?
 - 7.b. Should the appropriate faculty be required to share their letters with the department Chair?
8. Do the guidelines in the *Journal of Record* obligate the Chair to write two letters, one in the role of an “appropriate faculty” and another in the role of Chair?
9. When a faculty member informs the dean in May that she/he wishes to apply for tenure and/or promotion, does she/he need to submit a CV?
10. In fall of 2012, it appears that faculty who wished to submit their dossiers electronically rather than by the traditional 9-hardcopy method were told they needed to submit their dossiers to the office of the SVPA well before the December 1 deadline specified in the *Journal of Record*. Is this practice consistent with our current policies concerning rank and tenure?
11. At what point in the process is a candidate’s dossier considered complete, in the sense that he or she may no longer make changes to the dossier?

12. What are our current policies on the probationary period for tenure; in particular, when must prior service be counted? Are these policies being followed?
13. For promotion to Associate Professor, the *Faculty Handbook* requires “five years experience in the rank of Assistant Professor,” and for promotion to Professor, “five years experience in the rank of Associate Professor.” Must these be five consecutive years?

In addressing these questions, the subcommittee solicited the views of the outgoing Chair of the Rank and Tenure Committee, input from the other schools at Fairfield on their policies and practices (see Appendix III), and input from other universities concerning their policies.

Several meetings were held, and committee members determined recommendations pertaining solely to college-level issues should go to the college faculty for consideration. Issues that also involve faculty outside the College should be sent to the university Rank And Tenure Committee for consideration.

There is one broad recommendation that we hope will be of interest. We suggest the CAS faculty would benefit from a proposed CAS Tenure and Promotion Policies Summary, a FAQ-style document which clarifies our college policies and could be sent by the Dean to Chairs every fall for distribution to departments.

We also appended some material that informed our discussions and that faculty might want to see or be able to access easily.

Summary of Recommendations
Subcommittee on College Rank and Tenure Procedures

Setting for any action	Specific action recommended, if any
1. Issues for the CAS Governance Document	No changes are recommended to the CAS Governance Document involving current language on “appropriate faculty” or related issues (Q1)
2. Issues for a proposed CAS Tenure and Promotion Policies Summary, a FAQ which clarifies our college policies and would be sent by the dean to Chairs every fall for distribution to departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate faculty are professionally obligated to write letters for tenure applicants, but faculty not defined as appropriate may also do so. (Q2) • The department chair should solicit letters from appropriate faculty. The Dean’s office should report whether letters from all appropriate faculty have been received, but cannot inform the department chair which specific faculty members have written and which have not. (Q3) • When the chair is the candidate, the first choice for the writer of the “chair letter” should be a department member who recently served as chair, regardless of rank; the second choice would be another tenured department member; and the third choice would be a tenured member of a different department. This choice should be made with the department in consultation with the Dean. (Q4) • The chair should write the “chair letter” even if he/she is not at the rank sought by the applicant. (Q5) • There should be no CAS-specific or department-specific standards for applicants seeking tenure beyond what is already delineated in the Faculty Handbook and Journal of Record. (Q6a and Q6b) • Outside letters may not be read by faculty members other than the department chair. (Q7a) • Faculty are not be required to share their letters with the department chair. (Q7b) • When a faculty member informs the dean of an intent to apply for tenure and/or promotion, she/he must supply a current CV in addition to the other materials listed in the <i>Journal of Record</i>. (Q9) • Where appropriate, the Dean may recommend changes to strengthen the applicant’s dossier. The candidate may implement changes until the Dec. 1 deadline for submission to the SVPAA. (Q11)
3. Issues for the university Rank and Tenure Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater clarity on the issue of the Chair being permitted, but not required, to write two different letters for an applicant. (Q8) • A uniform filing deadline observed, whether a candidate uses print or electronic submission (Q10) • Greater clarity on the current policies regarding a probationary period for tenure, especially whether prior service at a different institution is counted (Q12) • The <i>Faculty Handbook</i> requires “five years experience” at rank before being allowed to apply for promotion to the next rank; it does not specify whether these must be consecutive years. (Q13)

Discussion and Formal Recommendations

Question 1

Should the characterization of “appropriate faculty” in the CAS Governance Document be modified?

The Faculty Handbook calls for schools to define “appropriate faculty.” (Appendix I) The CAS Governance Document currently specifies that for promotion, appropriate faculty are those members of the department at or above the rank being applied for, and, for tenure, appropriate faculty are all tenured members of the department. (Appendix II)

The consensus of the subcommittee was that the current characterization of “appropriate faculty” is proper and adequate.

