Dear Provost Phillips,

On behalf of the CLUE Planning Group on Promotion and Tenure, I am pleased to submit our final report to you. This report contains a detailed discussion of our group’s conclusions, and a comprehensive list of recommendations that address many aspects of the tenure and promotion process. As you will see, these recommendations are directed toward a variety of levels and agents, including candidates, departments and department chairs, deans and schools, faculty governance, and the Provost’s office. The recommendations which we consider to be of highest priority are indicated in bold.

We hope that this report will promote and stimulate discussion among deans and chairs, and among chairs and their departments, and will be useful in your efforts to enhance the tenure and promotion process on our campus.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process, and to contribute to the conversation about tenure and promotion at the University at Albany.

Mary P. Gallant
Chair
CLUE Planning Group on Promotion and Tenure
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In Fall, 2009, Provost Susan Phillips formally convened the CLUE Planning Group on Promotion and Tenure and charged it to review the tenure and promotion process at UAlbany and make recommendations for strengthening this aspect of the institution. Our group was comprised of 15 tenured faculty members representing eight of UAlbany’s nine schools and colleges. In addition, a representative from the University Faculty Senate’s Council on Promotion and Continuing Appointment served as a liaison to the group. The group met regularly from December 2009 to October 2011 to complete its work.

The group focused on understanding the extent of variation in the current processes and procedures for tenure and promotion across campus; the clarity, consistency and communication of expectations, and the level of variation in these expectations across departments and levels of review; and the processes, procedures, and expectations that ideally should exist. The resulting recommendations address the gaps, inconsistencies, and unacceptable levels of variation that we found in various aspects of the tenure and promotion process as it currently exists.

Methods and Data Sources

Four workgroups were formed which focused on (1) promotion from assistant to associate professor; (2) promotion from associate to full professor; (3) comparison to peer institutions; and (4) support needs of candidates, chairs, deans, and tenure review committee members. We utilized a variety of data and information sources, including existing written guidelines and documentation, a survey of 18 peer and aspirational peer institutions, human resources data, information from CPCA representatives, in-depth qualitative interviews with 25 faculty members and 7 Deans, and national publications, reports and resources about best practices.

Overall Findings

Our group concluded that overall, the tenure and promotion process is basically working fairly well, and is, in general, perceived to work fairly well by stakeholders across campus. However, there is significant variation and inconsistency across the campus in some aspects of the process. There are key areas in which changes could significantly enhance and strengthen the tenure and promotion infrastructure for the future.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are categorized according to different aspects of the tenure and promotion process. The highest priority recommendations appear in bold. Discussion of
the findings that support these recommendations, and additional detail for some of the recommendations, appear in the full report.

**Administrative Data Collection**

- Enhance Human Resources data system to include date of appointment to each rank, so that time spent at each rank can be determined, and so that administration can more easily and regularly examine data relevant to tenure and promotion.
- Develop a tracking and reporting system for tenure-related information, such as number of cases reviewed annually and overall success rates, for example.

**Assistant to Associate Professor: Enhancing Clarity, Consistency, and Communication of Expectations**

- Revise university guidelines to expand the description of expectations for research, teaching, and service.
- Develop a written document in each department that describes expectations for promotion with respect to research, teaching, and service.
- Hold annual workshops for pre-tenure faculty, sponsored by the Provost’s office, that focus on the process and expectations for tenure and promotion.
- Give chairs information and training on best practices for communicating expectations to pre-tenure faculty.

**Assistant to Associate Professor: Mentoring**

- Enhance mentoring across campus so that all pre-tenure faculty members have access to effective mentoring.
- Provide training and preparation for mentors in effective mentoring practices.

**Assistant to Associate Professor: Timing of the Review Process**

- Articulate, and adhere to, the timelines and deadlines for the tenure review process.
- Specify dates for the tenure review process in original employment letter.
- Adjust faculty renewal patterns and timing of pre-tenure reviews so that pre-tenure reviews are conducted at an appropriate time.

**Assistant to Associate Professor: Leaves and Tenure Clock Policies**

- Establish a formal family leave policy that is standard, clearly conveyed, understood by administrators, and evenly applied across the board.
- Develop and disseminate formal policies and procedures regarding stopping the tenure clock.
- Develop mechanisms for pre-tenure research leave for all faculty.
- Modify existing leave policies (i.e. the Drescher) so leaves can be awarded during the most appropriate time, and are not too late to impact the candidate’s progress toward tenure.
- Explore creative ways to provide release time for faculty, particularly (though not exclusively) for faculty in ‘book’ disciplines, and especially if formal research leaves are not available, and service and teaching loads are high.

**Associate to Full Professor: Enhancing Clarity of Expectations**

- Prepare and disseminate a “consensus” document that articulates expectations for promotion and what it means to be a full professor at UAlbany.
- Encourage departments and/or schools to prepare documents that describe expectations and norms for promotion to full professor.
- Assemble councils of full professors organized by discipline (one for the natural sciences, one for the social sciences, etc.) to articulate expectations for promotion of associate professors.
- Encourage associate professors to take the initiative to find trusted senior colleagues to learn disciplinary expectations and how to develop one’s portfolio accordingly.

**Associate to Full Professor: Career Development for Associate Professors**

- Introduce a formalized review process that provides feedback, goal setting, and direction.
- Sponsor workshops or seminar series that review tactics and strategies associate professors can employ to advance their trajectories.
- Develop suggested milestones as guidelines for mid-career faculty.
- Conduct individualized conversations among senior associate professors with their chairs and/or deans about plans for promotion.

**Associate to Full Professor: Reducing Barriers to Promotion**

- Establish a council of senior faculty who can advise or mentor associates, especially for units with few senior faculty of their own.
- Provide training for chairs in how to have the necessary conversations about moving forward to full professor.
- Encourage/incentivize/communicate the necessity to Deans to make promoting associate professors a priority.

**Institutional Definitions of Scholarship**

- Prepare and disseminate a statement from the Provost’s Office which recognizes a broader, and more inclusive definition of scholarship.
✓ Encourage and instruct schools and departments to provide a context for upper levels of review by specifically articulating expectations in their disciplines.
✓ Assemble and publicize resources on Provost’s website to assist departments and schools who do community-engaged, entrepreneurial, and other ‘new’ forms of scholarship in assembling tenure and promotion cases.

Guidelines and Dossiers

✓ Revise and reissue university-level guidelines.
✓ Provide an orientation or handbook for chairs and assistants to chairs/secretaries about the logistics of assembling dossiers.
✓ Provide sample dossiers for departments to use as examples.

External Reviewers

✓ Clarify and publicize the number of external reviewer letters needed. If more than the minimum number of letters is recommended, state this in written guidelines.
✓ Develop clearer guidelines for selecting appropriate external reviewers, based on a uniform conflict of interest definition (one that specifically excludes only those reviewers who have an identifiable interest in whether the candidate is tenured or promoted).
✓ Enhance the written guidelines to add more detail about the process departments should follow to select external reviewers and who is appropriate to serve in this role.
✓ Include in the guidelines a template for departments to follow to describe how external reviewers were chosen and why they are suitable reviewers for the case at hand.

Department Chair’s Role

✓ Provide an orientation to department chairs about their role in the process, including educating upper levels about departmental norms and expectations.

Peer Review of Teaching

✓ Provide detailed guidelines for how peer review of teaching should be carried out, documented, and used in the tenure review process.

Voting Rights

✓ Amend Senate Charter to restrict membership of CPCA to tenured, full-time members of the teaching faculty.
✓ Initiate a campus-wide discussion about voting practices.
Introduction

In Fall 2009, Provost Susan Phillips formally convened the CLUE Planning Group on Promotion and Tenure. The formation of this group was a direct outgrowth of UAlbany’s Going Forward Plan, which included as an objective, “To promote a University climate that supports the success of faculty and staff.” As part of this objective, the Going Forward Plan specified that the university would “revisit expectations about the teaching, research and service contributions of tenure-track faculty and clearly communicate those expectations.”

As a result, the CLUE Planning Group on Promotion and Tenure was formed with the following description:

This group will be made up of academic faculty from the tenured and tenure-track ranks, including those with experience on the Council on Promotions and Continuing Appointments, who express an interest in discussing what the tenure and promotion process should look like into the future at UAlbany. Issues for discussion and development of solutions may include, but are not limited to:

- Clarifying the standards and process for Promotion and Tenure in the academic ranks, including ways to set expectations for research, teaching and service contributions of tenure track faculty
- Suggesting formats for support systems and mentoring opportunities for faculty moving toward promotion and tenure
- Suggesting strategies, support systems and policies to help guide senior faculty and chairs in effective development of tenure and promotion cases

Our group was comprised of 15 tenured faculty members representing eight of UAlbany’s nine schools and colleges. In addition, a representative from the University Faculty Senate’s Council on Promotion and Continuing Appointment served as a liaison to the group. A complete list of the group’s membership appears on pp. 3-4 of this report. The group met regularly from December 2009 to October 2011 to complete its work.

