

August 6, 1992

TO: John L. Safko, Secretary
Faculty Senate

FROM: Gordon B. Smith, Chair
University Committee on Tenure and Promotion

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TENURE AND PROMOTION

During the 1991-1992 academic year, the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion considered a total of 108 cases. An analysis of these cases indicates the following rates of agreement between the UCTP, the President, the Provost and the unit:

President - UCTP	92%	(9 disagreements)
President - Provost	94%	(7 disagreements)
President - Unit	93%	(8 disagreements)

The UCTP's Sub-Committee on Criteria and Procedures received and carefully reviewed nine submissions from departments this year. Six were approved by the UCTP: Accounting, Applied Professional Sciences, Management Science, Law, Medicine-Basic Sciences, and the Thomas Cooper Library. Three criteria were carried over to next year or have been referred back to the unit.

For the first time, the UCTP this year notified departments of deficiencies in unit criteria or procedures that came to the committee's attention during the review of candidates' files. It is hoped that this will prompt some units to reevaluate their criteria. The UCTP continues to encounter unit criteria that fail to differentiate between promotion to different ranks or between promotion and tenure. Standards are sometimes vague, poorly defined, and inconsistent with the standards set forth in the Faculty Manual.

The UCTP urges units to consider how they might better evaluate teaching. While teaching evaluations are usually included in the candidates' files, group means and standard deviations are often omitted, making it difficult to interpret the teaching evaluations. Very few departments currently utilize systematic peer reviews of teaching to augment student evaluations.

The evaluations of candidates provided in external letters of referees are vital to the tenure and promotion process. The purpose in soliciting outside letters is to provide some external validation of the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarship. The independence and objectivity of the review process can be compromised, however, when all or the majority of

the letters are written by former dissertation directors, co-authors, friends, or former colleagues of candidates.

The UCTP remains committed to working with units to revise their tenure and promotion standards and procedures.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon B. Smith
Chair, University Committee on Tenure and Promotion