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends no changes to the current language of the CAS Governance Document defining appropriate faculty.

Question 2

Which members of a department write letters for a Rank and Tenure case? Are there department members who must write? Department members who are not required to write but who should write? Who, in a department, may write?

The subcommittee’s understanding of this question is that it arose from uncertainty over what the obligations are of certain members of a department with respect to writing letters. For example, are the appropriate faculty of the department contractually required to write letters in tenure and promotion cases? Are members of a department who are not among those defined as appropriate faculty prohibited from writing letters?

The *Faculty Handbook* is generally considered a contractual document, specifying contractual obligations of the institution toward faculty, and also specifying contractual obligations faculty are obliged to respect. The consensus of the subcommittee is that the *Handbook* language concerning tenure and promotion letters is not unequivocally phrased in the language of obligation. Thus the consensus of the subcommittee is that there is not a contractual obligation on the part of appropriate faculty to write such letters.

However, the *Handbook* seems clearly to anticipate that the appropriate faculty will write letters. Even if this does not rise to the level of a contractual obligation, the consensus of the subcommittee is that all appropriate faculty have a professional obligation to write letters. The issue of how to appropriately encourage faculty who should be writing letters, yet are reluctant to do so, is covered under Question 3, below.

The *Handbook* and other governance documents are silent as to whether faculty who are not among those defined as appropriate faculty are prohibited from writing letters. The consensus of the subcommittee is that while our governance documents do not anticipate such faculty writing letters, neither do our policies indicate that such faculty may not write letters. We note also that there are cases where it would seem entirely reasonable and helpful for faculty not included within the definition of “appropriate faculty” to write letters (e.g., when a junior member of the department, or someone outside the department, has team-taught with the faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion.

When faculty members not included in the definition of “appropriate faculty” write letters, presumably the Dean and members of the Rank and Tenure Committee will decide whether or not to take such letters into consideration, and, if so, how much weight to give them.

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends the proposed CAS Tenure and Promotion Policies Summary note that, consistent with the *Faculty Handbook* and *Journal of Record*, (i) faculty who fall under the definition of “appropriate faculty” have a professional obligation to write letters evaluating applications for tenure and/or promotion, and (ii) while our governance documents do not anticipate faculty other than those defined as the “appropriate faculty writing letters,” there may be cases where it is reasonable for such faculty to write.

Question 3

With respect to Question 2 above, how are these letters solicited?

There is no governance language addressing this question; however, it is reasonable to assume that the department Chair will inform the appropriate faculty when someone in the department is applying for tenure and/or promotion, communicate the deadline for the letters to be submitted, and provide any other relevant information. Presumably, this is the current standard practice.

The more difficult situation is how to encourage faculty who should be writing letters, but are reluctant to do so. The consensus of the subcommittee is that the confidentiality of such letters extends not just to the content of the letter, but also includes whether or not a letter has been written. Thus only those tasked with reviewing those letters—that is, the Dean and Rank and Tenure Committee members—should be able to know who has and has not written.

However, the view of the subcommittee is that it would be helpful for the Dean to contact the department Chair, before the November 8 deadline, to indicate whether or not all appropriate faculty have submitted letters. If any are missing, the Chair should send a general letter to all appropriate faculty in the department, reminding them of their professional obligation to submit a letter and encouraging them to submit a letter if they have not yet done so.

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends the CAS Tenure and Promotion Policies Summary note that (i) for reasons of confidentiality, the department Chair not be informed whether individual appropriate faculty have or have not written letters; (ii) that the Dean inform the Chair before the November 8 deadline whether or not all letters have been received; and (iii) when necessary, the Chair should send a reminder to all appropriate faculty of their professional obligation to submit letters by the November 8 deadline.

Question 4

When the Chair is the candidate, who writes the “chair letter” and how is that person selected?

The consensus of the subcommittee is that this role is best filled, in order, by a department member who has recently served as Chair; by a tenured department member selected by the department; or by a willing tenured

faculty member from another department.

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends the CAS Tenure and Promotion Policies Summary note that, in cases in which the Chair is a candidate for promotion, the “chair letter” be submitted by:

- (i) A department member, selected by the department, who has recently served as department Chair;
- (ii) In cases where (i) does not fulfill the need, a tenured department member selected by the department in consultation with the Dean;
- (iii) In cases where neither (i) nor (ii) fulfill the need, a willing and tenured member of another department, preferably from a related department, selected by the department in consultation with the Dean.