Provost Susan Phillips attended the first meeting of the group on December 2, 2009 and formally charged the group to review the tenure and promotion process at UAlbany and make recommendations for strengthening this aspect of the institution. Given this broad charge, the group used its initial meetings to discuss a variety of aspects of the tenure and promotion process in order to further define our agenda. This initial agenda setting resulted in a decision to focus on the following three broad questions:

- How much variation is there across campus in the process and procedures for tenure and promotion?
• What are the expectations for tenure and promotion across campus, and how much variation is there in these expectations both horizontally (i.e. across departments) and vertically (i.e. across different levels of review)?
• What should the process, procedures, and expectations for tenure and promotion be, and what variation should and should not exist?

Our initial agenda setting also involved further clarifying the specific role and purpose of our group. We agreed that although we wanted to better understand expectations for tenure and promotion on the campus, it was not our role to determine what the specific expectations for tenure and promotion should be across various disciplines; we felt strongly that departments and disciplines should have primary responsibility for determining specific expectations, especially for scholarship. However, we determined that it was within our role to examine and make recommendations about such things as minimum expectations, clarity and transparency of expectations, and how expectations are defined and communicated to different stakeholders.

Similarly, we understood that the charge of our group did not include revising or setting new policy related to tenure and promotion. However, we understood that our ultimate recommendations may involve suggestions on what new or revised policies are needed.

The remainder of this report details our methods, findings, and recommendations. Although the recommendations contained in the remainder of this report largely focus on aspects of the tenure and promotion process that could be improved, we wish to emphasize at the outset that our group concluded, overall, that the tenure and promotion process here at UAlbany is basically working fairly well. However, there are key areas in which some changes could significantly enhance and strengthen the tenure and promotion infrastructure for the future, and ensure equity and fairness.

**Methods and Data Sources**

In order to organize our work, we formed four informal workgroups to examine the following:

1. Promotion from assistant to associate professor
   • What are the current processes and expectations for promotion from assistant to associate professor?
   • How much variation in process and expectations is there across campus?
   • What types of variability should we expect and what should not be variable with respect to promotion from assistant to associate professor?
o What can we recommend to reduce the variability in aspects of the process where we think there should be more consistency?
o What parts of the process seem to be working well?

2. Promotion from associate to full professor
   o What are the current processes and expectations for promotion from associate to full professor?
   o How much variation is there across campus?
   o What types of variability should we expect and what should not be variable with respect to promotion from associate to full professor?
   o What can we recommend to reduce the variability in aspects of the process where we think there should be more consistency?
   o What parts of the process seem to be working well?

3. Peer comparison
   o How do our processes and expectations compare to our peers and aspirational peers?
   o In what areas should we make changes to be more consistent with practices of our peers?

4. Support needs
   o What support do candidates need to adhere to expectations and for the process to work well?
   o What support do people at other levels (i.e. chairs, deans, college and university committee members) need to adhere to expectations and for the process to work well?

Each workgroup spent time delineating relevant aspects of their workgroup’s topic and determining the data and information necessary to address these aspects. These data needs were compiled across workgroups, and an overall data collection strategy was developed. Once data and information were collected, each workgroup reviewed relevant aspects of the data, summarized their findings, and brought initial recommendations based on these findings to the larger group to consider. The recommendations contained in this report emerged after discussion and consideration by the entire group.

We used a variety of data and information sources, as follows:

Written guidelines and documentation. We collected and reviewed existing written guidelines including administrative guidelines from the Provost’s Office and CPCA (included in Appendix 1), administrative guidelines from the College of Arts and Sciences, a compilation of information about tenure and promotion processes across all schools and colleges that was assembled by
the Provost’s office, and available documentation regarding promotion and tenure in the library.

**Survey of peer institutions.** We sent a 12-question survey to the Provost’s office at 18 peer and aspirational peer institutions identified in UAlbany’s Middle States Review. We received responses from 5 institutions, representing a 28% response rate. A summary of our survey results appears in Appendix 3.

**Data from Human Resources.** We received data from Human Resources indicating number of faculty at different ranks and length of time at rank.

**Information Session with Representatives from CPCA.** On April 21, 2010, Bill Hedberg and then-current CPCA Chair Carlos Rodriguez attended a meeting of our planning group at which time they answered questions posed to them by the group about various aspects of tenure and promotion in relation to the work of CPCA, and they shared their perspectives on the issues and concerns most relevant to CPCA. In addition, our group membership included a liaison to CPCA as well as several members who had previous experience with either CPCA or a school-level review committee.

**In-depth qualitative interviews.** The group decided to use in-depth qualitative interviews as its primary mode of collecting data from faculty members. We chose this approach, rather than administering a survey to all faculty, for several reasons. First, we feared that faculty might be feeling somewhat over-surveyed, as there had recently been other faculty surveys done as part of the Strategic Planning Process and as part of other CLUE Planning Groups. In addition, these recent surveys generally yielded very low response rates. Also, given the nature of our inquiries, we wanted to gather rich in-depth information about individuals’ experiences with and perceptions of, the tenure and promotion process, and we felt that an interview in which respondents could provide us with detailed answers and in which we had the ability to ask follow-up questions, would best serve our purpose.

As a result, we developed interview protocols for assistant professors, newly-promoted (less than 3 years) associate professors, ‘seasoned’ (3 years or more) associate professors, department chairs, and deans. These interview protocols appear in Appendix 3. We first pilot tested our interviews with our planning group members, as our group had a diverse representation of ranks, former chairs, departments, and schools/colleges. We then conducted interviews with 25 faculty members and 7 Deans. We used a targeted sampling strategy to identify faculty members to approach for an interview, and we strove to assemble a group of interviewees that represented different units on campus, small and large departments, different disciplines, different ranks, and different experiences with the tenure and promotion
The interviewees included 11 assistant professors, 9 associate professors, and 5 department chairs, and they represent 18 departments.

Interview responses were made anonymous and compiled before being shared with the rest of the working group. Although our findings cannot be generalized to the entire faculty, responses to our interviews were, for the most part, remarkably consistent with each other and with the experiences of the Planning Group members. Thus we feel we can reasonably conclude that we have captured the major themes and issues related to the tenure and promotion process.

Publications and resources about best practices. The topic of tenure and promotion in academic institutions is a timely one, and there is much national discussion occurring on this topic. We utilized a variety of current publications and reports about changes in tenure and promotion approaches and about best practices, relevant news articles, and documents from other institutions. A complete list of these publications and resources appears in the Reference list.

Findings and Recommendations

General Perceptions of the Tenure and Promotion Process

Overall, the tenure and promotion process is perceived to work fairly well, but there are some key areas in which there is significant variation and inconsistency across the campus. In general, our data suggested that people feel the process as it is outlined on paper is fair and consistent. Most of our interviews reflected a positive perception of the process, although there was also a distinct negative perception shared by some junior and recently tenured faculty. However, though fairly clear on paper, there seems to emerge significant variability and inconsistency in how the process is implemented in different units on campus.

In addition, the perceptions about the transparency of the process were fairly different between chairs/deans and assistant/associate professors, with the latter group expressing a more tepid view of the openness and transparency of the process. While one would expect some amount of disconnect between perceptions of chairs and deans and those of relatively junior faculty, we concluded that the gap in perceptions is too large, and steps should be taken to mitigate this discrepancy. This is addressed by some of our specific recommendations in subsequent sections.
Assistant to Associate Professor

Using historical data and information from those with experience on the Council for Promotion and Continuing Appointment, we concluded that the vast majority of cases for promotion to associate professor with continuing appointment that reach the university level for review are approved. However, we were unable to accurately determine what percentage of junior faculty ultimately gain promotion because of a lack of available data regarding how many junior faculty have left in recent years prior to tenure review, and the reasons for those departures. (The CLUE Retention Group is examining issues related to faculty retention.) The general consensus of both faculty and administration is that a certain number of faculty who may not be competitive for promotion either choose to leave or are counseled to leave during their pre-tenure years, although we can’t quantify the frequency of these occurrences. The committee feels this overall climate for promotion (as opposed to a system where a large percentage get turned down at the university level) is fair and reasonable, and an aspect of our system worth preserving. In addition, we seem to be consistent with our peers in this regard. However, our findings did indicate that many faculty members have little knowledge of the percentage of candidates who receive positive votes from CPCA or our overall success rate for tenure and promotion.

Recommendations for Administrative Data Collection

- Develop a tracking and reporting system for tenure- and promotion-related information, and make this information widely available.
  - This information should include number of new hires, % that leave pre-tenure, date and reason for departure (if appropriate), number of tenure and promotion cases reviewed annually, % of cases approved for promotion to associate professor, % of cases approved for promotion to full professor.

Expectations

Our planning group’s view is that while the university should have some clearly articulated overarching expectations regarding standards of research, teaching and service that merit promotion and continuing appointment, the specific expectations, especially in terms of scholarship, will vary by discipline. It is the responsibility of each department or unit on campus to communicate those specific expectations to candidates within their units and to communicate those specific expectations upwards to higher levels of review.

Most of the assistant professors and recently promoted associate professors that we interviewed felt that the expectations for tenure are relatively clear and consistent. Some
qualified their statements about clear expectations by pointing out that in their department there was some inconsistency in standards or by pointing out that the information was there but that they hadn’t sought it out, or that they had to be proactive in seeking out clear guidance. A couple stated that expectations can only be clear to a point. A few indicated that expectations for tenure did seem to change a bit across their time at the assistant level, though their explanations for this varied (some felt that different faculty had different expectations; some felt that the expectations grew over time). However, even those who noted variations still said expectations were largely clear and consistent. In general, our findings indicated that expectations concerning research are clearer than those concerning teaching and service. Furthermore, some respondents mentioned the variability in service and teaching expectations across departments as potentially problematic. A common finding from our interviews was that most faculty felt that having department-wide written expectations or guidelines for research, teaching, and service is the best way to promote greater clarity and consistency in shared expectations, especially over time as department chairs and faculty composition in a department may vary.