Question 5

When the Chair does not hold the rank sought by the candidate, does the Chair still write the chair letter and, if not, what is the procedure for identifying another person to write that letter?

The consensus of the subcommittee is that a department Chair is in a unique position to have pertinent information other members of a department will not have, and thus, even if the Chair is at a lower rank, the Chair remains the best person to write the letter. (The subcommittee makes no recommendation on whether the Chair’s letter should be summative, reflecting as best as possible the views of senior faculty, or whether it should reflect only the views of the Chair.)

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends the CAS Tenure and Promotion Policies Summary state that in cases when the department Chair does not hold the rank sought by a candidate, the Chair nonetheless writes the required letter from the Chair.

Question 6

Regarding tenure and promotion standards specific to the CAS and/or specific to particular departments:

6.a. Should there be tenure and promotion standards specific to the College of Arts and Sciences concerning teaching, advising, scholarship, and service?

6.b. Should there be tenure and promotion standards specific to particular departments, with benchmarks established according to disciplinary expectations? If so, how would they be vetted and approved at the College level in order to ensure commensurability and consistency with the Faculty Handbook and the CAS Governance Document?

Any such additional standards could not be less stringent than the existing criteria for tenure and promotion found in the *Faculty Handbook* and *Journal of Record*. The consensus of the subcommittee is that any additional standards would a CAS candidate at a disadvantage as compared to candidates from the professional schools who did not have to address an additional set of expectations. Beyond that, it would be extremely difficult to find uniform college-level standards for a unit as diverse as the CAS. Even at the department level, it would be very difficult to develop uniform standards, especially in a department with various units or concentrations.

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends the CAS not pursue additional college-wide or departmental standards for tenure and/or promotion.

Question 7: In writing letters for tenure and promotion applications:

7.a. Should the appropriate faculty have access to the letters from the outside reviewers?

The *Journal of Record* is explicit concerning the routing of outside letters. In particular, outside letters go to the Dean, and the Dean then provides copies to the department Chair. The lack of any reference to such letters being shared with appropriate faculty indicates that the proper reading of this language, and the intent of the language, was that outside letters are not shared with the appropriate faculty other than the Chair. In addition, outside reviewers understand that their letters are to be confidential, shared only with the Dean and department Chair. And as a practical matter, any change in this practice, with outside letters being shared more widely, would likely result in increased difficulty in finding outside reviewers.

The consensus of the subcommittee is that appropriate faculty may not have direct access to letters from outside reviewers. The relevant governance language does not appear to prohibit the Chair from sharing the general assessments of those letters. But if a general assessment is shared, it must be done in such a way as to assure that the identity and institutional affiliation of the authors remain confidential.

Recommendation:

See recommendation under 7.b. below.

7.b. Should the appropriate faculty be required to share their letters with the department Chair?

Here again, the *Journal of Record* is explicit about the routing of letters from appropriate faculty. In particular, such letters go to the Dean. Given this, the consensus of the subcommittee is that the proper reading of the language from the *Journal of Record* is that faculty cannot be required to share their letters with the Chair. An individual faculty member may, of course, choose to share his or her letter with the Chair, but may not be required or pressured to do so.

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends the CAS Tenure and Promotion Policies Summary include statements that (i) other than the Dean and department Chair, faculty members may not have access to letters from outside reviewers; (ii) if the Chair shares with the department the general assessments found in the outside letters, it must be done in such a way as to assure that the identity and institutional affiliation of the authors remain confidential; and (iii) faculty cannot be required and may not be pressured to share their letters of evaluation with the department Chair.

Question 8

Do the guidelines in the Journal of Record obligate the Chair to write two letters, one in the role of an “appropriate faculty” and another in the role of Chair?

The *Journal of Record* language is somewhat ambiguous on this. On the one hand, the *Journal of Record* states that appropriate faculty members in the department should submit nine copies of their letter to the Dean's office by a November 8 deadline. In cases where the department Chair is also one of the appropriate faculty, which will usually be the case, this language could be read as saying the Chair should submit nine copies of his/her letter by November 8. On the other hand, the JOR specifies a deadline of November 15 for the Chair to submit nine copies of his/her letter to the Dean's office.

The subcommittee was asked to address the question of whether this language is best read as obligating the Chair to write two separate letters for each candidate, or whether the language is perhaps simply not phrased as clearly as it could be.

Following some archival archaeology and discussions with faculty with long memories, it seems reasonably clear to the subcommittee that the intent has been that the Chair is obligated to write only one letter, and that the two-deadline language currently in the *Journal of Record* is a vestigial remnant of the way the Rank and Tenure process used to work. Our understanding is that back in the day, when the faculty was much smaller, only the Chair wrote a letter to the Rank and Tenure Committee. Appropriate department members, other than the Chair, had a date by which they had to provide their input to the Chair, and the Chair had a date whereby her/his letter was due to the Dean's office. When the process was changed so that the department members sent their input directly to the Dean's office, the two deadlines, one for department members other than the Chair and the other for the Chair, remained as a vestige of the earlier process.

The consensus of the subcommittee is that the *Journal of Record* language does not prohibit a Chair from writing two letters for each candidate, should a Chair wish to do so. But the language in the *Journal of Record* does not require the Chair to write two letters.

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends the CAS faculty take no action on this at this time. Rather, this is an item the subcommittee views as appropriate to send to the Rank and Tenure Committee, for consideration as to whether to recommend the Academic Council approve minor *Journal of Record* changes clarifying the matter.

Question 9

When a faculty member informs the Dean in May that she/he wishes to apply for tenure and/or promotion, does she/he need to submit a CV?

The *Journal of Record* specifies that the candidate supply the Dean with a list of possible outside reviewers, an explanation of the candidate's relationship with the possible reviewers, and contact information for those possible reviewers. The consensus of the subcommittee is that candidates should also supply a current CV, to be sent to potential outside reviewers to inform them about the candidate and help them determine whether or not they are in a position to render an informed judgment.

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends the CAS Tenure and Promotion Policies Summary include the statement that when a faculty member informs the Dean in May that she/he wishes to apply for tenure and/or promotion, a copy of the candidate's CV should be included along with the other materials required by the *Journal of Record*.

Question 10

In fall of 2012, it appears that faculty who wished to submit their dossiers electronically rather than by the traditional 9-hardcopy method were told they needed to submit their dossiers to the office of the SVPAA well before the December 1 deadline specified in the *Journal of Record*. Is this practice consistent with our current policies concerning rank and tenure?

The *Journal of Record* specifies that a candidate's dossier does not go to the SVPAA's office until December 1. However, the practice from this past fall appears to be in tension with this requirement, in that it appears some candidates were told they needed to submit their dossiers to the SVPAA's office much earlier, although with the assurance that no one in the SVPAA's office would read the files until the December 1 deadline. Such candidates were allowed to make changes to their dossiers up to the December 1 deadline, though not directly, but rather by submitting updated dossiers to the SVPAA's office, after which someone in that office would presumably make the updates. The reason given for this new practice was apparently to enable dossiers to be submitted electronically rather than by the traditional hardcopy method. (See Appendix IV, exchange with SrVPAA, which came in just as the report was being distributed.)

The consensus of the subcommittee is that this practice is a violation of our policies in the *Journal of Record*. While we agree with the goal of moving toward electronic copies, there is a straightforward way to accomplish this in a manner consistent with our policies.

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends the CAS faculty take no action on this at this time. Rather, this is an issue the subcommittee views as appropriate to send to the Rank and Tenure Committee, including a recommendation for updating our policies in light of the increasing use of electronic dossiers.

Question 11

At what point in the process is a candidate's dossier considered complete, in the sense that he or she may no longer make changes to the dossier?

With respect to a candidate's dossier, the *Faculty Handbook* states that "the Dean should review the application and, when appropriate, make suggestions to strengthen it." Thus our policies envision a candidate being allowed to make changes to the dossier up to the December 1 deadline by which the candidate must supply 9 copies of the dossier to the office of the SVPAA.

However, in the not so distant past some Deans seemed to be unaware of this provision in the *Faculty Handbook*. The consensus of the subcommittee is that it would be helpful to include a reminder that Deans may make recommendations for strengthening an application when appropriate, and that candidates may make changes to the dossier up to the December 1 deadline by which the dossier must be submitted to the office of the SVPAA.

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends the CAS Tenure and Promotion Policies Summary note that (i) Deans may, when appropriate, make recommendations for strengthening a candidate's application, and (ii) that a candidate

may make changes to the dossier up to the December 1 deadline for submitting the dossier to the SVPAA office.