As expected, some Deans expressed that there is great variability in expectations across departments, though these are driven by disciplinary norms. Others said variations were minimal. Most deans agreed that both the candidate and the department needed to clearly educate higher levels about the expectations and norms in their disciplines, particularly as they relate to research.

Our planning group extensively discussed whether expectations for tenure and promotion should be documented in writing. At the present time, the extent to which departments have written documents outlining expectations in research, teaching, and service, is highly variable. We are well aware that all departments in CAS were asked to develop such documents several years ago, and while some did, there was resistance by some departments to specifying expectations on paper. The arguments behind this resistance are understandable. For example, written criteria can be narrowly interpreted as strict requirements or, if written too quantitatively, can lead one to emphasize quantity over quality or limit one’s ability to evaluate a small body of groundbreaking scholarship. However, the absence of written expectations can lead to processes that are vague and inconsistent, perceptions of unfairness and capriciousness, and highly variable experiences among faculty members. In addition, national reports on best practices in tenure and promotion include a standard of “clear and transparent tenure processes and expectations” in which “clear policies are disseminated widely” (Trower & Gallagher, 2008). The result of our extensive deliberation was a consensus that departments should have written documents that articulate expectations for research, teaching, and service; these documents should describe typical expectations and perhaps a range of expectations, but
should not prescribe rigid criteria or requirements. We have provided two examples of such documents that currently are in use on campus in Appendix 3. These documents would be useful in communicating expectations clearly and consistently to junior faculty, and in addition, they would provide a useful way to educate higher levels of review as to disciplinary and departmental norms.

**Recommendations for Enhancing Clarity, Consistency, and Communication of Expectations**

- **Revise university guidelines to expand the description of expectations for research and scholarship, teaching, and service.**
- **Develop a written document in each department that describes expectations for promotion with respect to research, teaching, and service.**
  - These expectations can be general and can be revised over time. Ideally, they should include a prototypic example and then a range to give people an idea of what is expected. (Note – Requirements are different from expectations. These documents should describe expectations, not set out a list of absolute requirements that must be met.)
  - Two examples of ways expectations can be written (one from a humanities discipline and one from a social science discipline) appear in Appendix 4.
- **Hold annual workshops for pre-tenure faculty, sponsored by the Provost’s office, that focus on the process and expectations for tenure and promotion.**
- **Give chairs information and training on best practices for communicating expectations to pre-tenure faculty (i.e. annual meetings, written reviews, etc.)**

**Mentoring**

Our findings indicate significant variation across campus in mentoring practices and experiences for junior faculty. Although most departments across campus describe having mentoring programs in place, there is great variation in whether those programs are actually implemented, the type and extent of mentoring that occurs, and the extent to which any mentoring activities are effective and helpful. This variability ranges from some junior faculty having an assigned mentor and meeting quite regularly with that mentor to discuss their progress, to having an assigned mentor but having little or no regular contact with that mentor, to having negative and unhelpful interactions with a mentor, to not having an assigned mentor at all.

There is also a great amount of variability among junior faculty and among departments in how mentoring is defined and conceptualized, in expectations for mentoring, and in individual needs and desires for what a mentoring relationship should entail. Perhaps
because of this variability, some faculty members seem ambivalent about whether mentoring needs to be more consistent or prominent. However, those individuals who were the recipients of effective mentoring spoke positively about its value. From these findings, it is reasonable to conclude that we need a clear articulation of good mentoring – what it is and processes for accomplishing it – while also being attentive to the fact that there will always be variation in individual faculty needs regarding mentoring.

In terms of informal mentoring, most junior faculty describe being successful at finding colleagues, in and/or outside their departments, to serve as informal mentors. Junior faculty who have little formal mentoring, or who reported dissatisfaction in their assigned formal mentor, seemed to be more likely to describe efforts to find informal mentors. Thus, most tenure track faculty seem to have successfully built a network of colleagues who they turn to for advice, but it often takes place at their own initiative and with considerable expense of time and energy.

Recommendations for Mentoring

➢ Enhance mentoring across campus so that all pre-tenure faculty members have access to effective mentoring.
  o Give departments and junior faculty members clearer guidance about effective mentoring
  o Highlight best practices in mentoring across campus
  o Publicize the existing resources for mentoring available on the Provost’s website
  o Ensure that workshops for junior faculty include tips for developing network of informal mentors
➢ Provide training and preparation for mentors in effective mentoring practices.

Timing of the Review Process

Our findings indicate that some lack of clarity exists about the timelines for the review process, and some of our respondents mentioned that there was not a strong pipeline of information about the process, though some suggested that this has improved in recent years. As a great example of this inconsistency, half of the junior faculty said they clearly understood when they would come up from tenure from the time they were hired, and half said it was very unclear. Even some department chairs and deans indicated that they had a difficult time figuring out when someone should be coming up for review.

The general consensus from junior faculty was that they would like to see the information given to them more clearly and early on. Many indicated that there was variability in
gaining access to information, and that there should be regular, repeated, and consistent delivery of this information.

Our findings also revealed a second issue related to timelines that applied in certain cases, especially, though not exclusively to cases that received mixed votes at different levels of review. Some faculty indicated dissatisfaction with the length of time it took to hear about the final outcome of a case. In some instances, faculty reported that it was many months past the final decision date indicated in the guidelines before they received the decision about their case, and during those months they were unable to get any information about when their case would be decided.

**Recommendations related to Timing of the Review Process**

- **Articulate, and adhere to, the timelines and deadlines for the tenure review process.**
  If a case gets delayed for some reason, the candidate should be given a date by which a decision will be made.

- **Specify dates for the tenure review process in original employment letter from the university.** For example, faculty members should know when they are hired when they are expected (barring any leaves or extenuating circumstances) to submit their materials for review, and when they will receive a decision about promotion and continuing appointment.

- **Adjust faculty renewal patterns and timing of pre-tenure reviews so that pre-tenure reviews are conducted at an appropriate time.**
  
  - For example, CAS has now instituted a 3-2-2 pattern of renewals for assistant professors so as to have a formal review and renewal opportunity during the faculty member’s fourth year. This allows for the demonstration of significant progress toward tenure, while still leaving time to incorporate feedback and make changes before submitting materials for tenure review.

**Personal Leaves, Pre-Tenure Research Leaves, and Stopping the Tenure Clock**

UAAlbany appears to be significantly out of step with our peers with respect to a formal family leave policy, of which we have none. Most other institutions we examined (i.e. the peer and aspirational peer institutions that we surveyed) have formal policies for both medical and family leave, which automatically stop the tenure clock. And national resources on best practices in tenure and promotion consistently cite family friendly policies as a necessity (COACHE, 2010; Trower & Gallagher, 2008). We understand that the University Life Council of the University Senate developed such a policy several years ago, and it was approved by the UAAlbany Faculty Senate in 2006. However, that policy never advanced beyond that level. As a result, there is significant inconsistency in the availability
and execution of family friendly policies on campus, and our findings contained repeated references to this. Many faculty members have successfully combined career with children and family, but it often involves complicated organization and mechanisms not consistent across the university. Fairness would be enhanced with more explicit rules and policies. Informal policies and practices may exist, but the perception is that it is up to individuals (e.g. Deans, Chairs) to decide whether they will enforce them, and many Chairs and Deans do not even know of this information. Many faculty members indicated that there is not a clear pipeline of information about what family friendly policies are available. This lack of consistent information and support for junior faculty who want to have families represents a serious problem on our campus, and our lack of specific policies in this regard has led to perceptions of bias and lack of fairness in the system.

Despite our lack of formal policies in this area, there are some mechanisms available on campus to stop the tenure clock for family reasons or for other extenuating circumstances, but it is strikingly evident by our findings that there is much ambiguity, misunderstanding and lack of awareness about these mechanisms. For example, while most chairs and deans seem to be aware of the Nuala McCann Drescher award (which is often used by female faculty to stop the clock), some faculty members and administrators seem to think that the Drescher automatically stops the clock, which it does not unless requested by the faculty member. In addition, while members of some units on campus are aware of and have utilized informal requests to the Provost from the chair and dean to stop the tenure clock for various reasons, other faculty members, chairs and deans are unaware that this option even exists. However, one consistent finding across all our interviews is that the vast majority of respondents strongly support policies and mechanisms that allow a faculty member to ‘stop the clock’ when they are experiencing life events or extenuating work circumstances that may interfere with normal progress toward tenure, but that such mechanisms not be used merely to give extra time to candidates with weak research records.

UAlbany also appears to be a significant outlier when it comes to research leaves for junior faculty. UAlbany is one of the few places that does not offer a pre-tenure research leave, except in the form of the Drescher award. For example, SUNY campuses at Buffalo, Binghamton, Stony Brook and Purchase all have (or have had until recently) development or research leave awards for junior faculty. The need for this emerged from our findings, particularly from faculty members in book fields (i.e. disciplines with tenure expectations of publishing a book or a monograph). It is not uncommon for junior faculty members in these disciplines, who often have large teaching and advising loads, to need to take an unpaid leave for a semester or year in order to have enough time to prepare a manuscript. This has become a serious retention problem for tenure track faculty in book fields. We recognize
that in these challenging budgetary times the funds necessary for such leaves may not be readily available. However, it is in precisely these times, when teaching, advising and service loads for junior faculty are growing, when these leaves are most needed.

Our findings are consistent with the findings of the CLUE Retention Group based on their interviews with faculty who left the university pre-tenure. As stated in their report:

Several individuals complained of a lack of support for junior faculty, including required teaching overloads, a lack of teaching releases, a lack of pre-tenure research leave, and a paucity or absence of funding for conference and research travel. Some individuals complained that the lack of support for junior faculty may be particularly impactful for assistant professors in fields in which the publication of a book is a key criterion for earning tenure.

The only formal option for pre-tenure leave on our campus is the Drescher award, which is available for women and underrepresented groups. Not only is this award limited to certain groups, because of its competitiveness, it is often given late in the tenure process. The timing of the Drescher may mean that it is not a helpful mechanism for faculty in book disciplines since book manuscripts typically take several years from development to publication.

**Recommendations for Leaves and Tenure Clock Policies**

- Establish a formal family leave policy that is standard, clearly conveyed, understood by administrators, and evenly applied across the board.
- Develop and disseminate formal policies and procedures regarding stopping the tenure clock.
  - Such policies should distinguish between research and family leaves
- Develop mechanisms for pre-tenure research leave for all faculty
  - Creative strategies and examination of best practices may be needed to accomplish this in the current budget environment
- Modify existing leave policies (i.e. the Drescher) so leaves can be awarded during the most appropriate time, and are not too late to impact the candidate’s progress toward tenure.
- Explore creative ways to provide release time for faculty, particularly (though not exclusively) for faculty in ‘book’ disciplines, and especially if formal research leaves are not available, and service and teaching loads are high.
  - For example, perhaps a formal policy for stopping the tenure clock (see previous recommendations) could account for the unique time pressures of book fields.
The findings from our data collection and analysis and our resulting recommendations related to tenure and promotion of junior faculty are very much in line with current national trends regarding best practices in tenure and promotion. For example, Trower and Gallagher (2008), in their report from a COACHE (Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education) survey of junior faculty at six institutions, list the types of support that pre-tenure faculty value most highly as follows:

- **Time and Money** – protection from teaching and service, leaves, financial support for research
- **Clear and Transparent Tenure Process and Expectations** – clear policies and widespread dissemination; ‘how to’ workshops, formal annual reviews and thorough mid-term reviews
- **Support for Professional Development** – grant-writing assistance, assistance with improving teaching, collaborative projects, guidance about networking and marketability
- **Climate of Collegiality and Collaboration** – formal mentoring, informal mentoring, chair and senior faculty engagement
- **Quality of Life in terms of Balancing Work and Home** – dual career couples and spousal hiring, personal and parental leave, stop-the-tenure-clock, childcare
- **Workplace Diversity** – messages, resources, recruitment and retention

In addition, COACHE (2010) has specified benchmarks for various aspects of tenure-track faculty satisfaction. The benchmark categories and their associated dimensions that most relate to tenure and promotion appear in Appendix 5.

**Associate to Full Professor**

As of 2010, UAlbany had 220 full or distinguished professors, 226 associate professors and 161 assistant professors. Thus, associate professors account for 37% of the total teaching faculty. Among full/distinguished professors on campus, 19% are female and 4% belong to underrepresented minorities. Our planning group acknowledged that there is a perception on campus that many associate professors remain at this rank for a long time, sometimes indefinitely. We could not find national estimates of percentage of faculty by rank for comparison purposes. In addition, little national data is available regarding average time in rank for associate professors; the limited available data indicate an average of 7.4 years at the associate professor rank, and a trend for women to remain at the rank of associate professor longer than men (MLA, 2009).
The following table presents some limited statistics related to time in rank for current associate professors at UAlbany (using data from 9/2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean years in rank</th>
<th>Median years in rank</th>
<th>Range, in years</th>
<th>% at rank for 15+ years (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0 - 40</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0 - 35</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0 - 40</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0 - 35</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented Minorities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0 - 32</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately, our ability to draw firm conclusions about these data is very limited because these numbers only represent current associate professors, and do not account for associate professors who have already been promoted to full. Thus the time in rank may not adequately represent average time in rank for ALL associate professors because we assume that those individuals who have been promoted to full will have short to moderate time periods as associate professors. It is not possible to examine how long current full professors stayed at associate rank before being promoted because currently available Human Resources data only records the date of the most recent appointment.

Because of the limitations of the available data, we are also not able to draw any conclusions about differences in time at associate professor rank by gender or ethnicity. Examining time at rank is further complicated by the fact that women and underrepresented minorities may have been hired in disproportionately higher numbers more recently.

Despite this, it is still useful to make general observations about the data we do have. First, in all categories we have associate professors who have been at that rank for several decades. This is somewhat to be expected, since not every associate professor will ultimately reach full professor status. However, our group feels that one of the overarching principles of the tenure process should be that tenure is only given to faculty members who seem to be on a trajectory to eventually achieve full professor status; the perception among our group is that this norm is not as strong here as perhaps at some of our peer institutions.


Recommendations for Administrative Data Collection

➢ Enhance Human Resources data system to include data of appointment to each rank, so that time spent at each rank can be determined, and so that administration can more easily and regularly examine data relevant to tenure and promotion.
   o This would allow, for example, accurate analysis and examination of tenure rates, trends in time to promotion, gender differences in time to promotion, etc. and would allow for comparisons between our institution and national benchmarks.

Expectations for Promotion to Full

The body of work that would merit promotion to full professor is assumed to vary by discipline, and it is widely accepted that the department/school has the primary responsibility for articulating the discipline-specific standards to its faculty as well as to the CPCA. However, most current associate professor interviewees were uncertain about what the standards are. Moreover, there was a sense from interviews with Deans that they needed to be very careful with offering descriptions of discipline-specific criteria: they felt that the CPCA might discount such descriptions because a dean’s intervention by means of written or oral explanations of such criteria may sound like undue pressure on the CPCA with the hope of altering a final decision. Our planning group also concluded that the standards and expectations for full professor have changed across the university over the past 15 years. Overall, our interviewees emphasized great ambiguity and lack of clarity in the expectations for promotion to full professor, and in the relative weight of research, teaching, and service in these expectations. The few exceptions to this seem to exist in large and well established departments which have a long departmental and disciplinary history in this regard.

Recommendations for Enhancing Clarity of Expectations

➢ Prepare and disseminate a “consensus” document that articulates expectations for promotion and what it means to be a full professor at UAlbany. See Appendix 6 for an example of such a document recently prepared by the University of Wyoming.

➢ Encourage departments and/or schools to prepare documents that describe expectations and norms for promotion to full professor, and provide this document to both faculty members and CPCA.
   o This should include such things as norms about publication rates and types, funding, order of authorship, the importance of citations and norms regarding citation counts, and national prominence.
Assemble councils of full professors organized by discipline (one for the natural sciences, one for the social sciences, etc.) to articulate expectations for promotion of associate professors.

Encourage associate professors to take the initiative to find trusted senior colleagues here and at other universities to learn disciplinary expectations and how to develop one’s portfolio accordingly.

Career Development for Associate Professors

Our findings lead us to conclude that there is a systematic lack of focus on career development for associate professors on this campus. Obtaining accurate information about the process and expectations for promotion to full appears to depend exclusively on an individual faculty member’s initiative. Formal departmental, school or university level incentives, career development opportunities, or availability of mentorship are rare.

We wish to emphasize that ‘mentorship’ for associate professors has a much different meaning than it does for assistant professors. Many associate professors do not need or want the kind of systematic formal mentoring that is effective for junior faculty development. However, many associate professors did express the desire to receive more guidance from senior faculty and administrators about the path to full professor. In some units on campus this happens effectively. For example, in the Sociology department, the Executive Committee (comprised of full professors) regularly reviews the progress of associate professors and offers guidance to specific faculty members about their progress and readiness for promotion. However, this type of practice is more the exception than the rule.

Recommendations for Career Development for Associate Professors

- Introduce a formalized review process that provides feedback, goal setting, and direction.
- Sponsor workshops or seminar series (i.e Tenure Trek program for associate professors) that review tactics and strategies associate professors can employ to advance their trajectories.
  - Given the current economic challenges, a timely session might focus on creative ways to develop and sustain a national or international reputation when travel is restricted. These workshops could also include “do’s” and “don’ts” for preparation of successful promotion dossiers and the sharing of appropriately redacted letters that have been written in support of associate professors at other institutions seeking promotion to full.
Develop suggested milestones as guidelines for mid-career faculty.

Conduct individualized conversations among senior associate professors with their chairs/deans about plans for promotion.

- The Dean should conduct these conversations in small schools and in instances where the department chair is a young associate professor.

### Barriers to Promotion to Full Professor

In addition to the lack of career development opportunities, our work led us to uncover the existence of a variety of other barriers that hinder the process of advancing to full professor for some individuals. Some of these barriers are unique to our campus, while others are common to other institutions as well.