Question 12

What are our current policies on the probationary period for tenure, in particular, when must prior service be counted? Are these policies being followed?

As specified in the *Faculty Handbook*, the normal maximum probationary period is seven years, after which faculty members under contract shall have academic tenure.

The *Handbook* requires prior service in the academic profession at another institution be counted towards the probationary period except for the following allowable exceptions:

- The prior service was at a foreign university;
- The prior service was in a different discipline;
- There has been a significant gap in time since the prior service;
- The other institution was of a type which required significantly different teaching loads or had significantly different expectations of professional competence from Fairfield;
- The service at the other institution was prior to the receipt of the appointee's doctorate or terminal degree.

With respect to service at Fairfield University, the *Handbook* specifies that:

- Years spent in full-time teaching at Fairfield prior to the receipt of the doctorate or terminal degree in the candidate's field, and/or years spent in full-time teaching at Fairfield on a temporary basis or with an appointment for a fixed term, must be counted in the computation of the probationary period;
- A minimum probationary period of two years must have been served at Fairfield University, even if this extends the normal maximum probationary period beyond the normal seven years.

There are a small number of other relatively rare circumstances involving leaves of absence (not including pre-tenure leaves) that can affect the computation of the probationary period, but the lists above cover the usual cases.

Our understanding is that these policies are not being uniformly followed. Since such matters are generally handled within confidential letters of appointment, it is difficult to verify that the policies are indeed not being uniformly followed. However, the consensus of the subcommittee is that our current policy on counting prior service is, in a certain way, overly strict. It is, in fact, stricter than AAUP policies. The view of the subcommittee is that our policies on counting prior service would be better if they were made less strict, though in a way still compatible with AAUP policies.

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends the CAS faculty take no action on this at this time. Rather, this is an item the subcommittee views as appropriate to send to the Rank and Tenure Committee, for consideration on whether

to recommend the Academic Council approve *Faculty Handbook* changes to make Fairfield University's policies more in line with AAUP recommendations.

Question 13

For promotion to Associate Professor, the *Faculty Handbook* requires “five years experience in the rank of Assistant Professor,” and for promotion to Professor, “five years experience in the rank of Associate Professor.” Must these be five consecutive years?

The consensus of the subcommittee is that this is a matter that must be clarified on a university-wide level.

Recommendation

The subcommittee recommends no action be taken on this at the college level. The subcommittee will send this issue to the Rank and Tenure Committee and ask that it pursue language to clarify this issue.

Appendices

Appendix I

Faculty Handbook, definition of "appropriate faculty" (from section II.A.1a)

Appendix II

Governance Document for the College of Arts and Sciences, "Responsibilities of Chairpersons" (from section 1.7)

Appendix III

Information on Rank and Tenure Policies from Fairfield Professional Schools and Other Institutions

Appendix IV

Information from SrVPAA, electronic vs. hard copy submission

Appendix I

Faculty Handbook, definition of "appropriate faculty" (from section II.A.1a)

<http://faculty.fairfield.edu/gfs/fhb2006.pdf>

Schools shall publish their procedures for appointment. Procedures in all schools shall conform to the following guidelines: (1) all appointments shall be made upon the recommendation of the appropriate faculty; (2) the appointment procedure shall provide for separate evaluations of applicants to be submitted to the Academic Vice President by both the appropriate faculty and the Dean of the appropriate school; (3) appointments shall be made by the Academic Vice President upon the recommendations submitted by the appropriate faculty and the Dean of the appropriate school; (4) the Academic Vice President may decline to appoint a recommended applicant, in which case the Academic Vice President shall state the reasons for doing so in writing to the faculty recommending appointment; (5) **schools shall define "appropriate faculty" in adequate detail in the publication of their procedure for appointment.** (emphasis added)

Appendix II

Governance Document for the College of Arts and Sciences, "Responsibilities of Chairpersons" (from section 1.7.15)

http://faculty.fairfield.edu/cas/COLLEGE_DOCUMENTS/CAS_GovDoc_2011_11_11.html

1.7.15 Evaluate the work of the members of the department applying for tenure and/or promotion and, after consultation with at least all **appropriate faculty*** (emphasis added) members of the department, will submit all dossiers along with letters of approval or disapproval of the promotion or tenure applications to the Dean of the College in accordance with procedures described in the current editions of the *Fairfield University Faculty Handbook* and the *Journal of Record*.