The scarcity of full professors in some small or newer departments leads to several relevant consequences for associate professors, including a lack of role models and potential mentors, a lack of senior faculty to serve on department ad hoc promotion committees, and a perception that the national and international reputation needed for full professor status is unattainable in the absence of seeing others who have done it. Other identified barriers include no explicit timeframe (and thus no time pressure to go up for review), no incentive for either faculty members or departments to spend the necessary time to assemble the dossier, significant service loads that detract from research time, and the small pay increase associated with promotion. In the face of these barriers, and the stress/vulnerability associated with being reviewed by one’s colleagues (especially in light of unclear expectations for promotion), many associate professors remain at their current rank.

Serving as department chair while an associate professor is also viewed as a barrier to promotion, although in at least one school on campus, this is an expected route to becoming a full professor. Currently, 17 out of 43 (40%) department chairs on campus are associate professors. In fact, there is a relatively common perception that administrative responsibilities, including the chairing of departments, are a barrier to promotion. There may be two reasons for this: service in the form of administrative roles is time consuming and thus detracts from research and among the promotion trifecta (research, teaching and service), service is not valued as much as research. In addition, having department chairs who are associate professors may present barriers or difficulties to promoting other faculty in the department.

Several respondents gave many examples of barriers to career progression that may in fact be unique to the current economic climate. For example, the suspension of doctoral programs has negatively affected research productivity and development in some units.
Funding restrictions for conference travel hinder the development of a wide professional reputation. And staff shortages make it more difficult for departments to make assembling dossiers for non-mandatory promotion a priority. In addition, in some fields the pressure to publish in top tier journals has increased substantially and more international scholars are submitting to these journals (Segalla 2008), thus making it more difficult to develop the necessary publication record.

**Recommendations for Reducing Barriers to Promotion to Full Professor**

- Establish a council of senior faculty who can advise or mentor associates, especially for units with few senior faculty of their own.
- Provide training for chairs in how to have the necessary conversations about moving forward to full professor.
- Pressure/incentivize/communicate the necessity to Deans to make promoting associate professors a priority.

Thus, we conclude that our institution is not organized well to support the development and advancement of associate professors, and there’s very little systematic attention to nor institutional support for the transition to full professor. Our committee feels strongly that greater institutional support for both individual faculty members and for departments is needed for career development for associate professors. A commitment by the institution to better cultivate its mid-career faculty would not only benefit individual faculty members, but would strengthen the university as a whole.

**Institutional Definitions of Scholarship**

In recent years there has been an increasingly prominent conversation at the national level about the ways in which traditional scholarship is changing. Many disciplines – especially those housed in professional schools – have been grappling with the question of what constitutes scholarship, deciding on the metrics that should be used to evaluate community engaged or entrepreneurial scholarship (especially regarding the impact of such scholarship), and who should be involved in providing those evaluations (e.g., maybe reviewers should include the community agency leaders who collaborate with academics). Some of these other disciplines (like nursing and public health) have developed some frameworks and guidelines. (See, for example, AACN (1999) and Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions (2005)). Several of our own deans expressed concerns over these very issues in their interview responses. And these issues increasingly contribute, in some fields, to concerns about clarity of expectations for tenure and promotion.
Historically, there have been a few disciplines in which academic scholarship included a broader range of activities and outputs than traditionally defined. For example, our own department of Geography and Planning has routinely included, in tenure and promotion dossiers for planning candidates, a statement from their professional organization that describes the sometimes non-traditional scholarly work that is common in that discipline. But issues related to expanding definitions of scholarship are becoming increasingly pertinent on our campus.

Two specific examples that might be highlighted include the role of entrepreneurship in the sciences and community-engaged scholarship in disciplines such as social welfare, public health, and education. Recently, there has been growing emphasis SUNY-wide on the importance of entrepreneurship, inventorship, patents, and technology development in the sciences. But presently there is no rubric within the typical tenure and promotion process to account for and evaluate the outcomes of such work, which may involve disclosures, patent applications, and patents received, as opposed to peer-reviewed manuscripts. The College of Nanoscale Sciences and Engineering has been grappling with these issues, and as a result, includes a detailed forward in tenure and promotion dossiers to explain a candidate’s work within these contexts. Similarly, UAlbany has made a commitment to community engagement, but community-engaged scholarship in disciplines such as public health and social welfare is also not well captured by typical tenure and promotion evaluation rubrics.

As these issues increase in importance and breadth, departments and schools should be encouraged and expected to provide a context for the scholarship in their discipline to upper levels of review. But our planning group also feels that our University itself needs to acknowledge that expectations and practices regarding scholarship are changing, and embrace a broader institutional view of scholarship. If we do not grapple with these questions about what constitutes scholarship as it applies to particular departments and disciplines we are going to fall out of step with leading universities and funders.

Other universities are already beginning to address this issue. As an illustrative example, Syracuse University revised the description of ‘scholarship’ in its faculty handbook in 2009 to include this statement:

_Syracuse University is committed to longstanding traditions of scholarship as well as evolving perspectives on scholarship. Syracuse University recognizes that the role of academia is not static and that methodologies, topics of interest, and boundaries within and between disciplines change over time. The University will continue to support scholars in all of these traditions, including faculty who choose to participate in publicly engaged scholarship. Publicly engaged scholarship may involve partnerships of University knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, creative activity, and public knowledge; enhance curriculum._
teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address and help solve critical social problems; and contribute to the public good. (Syracuse University, 2009)

**Recommendations for Institutional Definitions of Scholarship**

- Prepare and disseminate a statement from the Provost’s Office which recognizes a broader, and more inclusive definition of scholarship.
- Encourage and instruct schools and departments to provide a context for upper levels of review by specifically articulating expectations in their disciplines.
  - Perhaps there could be a standard template that each dept/school is expected to develop and include for the CPCA (and maybe even include in its requests to external reviewers). The instructions provided to the dept/school about what level of detail to include in the template, and the categories themselves would also be a way for the provost to recognize and value different visions of scholarship. See for example Appendix C in the toolkit available at the Community Campus Partnerships for Health [http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info/](http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info/).
- Assemble and publicize resources on the Provost’s website to help departments and schools who do community-engaged, entrepreneurial, and other ‘new’ forms of scholarship in assembling tenure and promotion cases.
  - The reference section in this report include a sample of such resources [See, for example, Calleson, Jordan, & Seifer, 2005; Nora et al., 2000; Nyden, 2003; O’Meara, 2005]. Appendix 9 also contains references to resources related to documenting engaged scholarship.

**Guidelines and Dossiers**

Presently, administrative guidelines from both the Office of Academic Affairs and from CPCA are available on the Provost’s website. They appear here in Appendix 1. These guidelines have not been updated in several years, and it is unclear, in fact, when they were originally issued. (The CPCA guidelines appear to have been last revised in 2002, although they include a document on the evaluation of teaching that dates to 1984.) Our findings indicate that many campus members, even junior faculty approaching their tenure review, are not well-acquainted with, or even aware of, these guidelines. We also note that much of the guidelines refer to administrative details regarding the assembly of a dossier, and the language regarding definitions and expectations for research, teaching, and service are somewhat vague and extremely brief. While many of our interview respondents evaluated the dossier-assembly instructions as clear, many made the observation that language regarding expectations was
somewhat ambiguous. In this regard, our guidelines are much briefer and less detailed than many of our peer or aspirational peer institutions.

The committee reviewed documents about tenure and continuation posted on websites of several other institutions. Universities selected for this review included peer institutions, institutions identified as having best practices, and a convenience sample of institutions across the US. These documents provided an opportunity to reflect on the current documents at the University at Albany and provide insight into potential modifications that could enhance the promotion and continuation process. Several key findings emerged from this comparison.

First, compared to other institutions, our guidelines lack a clear statement of the goals and objectives of the tenure and promotion process, and how that links to the mission of the University. This finding is consistent with the findings from our interviews that the current definitions and description of expectations for scholarship, teaching, and service are brief and vague. In fact, other universities have much longer and in-depth introductory statements that address the meaning of scholarship, teaching and service, their role in the mission of a research university, and the expected faculty achievement in these areas.

Second, it would be useful to have one comprehensive guidance document that is up-to-date. Currently, our guidelines include separate documents from CPCA and the Provost’s Office, plus several appendices. A single document would provide the full context of the process as well as the procedures, and would enhance the understanding of how the procedures are designed to facilitate attaining the objectives of the tenure and promotion process.

Third, our current guidelines are not well organized. Although they contain much useful information, the lack of organization makes that information difficult to discern and easily understand. As a result, the current guidelines are lacking in clarity. In addition, more detail about selection of external reviewers (addressed in a subsequent section of this report), responsibilities of each person involved in the process, required documentation, and the role of CPCA would enhance the usefulness of our guidelines. Revised guidelines would achieve greater clarity if they described the goals of the evidence to be presented, what documentation is required for the presentation of that evidence, and what is recommended in terms of evidence.

In addition, we learned from department chairs that while the process for putting together files may have guidelines (laid out by the administration), the implementation of assembling files can vary greatly across departments and schools. This has implications for the file itself, and indeed the experience of CPCA members is that the presentation of cases can vary greatly. This creates potential inequities in how candidates are perceived when CPCA reviews their files, since well-prepared dossiers can enhance the impressiveness of a candidate, while a similarly impressive candidate might be harmed by a less accomplished presentation.
departments, which may lack the administrative assistance necessary to assist in file assembly and/or senior faculty with experience in dossier preparation, may be especially disadvantaged in this regard. This variability weakens the clarity, quality and equity of our tenure review process.

**Recommendations for Guidelines and Dossiers**

- **Revise and reissue university-level guidelines**
  - Guidelines should include more in-depth language about expectations for scholarship, teaching and service for different levels
  - Guidelines should include more specific information regarding
    - external reviewers (see subsequent section for more detail)
    - required documentation and who is responsible for the preparation of each document
    - the responsibilities of everyone involved in the process (i.e. candidate, chair, assistant to chair, etc.)
    - the role of and charge to CPCA
  - Reissuing these guidelines will address the general lack of knowledge and awareness of their existence
- **Provide an orientation or handbook for department chairs and assistants chair/secretaries about the logistics of assembling dossiers**
- **Provide sample dossiers (either anonymous or fictional) for departments to use as examples**

**External Reviewers**

Currently, university guidelines stipulate that a minimum of 4 external reviewers are required for each promotion case. In practice, CPCA expects at least 6 letters for a tenure case and 6 to 8 for a case involving promotion to full professor, although they recognize that only 4 ‘untainted’ letters are sufficient for a case to move forward. However, this expectation is not stated anywhere in writing. Our findings indicate striking variation at all levels across campus in the understanding of how many external reviewers are needed. Some of this variation is undoubtedly due to the explicit emphasis of former Provost Susan Herbst to increase the number of letters in each case to at least 6, if not more. However, the significant variation in understanding of the current rules about the required number of letters is problematic.

University guidelines offer some guidance about how reviewers should be selected, but say little about who is responsible for selecting reviewers and who is appropriate to serve in this role. The unwritten rule is that external reviewers should be from peer or aspirational peer
institutions, and should hold the rank of full professor. It is also acceptable if one or two reviewers for assistant professor cases are senior associate professors. When asked directly, chairs seemed to think the process of identifying and soliciting external letters was clear. But indirectly, some department chairs expressed that there is variability here, or potential for it. There is a sense in the Chairs’ and Deans’ comments that the knowledge about what types of letters are expected (from what institutions, what rank) and knowledge about what constitutes acceptable research in each discipline has to be regenerated each year on CPCA, so it is of course highly dependent upon the Chairs’ and Deans’ letters (which can add variability to the process) and upon the knowledge and perspective of CPCA members.

The general perception on campus is that the way that departments select external reviewers is unclear and is highly variable across units. CPCA representatives also indicate that the process of selecting reviewers is not well described in most dossiers, even though the current guidelines stipulate that this should be explained in detail. This ambiguity concerning reviewer selection can contribute to doubts about the independence of reviewers in some instances.

UAlbany’s approach to the external review of candidate’s research and scholarship rests on the premise that external reviewers are objective and independent. However, there is not a consistent understanding across campus regarding how that is defined. The current written guidelines offer a brief and somewhat vague definition that reads, “Reviews cannot be from persons who have a close relationship to the candidate (i.e., recent colleagues, research collaborators, current or former students, mentors, thesis or postdoctoral advisors, co-authors, and the like must be avoided).” Information we gathered from interviews and from CPCA representatives indicate that the specific interpretation of this varies widely across campus. For example, some people only conclude that a letter is ‘tainted’ when it comes from someone with an obvious close relationship to the candidate, like a former mentor or colleague. On the other hand, some individuals apply a much more stringent definition, and rule out such people as editors of journals in which a candidate has published and co-presenters on conference panels. In practice, this had led to problematic situations in which the standards that people at different levels of review use to evaluate the acceptability of letters can be quite different.

Our planning group feels that some of these interpretations of ‘tainting’ are too stringent and that we need a more explicit definition of independent reviewers that can be consistently applied and adhered to by all levels of review. In addition, during our interviews across campus, we heard a number of voices expressing that our rules for external reviewers are too strict, and stricter than those of many other universities, and as a result may exclude the people who may very well be the most knowledgeable about a candidate’s work. We conclude that approaching this issue in terms of conflict of interest would lead to a more reasonable and
easily operationalized process for selecting external reviewers and assuring their independence or lack of bias. This is addressed in our detailed recommendation that follows.

**Recommendations for External Reviewers**

- Clarify and publicize the number of external reviewer letters needed. If more than the minimum number of letters is recommended, state this in written guidelines.
- Develop clearer guidelines for selecting appropriate external reviewers, based on a uniform conflict of interest definition (one that specifically excludes only those reviewers who have an identifiable interest in whether the candidate is tenured or promoted).
  - A suggested draft of such a statement is included in Appendix 7.
- Enhance the written guidelines to add more detail about the process departments should follow to select external reviewers and who is appropriate to serve in this role.
  - Current rules that allow candidates to specify reviewers who should not be included due to theoretical or professional tensions should be maintained
- Include in the guidelines a template for departments to follow to describe how external reviewers were chosen and why they are suitable reviewers for the case at hand.

**Role of the Department Chair**

There is some variability across campus in department chairs’ knowledge about their role in assembling a dossier, shepherding a case, and educating upper levels about the context of the department and a particular candidate’s work. Much of this variation depends on previous experience of the department chair – i.e. past experience on CPCA, familiarity with previous cases in the department, etc. But most new chairs learn their role by relying on past chairs and their assistants to chairs.

**Recommendations regarding Department Chair’s Role**

- Provide an orientation to department chairs about their role in the process, including educating upper levels about departmental norms and expectations

**Peer Review of Teaching**

Although the administrative guidelines stipulate that peer review of teaching is part of each tenure and promotion package, the guidelines do not include specific instructions as to what this should consist of or how it should be carried out. Our findings, from multiple sources, indicate there is some variability and lack of consistency across campus in the meaning of peer
review of teaching. With respect to its execution, there is some consistency across departments, with most departments using a mix of SIRFs, in-class observation, and consultation with faculty to assess the candidate’s teaching, but the specifics of how and when these are carried out, used to evaluate teaching, and presented in the dossier vary greatly.

This aspect of the review process would be greatly enhanced by more standardization across campus. Our planning group recommends that ideally peer review of teaching should include direct classroom observations by peers that are recorded in written form. These observations should be done at two time periods – once early in the career of an assistant professor, and then again closer to the time of tenure review – so that feedback can be used to make adjustments in teaching, and changes and improvements can be documented.

*Recommendations for Peer Review of Teaching*

- Provide detailed guidelines for how peer review of teaching should be carried out, documented, and used in the tenure review process.
  - ITLAL has extensive materials available on its website related to peer observation of teaching, but it is unclear whether departments are aware of these.

*Voting rights*

While there is no explicit university rule or policy regarding who has voting rights on personnel matters, for the most part, all full-time members of the teaching/academic faculty vote on tenure and promotion cases at the department level, although the guidelines stipulate that votes from tenured and untenured faculty are to be reported separately. There are a few exceptions to this. For example, at the School of Public Health, faculty members who have ‘unqualified’ appointments but who are employed by the NYS Department of Health have voting rights. Also, there are a few departments which have extended voting rights to an instructor, or which have restricted voting to only tenured faculty.

At higher levels of review, voting rights are varied. Some schools and colleges restrict membership on school/college tenure and promotion committees to tenured faculty. However, the Charter of the University Senate allow for assistant professors to serve on, and even chair CPCA, although in practice that rarely happens. Also the charter stipulates that voting members of CPCA include one professional staff member and one graduate student.

There is little information in the literature about norms regarding voting rights at universities. However, a brief review of voting practices at many of our peer institutions suggest that most restrict voting on tenure and promotion to tenured faculty only, and some restrict voting to only those faculty at or above the rank of the candidate.
Our interviews revealed great differences in opinion from respondents at all levels about whether untenured faculty should vote on tenure and promotion, with faculty being almost evenly split between those in favor and those opposed of such rights. Junior faculty seemed slightly more likely to support this practice, while most Dean’s held the opposite view.

Those in favor of allowing junior faculty to vote on tenure and promotion cases cite the increased transparency and accountability that comes with such practice. Many faculty interviewees reported that it was during these departmental discussions and votes that they learned the most about how cases were evaluated.

On the other hand, many faculty acknowledge the potential for junior faculty to feel pressured to vote a certain way or to feel unable to express their honest views about a case. In fact, some respondents reported being faced with such situations in their own departments. In addition, the practice of allowing junior faculty voting is perceived to be at odds with peer institutions.

Some respondents advocated for only allowing full professors to vote on cases involving promotion to full. However, given the relative paucity of full professors at UAlbany, especially in some departments, it not feasible to have only full professors vote on these cases, at least at the department level. In addition, because women and underrepresented groups are less likely to hold this rank, this practice would effectively limit the voice of these groups in the decision-making process.

Of additional concern, especially for Deans and Chairs, is fact that professional staff members have voting privileges on CPCA. Our planning group agrees that changes should be made to the composition of CPCA to restrict its membership to full-time tenured members of the academic faculty (including librarians). We also looked favorably on last year’s efforts to make the chair a full professor.