- * The term "appropriate faculty" in the above shall be interpreted as follows:
 - a. for promotion, all members of the department holding at least the rank in question;
 - b. for tenure, all tenured members of the department.

Appendix III

Information on Rank and Tenure Policies from Fairfield Professional Schools and Other Institutions

(Note: the following information was collected by CAS Associate Dean James Simon in summer 2012 through e-mail exchanges with the deans of the professional schools. The material has been condensed, based on relevancy, and as much of the original language as possible has been retained.)

1. Who, in a department, comments on a RT case (must, should, may)? How is this commentary solicited?

Other FU schools:

- Engineering (Dean Beal): We ask every full-time, tenured faculty member in the School to comment on any R&T candidate irrespective of Department. The key work is ask; they do not have to comment. However, those in the Department must comment.
- Business (Dean Gibson). All members of the department at the rank of what an applicant seeks or above write letters on a RT case. The chair asks the appropriate faculty for letters. (Dean Gibson also issued this overall caveat: “Most of these “guidelines” are more in the nature of norms rather than rules—I checked our governance document and it refers to the Faculty Handbook for procedures regarding rank and tenure.)
- GSEAP (Dean Franzosa). GSEAP doesn't have bylaws or additional guidelines for promotion and tenure cases. We use the faculty handbook as a guide. The GSEAP governance document outlines the responsibilities of the Peer Review Committee - the committee responsible for annual review of the untenured and merit reviews. We do have guidelines for reviewing untenured faculty – which correspond to expectations for tenure... The questions you raise are all important. In GSEAP we answer them through precedent but have nothing in writing. I think we should have them in writing and will explore this with the faculty in the fall.

She added: All GSEAP faculty members holding the rank above the candidate's rank from all four departments are asked to submit letters to the dean. It is not compulsory. [Note: at my former universities, University of Hampshire and University of WA, faculty at every rank were invited to submit letters. At UNH, it was considered compulsory except for untenured faculty in their first year.]

- Nursing (Meredith Wallace Kazer). The School of Nursing has its own Rank & Tenure committee which is detailed at the end of our bylaws (see below). This committee works with candidates for rank and tenure to assign mentors and conduct annual evaluations. We do not have departments or chairs in the School of Nursing and the Dean writes all the formal letters of support from the School.

Here is the Nursing bylaw language on RT:

A. Tenure and Promotion Committee

Section 1. The purpose of the Tenure and Promotion Committee is to provide leadership and guidance to faculty in the promotion and/or tenure process in accord with the University Faculty Handbook and make recommendations to the Dean regarding the readiness of individual full-time tenure track faculty for promotion and/or tenure.

Section 2. The functions are to:

- a. ensure mentorship of incoming full-time faculty;

- b. counsel faculty as they progress through the promotion and tenure process;
- c. review application materials from candidates for promotion and tenure;
- d. conduct a formal review process at the 3rd year (or at the anticipated midpoint between hire and application for promotion and/or tenure), for untenured faculty;
- e. consult with the Dean prior to any search for new faculty;
- f. participate on faculty search committees (one current Tenure and Promotion Committee member/search committee);
- g. inform faculty about the peer review process.

Section 3. Membership

The membership shall consist of the current School of Nursing member of the University Rank & Tenure and two full-time tenured faculty representing both Associate and Full Professor ranks elected by the voting members of the Faculty Organization & Curriculum Committee. The term of office is three years.

Section 4. Chairperson

The Chairperson shall be elected yearly from among membership and may be reelected for one term.

Other universities:

- **Holy Cross.** Chair reviews with senior members of department the qualifications of applicants for promotion... The Chair shall prepare a separate report on each probationary member being reviewed, including signed majority and minority opinions, recommending to the President, through the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College, whether or not the individual is to be reappointed

During their deliberations the senior members shall choose a senior faculty member of the department as a representative to the Committee on Tenure and Promotion. This representative shall not be an elected member of the committee and shall serve solely as a resource person to the committee. In the case where a department has more than one candidate for tenure and/or promotion the department may choose a separate representative to the committee for each candidate. At the same time, the Chair of each department shall review, with the senior members of the department, the qualifications of any tenured faculty whom either the Chair, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College, the individual or a majority of the senior members of the department shall wish considered for promotion. Detailed recommendations for each case, including signed majority and minority opinions shall be in the hands of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College no later than 1 February. An unsigned copy of these reports shall be communicated by the Chair to the faculty member under consideration. In all cases the Chair shall solicit the written opinions of all junior members of the department who have been members of the department for at least one year.