Given the almost evenly split opinions about this issue that emerged from our interviews, and indeed existed among the members of our planning group, we are not prepared to make a formal recommendation regarding whether UAlbany should continue the practice of allowing non-tenured faculty members to vote on tenure and promotion matters at the department level. We agree that that there are many benefits to having pre-tenure faculty participate in the discussion of candidates, even if they have no formal vote. But we feel there needs to be a larger discussion, with broad participation, about this issue across campus.

**Recommendations on Voting Rights**

- Amend Faculty Senate Charter to restrict membership of CPCA to tenured, full-time members of the academic faculty
- Initiate a campus-wide discussion about voting practices
References


Wilson, R. July 24, 2011. Associate Professors: Academe’s Sandwich Generation Chronicle of Higher Education
Career Leadership & University Excellence (CLUE)

Planning Group on Promotion and Tenure

Final Report Appendices
Appendix 1

Current UALbany Adminstrative Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

These guidelines are to be found on the Provost’s Website under “Information for Faculty and Staff” and the Senate Website in the Senate Handbook:

http://www.albany.edu/academics/procedures.promotions.continuing.appointment.shtml

http://www.albany.edu/senate/handbook_section1.htm#tenure

The guidelines are placed permanently in those locations, and any updates to the guidelines will be made on those websites. Should the links above no longer work, please consult either the Provost’s office site: http://www.albany.edu/academics/provost.shtml or the Senate Handbook at the Senate site: http://www.albany.edu/senate/ for details.
Appendix 2

Interview Protocols for Interviews with Current Albany Faculty Members

For Assistant Professors in their 4th or 5th year

1. What is your rank, and how long have you been at the University at Albany?

2. What is your general perception of the promotion and tenure process here at UA? Is it generally positive, generally negative, or somewhere in between?

3. What kinds of formal and informal mentoring do you receive as a junior faculty member, and how effective do you think that mentoring is?

4. In your opinion, what would improve the mentoring of junior faculty?

5. Do you feel the expectations for promotion to associate professor, in terms of research, teaching, and service have been communicated to you clearly and consistently?
   a. Explain why or why not

6. What has helped you most in understanding and meeting these expectations?

7. Do you have suggestions for what kinds of things could better assist junior faculty in understanding and meeting expectations of their department and discipline?

8. Since you began your tenure-track appointment here, has it always been clear when your tenure clock indicates you should present your case for review?

9. Are you aware of any mechanisms in place to accommodate junior faculty who would like to stop the (tenure) clock (for child-related reasons, or various other unexpected personal or work-related reasons), gain some flexibility in time to tenure, or obtain “leaves” (research leaves to write a book, maternity leaves, etc.)?
   a. If so, do you know anyone who has availed him- or herself of these mechanisms, and how they went about doing so?
   b. Do you support such mechanisms?

10. How well informed do you feel you are about the actual process of assembling your file for promotion and tenure, and about the whole process of promotion and tenure review after your file leaves the department?

11. What do you think about junior faculty voting on promotion cases?

12. Do you have any specific suggestions for what would improve the tenure and promotion process, and the junior faculty experience, here at UAlbany?
For Associate Professors

1. How long have you been at the University at Albany? What is your current rank, and how long have you been at this rank?

For “new” associate professors (3 years or less)

1. What is your general perception of the promotion and tenure process here at UA? Is it generally positive, generally negative, or somewhere in between?
2. What kind of mentoring did you receive as a junior faculty member?
   a. Can probe for various details
3. What would improve the mentoring of junior faculty in your department?
4. Do you feel the expectations for promotion to associate professor, in terms of research, teaching, and service were communicated to you clearly and consistently?
   a. Explain why or why not
5. What helped you most in understanding and meeting these expectations?
6. How well informed were you as a junior faculty member about the actual process of assembling your file for promotion and tenure, and about the whole process of promotion and tenure review at the various levels?
7. As a junior faculty member, what additional information or support would you like to have related to the promotion and tenure process?
8. Are you aware of any mechanisms in place to accommodate junior faculty who would like to stop the (tenure) clock (for child-related reasons, or various other unexpected personal or work-related reasons), gain some flexibility in time to tenure, or obtain “leaves” (research leaves to write a book, maternity leaves, etc.)?
   a. If so, do you know anyone who has availed him- or herself of these mechanisms, and how they went about doing so?
   b. Do you support such mechanisms?
9. What do you think about junior faculty voting on promotion cases?
10. Do you have any specific suggestions for what would improve the tenure and promotion process here at UAlbany?

For “seasoned” associate professors (more than 3 years)

1. What is your general perception of the promotion and tenure process here at UA? Is it generally positive, generally negative, or somewhere in between?
2. What kinds of activities, if any, occur in your department or school for mentoring, or career development for associate professors?

3. Are there mentoring or career development activities that you would like to have?

4. Do you feel the expectations for promotion to full in terms of research, teaching, and service are clear and consistent? Explain why or why not.

5. What’s the best way for faculty to learn these expectations?

6. Are you aware of any mechanisms in place to accommodate junior faculty who would like to stop the (tenure) clock (for child-related reasons, or various other unexpected personal or work-related reasons), gain some flexibility in time to tenure, or obtain “leaves” (research leaves to write a book, maternity leaves, etc.)?
   
   a. If so, do you know anyone who has availed him- or herself of these mechanisms, and how they went about doing so?

   b. Do you support such mechanisms?

7. What do you think about junior faculty voting on promotion cases, and associates voting on promotion to full?

8. National trends show that many associate professors don’t seek promotion to full. What barriers do you think exist that may hinder associate professors from seeking promotion to full professor? (These may include personal, professional, and institutional barriers)

9. What are your plans to come up for full professor? When and if do you plan to come up?

10. What aspects of your department, school or the university facilitate the process of associate professors seeking promotion to full?

11. What things could be put in place to facilitate the process of associate professors seeking promotion to full? (Or, do you have any specific suggestions for what would improve the Associate to Full promotion process here at UAlbany?)

For Department Chairs

1. When and for how long were you department chair? What was your rank when you were chair? Approximately how many promotion and tenure cases did you oversee?

2. What is your general perception of the promotion and tenure process here at UA? Is it generally positive, generally negative, or somewhere in between?

3. How are expectations for tenure and promotion communicated to faculty in your department? Are they documented in writing?
4. Are you aware of any mechanisms in place to accommodate junior faculty who would like to stop the (tenure) clock (for child-related reasons, or various other unexpected personal or work-related reasons), gain some flexibility in time to tenure, or obtain “leaves” (research leaves to write a book, maternity leaves, etc.)?
   a. If so, do you know anyone who has availed him- or herself of these mechanisms, and how they went about doing so?
   b. Do you support such mechanisms?

5. In your experience, how much variation is there in expectations for research, teaching, and service between your department and higher (i.e. school/college and university) review levels?

6. If there is variation, what is/was your role as chair in dealing with different expectations at higher levels? (In other words, does the department chair have a role or responsibility to educate higher levels as to the specific expectations of a department or discipline?)

7. How did you learn about your role as chair in putting together a tenure/promotion file and shepherding it through the process, what would help department chairs learn how to put together and shepherd a tenure/promotion file?

8. In your department, who is responsible for putting a file together? In other words, what do the following people do with respect to assembling the file – candidate, a committee, chair, assistant to chair?

9. How is peer evaluation of teaching and grading conducted in your department?

10. What is your opinion of the University’s current criteria for external reviewers? Are the criteria clear? What should be changed? What would be helpful for selecting external reviewers?

11. In thinking about external reviewer letters, what do you consider to be a “tainted” letter?

12. What is your perspective/opinion about faculty below the rank of promotion voting? (e.g. assistant professors voting on promotion to associate, and associate professors voting on promotion to full)

13. Do you have any specific suggestions, from your perspective as Department Chair, as to how the tenure and promotion process could be improved?
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REPORT ON PEER AND ASPIRATIONAL PEER INSTITUTIONS ON PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESSES

Contacted Peers: 10 Institutions
Information from Peers: 2 Institutions (20% response rate)

Contacted Aspirational Peers: 8 Institutions
Information from Aspirational Peers: 3 Institutions (40% response rate)

Note: not all institutions answered all the questions

Q1: In the past 5 or more years, what percentage of candidates for promotion and tenure have been granted it?

Peers average: 97.5%
Aspirational Peers average: 91%

Comments: It would seem that UAlbany is similar to its peers in this regard. The committee had no particular recommendations

Q2: What percentage of professors and professional staff who are hired in tenure track positions leave before mandatory tenure review?

Peer average: 21%
Aspirational Peers: no information

Comments: this data is not broken down between those who leave because they were offered a better opportunity and those who left because tenure looked unlikely. Also, the n here is only 1.

Q3: Are there written guidelines for PROCEDURES for tenure and promotion?

Both Peers and Aspirational Peers uniformly have university level procedures written out and posted to the internet, much like UAlbany

Q4: Are there written expectations for accomplishments for successful promotions and tenure?

The Peers’ colleges and schools have written guidelines (much like our CAS guidelines)
The Aspirational Peers are similar. Of note, quantifying a candidate’s research work proves sometimes difficult.
Comments: Although the committee recognized the difficulties of quantifying research across disciplines, we recommend that some effort be made (again) to do so. As an example, the University of Delaware’s Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures publishes its Policies on Promotion (www.udel.edu/fllt/governance/promotion.pdf). An example of a less specific departmental policy is that of the Department of Philosophy at Bowling Green State University (http://www.bgsu.edu/departments/phil/resources/page27283.html). Flying up to 30,000 feet, the AAUP statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure (http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1940statement.htm) seems to be the core document that many institutions have built on over the years. But, that document is nowhere near specific.