- **St. Louis University (using a College RT committee as an extra step) .**

Section D: Rank, Tenure, and Sabbatical Committee. The College Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Sabbaticals is composed of six faculty members with the rank of professor, two from each of the divisions. Each spring, the existing Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Sabbaticals elects one of their current members to chair the new committee which will serve during the next academic year. The Chair of the Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Sabbaticals is an ex officio non-voting member of the Faculty Council and the Executive Committee. The Dean does not attend meetings of the Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Sabbaticals at which rank and tenure cases are evaluated. The Dean, however, may attend the meetings of the committee during its review of sabbatical applications. The committee does not report to the Faculty Council on its recommendations relative to rank, tenure, and sabbaticals. This committee is charged with the review of

college and departmental policies and procedures relative to rank, tenure, and sabbaticals when such reviews are necessary. In matters relative to these policies and procedures, the committee makes recommendations to the Faculty Council.

2. In the case when the Chair is the candidate, who writes the chair letter and how is that person selected?

Other FU schools:

- Engineering. If the candidate is the Chair of a Department, then in the past the Dean assumes the responsibility for writing the Chair letter. In practice, this really is just the Dean's letter with maybe some additional comments. In the future, I would ask the Assoc. Dean to write the chair letter so that the Dean could write a separate and non-overlapping letter.
- Business. Not sure this has happened (at least in my time). I believe the Dean would write the letter, but I'll ask around.
- GSEAP. The dean asks a senior faculty member to do the chair's letter.
- Nursing. (No specific mention in bylaws. Note the Nursing RT Committee does not necessarily include the chair).

3. In the case when the Chair does not hold the rank sought by the candidate, does the chair still write the chair letter and, if not, what is the procedure for identifying another "chair"?

Other FU Schools:

- Engineering. If a mismatch in rank in a department, the current Chair would write the chair letter anyway; we do have a case whereby the current Chair is on a tenure-track. When he comes up for tenure decision assuming that he is still Chair, I will ask the Assoc. Dean to write the Chair letter.
- Business. No, there aren't specific written standards here in the DSB; it's mostly determined by coaching communications from the chair, dean, and colleagues who have gone through rank and tenure. Yes, I think more written standards would be a good idea, though they'll need to have a good amount of flexibility. Melissa Quan and others have been working on the idea of scholarship of engagement.
- GSEAP. Yes, the chair writes the chair's letter regardless of rank.
- Nursing. We do not have departments or chairs in the School of Nursing and the Dean writes all the formal letters of support from the School.

4. Are there specific college standards in relation to teaching, advising, scholarship, and service?

Other FU schools:

- Engineering. No specific School standards; we use the Handbook standards
- Business. Again, these are more the manner of norms and are "passed down" by applicants looking at past dossiers as exemplars. There are disciplinary differences that should probably be delineating rather than relying on faculty expertise that happens to be on the R&T committee. For example, the viability of book publishing versus journal articles (in the DSB it's all about peer-reviewed journal articles) is always a matter of discussion
- GSEAP: These are captured generally in the guidelines for review of untenured faculty.
- Nursing, apparently no separate standards

5. If you have multiple departments, do they have department R&T guidelines that clearly delineate standards according to disciplinary expectations? If so, how were they vetted and approved at the College level in order to ensure commensurability and consistency with the Handbook and the School gov. doc.?

Other FU schools

- Engineering. No standards specific to disciplinary expectations; Handbook standards work OK for Engineering.
- Business: No Response
- GSEAP: We have four departments. We have one GSEAP Peer Review Committee composed of the department chairs and elected representation from each department.
- Nursing: We do not have departments or chairs in the School of Nursing and the Dean writes all the formal letters of support from the School.

Appendix IV Information from SrVPAA, electronic vs. hard copy submission

From: Richard DeWitt [rdewitt@fairfield.edu<<mailto:rdewitt@fairfield.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2013 4:03 PM
To: Fitzgerald, Paul
Cc: Fernandez, Anita; Nash, Laura; Simon, James
Subject: Query concerning Rank and Tenure policies

To: Paul Fitzgerald, SVPA

From: Rick DeWitt, Chair, CAS Subcommittee on Rank and Tenure Guidelines

Date: 3/12/13

Re: Query concerning Rank and Tenure policies

CC: Subcommittee members Professors Anita Fernandez, Laura Nash, Jim Simon

Dear Paul,

In fall 2012 the CAS faculty formed a subcommittee to provide input on various questions concerning Fairfield's Rank and Tenure guidelines and policies. One question the subcommittee was asked to address was the following:

In fall of 2012, it appears that faculty who wished to submit their dossiers electronically rather than by the traditional 9-hardcopy method were told they needed to submit their dossiers to the office of the SVPA well before the December 1 deadline specified in the Journal of Record. Is this practice consistent with our current policies concerning rank and tenure?

The consensus of the subcommittee is that there is a clear advantage to submitting R&T dossiers electronically, and to this end we will be recommending the Rank and Tenure Committee propose modified language for the Journal of Record to accommodate the option of electronic submissions. However, electronic submissions, as with hardcopy submissions, must be done in a way that respects the various deadlines in the Journal of Record.

Using Xythos folders, there is a straightforward way to accommodate electronic submissions that would fully respect the deadlines in our governance documents. Under this system, the SVPA's office would not have control over, or any access to, a candidate's dossier until the December 1 deadline. The subcommittee is assuming this would be agreeable to you, given that it straightforwardly respects our policies concerning R&T related deadlines.

Our main question in writing today is to confirm that this approach—i.e., a system under which the SVPA's office would not have access to or control over a candidate's dossier until the December 1 deadline—would be agreeable to you. Assuming this is agreeable, when we report to the CAS faculty later in March we will note this and submit to the Rank and Tenure Committee the outline we are proposing for handling electronic submissions.

Regards,
Rick

From: <Fitzgerald, Paul <pfitzgerald@fairfield.edu<<mailto:pfitzgerald@fairfield.edu>

Date: Wednesday, March 13, 2013 4:08 AM

To: "Dewitt, Richard" <RDewitt@fairfield.edu<<mailto:RDewitt@fairfield.edu>

Cc: "Fernandez, Anita" <afernandez@fairfield.edu<<mailto:afernandez@fairfield.edu>, Laura Nash <lnash@fairfield.edu<<mailto:lnash@fairfield.edu>, "Simon, James"

<JSimon@fairfield.edu<<mailto:JSimon@fairfield.edu>

Subject: RE: Query concerning Rank and Tenure policies

Dear colleagues,

This past year was the first one in which we allowed and encouraged candidates to file their petitions for tenure and/or promotion electronically via Xythos. Several candidates did so. Along the way I discovered several things.

1. It is rather easy and straightforward to open and close access to the electronic documents to the appropriate colleagues at the appropriate times in order to respect the policies and procedures of the HB and the JoR, and the security of the system is excellent. The dossiers of the candidates who opted for e-submission were uploaded into Xythos according to the JoR timeline for the viewing of their departmental colleagues. At the proper time, access for those colleagues was turned off, and access by the dean was turned on. Again, at the appropriate time, access by the dean was turned off and then access by the R&T committee and by me was turned on.

2. Dr. Mary Frances Malone and Ms Kim Baer handled the mechanics of the uploading. I took no part in this and thus did not have access to the dossiers until the appropriate time, as per #1 above. Technically, they are members of the SVPAA's office, so you will need to clarify your concern about my office versus your concerns about me. Candidates needed technical help from persons who understand both the mechanics of Xythos and the protocols around R&T.

3. In the past, candidates sometimes received helpful feedback from departmental colleagues during the fall while their dossier and supporting materials were available to appropriate departmental/program colleagues and were able to amend their dossier before submitting it to the dean and/or before submission to the R&T committee. We allowed that this past year - some candidates chose to submit a modified dossier and to swap it out for the prior one in Xythos. We accepted this request on their part in order to keep a level playing field with candidates who submitted in hard copy.

4. No member of the Rank and Tenure committee chose to work off of e-documents. Every member wanted everything in hard copy so as to perform their obligations through the period of reading, preparation and collegial conversation, leading up to the votes and the recommendations to me and to Fr. Von Arx.

Thus, while it seemed a promising idea to make the process paperless, in fact such was not the case. In the end, we made as many copies of everything as we did in years past. Technically and by the rules, the process worked perfectly. Practically speaking, it did not achieve the desired goal of being Eco-friendly.

In the fall, I will meet with members of the new rank and tenure committee, discuss the experience of this past year and decide with them how we should proceed. If we wish to try again for a paperless process, then they should propose changes to the language of the JoR where appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

Paul