Q5: Do committee decisions carry equal weight with administrative decisions or is there greater weight at a given level?

The responses here were quite varied. We could not discern a trend. Answers were necessarily anecdotal, and not based on data.

Q6: Is there a timeline for review of promotion and tenure cases at your institution?

All institutions have some timelines, but there was not uniformity. One institution had no deadline at the Provost or Presidential levels, “since the institution does not want to limit the time for careful review.”

Comments: The committee realized after the fact that this question should have been twofold. Not only should we have asked whether there was a timeline, we also should have asked what happened if the timeline isn’t adhered to.

Recommendation: We are aware that missing deadlines on our own timeline has been an issue in recent years. We recommend that the Academic Affairs document be modified, in consultation with CPCA and GOV, to include information about what happens when a deadline is missed (i.e., whose responsibility is it to notify the candidate of the delay, what accountability is there, etc.).

Q7: When a case has “mixed” reviews, does the institution have a trend in a particular direction?

Although responses were mixed, in general the trend seemed to be that a negative recommendation at any level pushes a case toward a negative decision. Again, it would seem that this information was anecdotal, and not based on data of cases. No numbers were provided.

Q8: Is the institution (i.e. faculty and staff) unionized?
Peers: No
Aspirational Peers: one yes, one no

Q9: What is the level of transparency in the promotion and tenure process?

All institutions indicated that the transparency is high.

Q10: Is there an official policy on stopping the tenure clock?

Uniformly family and medical leaves are granted, stopping the tenure clock. Other stops are rare, but not impossible.

Q11: What is the percentage of faculty and staff who are hired at the pre-tenure level?

Peers: 90+% and 80+%  
Aspirational Peers: 70+%  

Q12: What is the number and process for selecting outside reviewers?

The minimum number of letters required was 4 (one institution) and the others required either 5 or 6. Candidates are often permitted to suggest names of outside reviewers. In some cases they choose up to half their reviewers. “Tainting” is not well defined, but seems to be less stringently gauged than at UAlbany.
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Examples of Department Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Example 1.

History Department Tenure and Promotion Procedures and Criteria

Drafted and adopted spring 2007

PROCEDURES

I. Timing and initiation of file

1. For assistant professors the department chair initiates the process. In most cases the process begins at the end of the spring semester of the candidate’s fifth year. In some cases where the record justifies it, the process may begin in an earlier year.

2. For associate professors, the candidate wishing to come up for promotion to full professor initiates the process in consultation with the department chair.

3. Once a candidate has elected to be considered for promotion (or in the case of assistant professors, has reached the year when the department and university are obligated to consider their case), the timing of the process occurs as follows:

Late Spring

1. The candidate submits copies of all of her/his publications and of works in progress to the department Chair along with an up-to-date c.v.

2. The department Chair, in consultation with faculty members, selects a three member committee of tenured faculty to write a report for the department that will evaluate the candidate’s research, teaching and service. If there is no department member in the candidate’s immediate field, the Chair may ask an affiliated faculty member in another department to serve on the committee.

3. The candidate provides the Department Chair a statement summarizing her/his research accomplishments and plans for future research, including an assessment of progress on new research projects. (Additional statements on teaching and service accomplishments and goals for the future may be delayed until late summer.)

4. The members of the internal committee, in consultation with other senior faculty in the candidate’s field, will generate a list of ten to twelve potential external reviewers of the candidate’s scholarship that will be submitted to the Chair. As indicated in the University guidelines, candidates will be asked to identify potential referees who for personal reasons ought not to be consulted.
5. The Chair will contact potential outside reviewers until six or seven have consented to serve. They are sent copies of the candidate’s publications along with the c.v. and research statement. The Chair will take care to ensure that outside reviewers have no close associations with the candidate. A deadline of mid-August is set for submitting evaluation letters.

**September**

1. The candidate submits to the Chair of the evaluation committee copies of all of her/his syllabi and other selected teaching materials.

2. The member of the evaluation committee responsible for teaching solicits letters evaluating the candidate’s teaching from former undergraduate and/or graduate students the candidate has taught or advised, as suggested by the candidate. These letters are treated as non-confidential, and the writers are so advised.

3. The member of the evaluation committee responsible for service solicits letters evaluating the candidate’s service from selected persons on campus, in the profession, and in the community as suggested by the candidate. The candidate has the option of soliciting additional letters from colleagues who can evaluate the candidate’s service.

Additional (non-solicited) letters from current or former graduate or undergraduate students, if received, will be placed in the file and treated as non-confidential. The writers are so advised.

4. Members of the committee will observe the candidate’s classes, in consultation with the candidate, and write an evaluation of classroom performance that will be part of the candidate’s promotion file.

5. The department compiles the candidate’s student evaluations and grade distributions for all courses she/he has taught, as well as comparative information for the department.

6. In late September, the committee submits its report evaluating the candidate’s research, teaching, and service to the department. The Chair will let the department faculty know that the outside letters, the faculty committee’s report and copies of all research, teaching and service materials, including the candidate’s three statements, are available for the faculty to review.

**October-Early November**

1. By mid-October the department will meet to discuss and vote on the candidate’s promotion case.

2. Within one week of the meeting minutes will be available for review by the faculty for accuracy. Any faculty corrections are incorporated into the final version of the minutes.

3. The Chair will write a letter discussing the case, reviewing the department’s meeting and vote and presenting her/his own evaluation of the case.

4. Following University guidelines, portions of the file are available for the candidate’s review.
5. In early November, the entire case file is forwarded to the College of Arts and Science’s Tenure and Promotion Committee.

6. These dates are subject to change in accordance with changes in College and University guidelines.

II. Sources of material in the file

From the candidate

1. Copies of all publications and work in progress. (For materials to be sent to outside reviewers, the candidate provides multiple copies.)

2. Copies of all syllabi and other selected teaching materials.

3. Three statements, one each that summarizes the candidate’s research, teaching and service accomplishments and goals for the future.

4. Names of persons who can be asked for letters on service, former students who may be asked to write letters, and names of persons who should not be asked to serve as outside reviewers.

From others

1. The department provides the candidate’s student evaluations and grade distributions for all courses she/he has taught with comparative information for the department and an explanation of leaves and/or tenure clock stoppages.

2. The department’s three member evaluation committee provides: a report evaluating the candidate’s research, teaching and service to the department and a report on faculty observation of the candidate’s classroom performance.

3. The department Chair provides: a letter discussing the case, reviewing the department’s meeting and vote, and presenting her/his own evaluation of the case

4. Undergraduate and graduate students provide letters evaluating the candidate’s teaching and advising. (Letter writers will be informed that these letters are not confidential. No letters from current students will be solicited.)

5. Colleagues on campus, in the profession and in the community provide letters evaluating the candidate’s service. (These letters are treated as confidential unless writers indicate otherwise.)

6. Outside reviewers provide: letters evaluating the candidate’s research. (These letters are treated as confidential unless writers indicate otherwise.)

Voting Process

1. Voting will take place in accordance with University guidelines.
2. Procedures for candidates appointed across departments or appointed in part to an interdisciplinary program will follow the guidelines outlined in the agreement drafted and signed during the candidate’s first semester on campus.

CRITERIA

I. Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor

General Criteria: The candidate must show excellence in research and teaching, together with evidence of substantive contributions in service.

Research

For promotion to Associate Professor we expect the candidate to have made a distinct and substantial contribution to the discipline in at least one of the following ways:

- a book published by a reputable press,
- a book manuscript accepted for publication by a reputable press,
- an equivalent body of articles in journals,
- articles in edited collections,
- production of original historical research in other media (such as public exhibitions, hypermedia productions, film documentaries, aural documentaries)

The candidate’s scholarly work, regardless of genre, must be subject to peer review. Evidence of work on a well-defined future project is expected. Publication varies in history because the discipline encompasses so many geographical, topical, and methodological fields; thus a strict quantitative standard is impossible to define and apply.

Teaching

Candidates are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. We expect that all faculty members will teach well-organized courses that expose students to the current state of historical knowledge at levels appropriate for those students. We also expect faculty to offer graded assignments that challenge students at appropriate levels. We recognize that the large numbers of undergraduate history majors and of non-majors who take history classes will influence the pedagogy and the kind of work faculty can offer in many courses.

We also expect faculty members to play some role in advising masters and doctoral students and serving on comprehensive examination committees.

Teaching evaluations of candidates will be based on course materials, grade distributions, course ratings and qualitative evaluations, and faculty classroom observation, and may also be based on student letters. We interpret those ratings in conjunction with our evaluation of course materials and also recognize that candidates may contribute by developing new courses for the department or beyond the department.
Service

Because we expect assistant professors to devote most of their time and effort to developing their research agendas and to teaching, our requirements for service in those years are not as great as for senior faculty. We do, however, expect candidates to be “good departmental citizens” by carrying out tasks and committee service assigned to them by the Chair.

We expect candidates to play a more limited role within the University at Albany beyond the departmental level and recognize that faculty at this level generally do not play leadership roles in service to the discipline. We do expect faculty to play some role at that level, however, for example by reviewing for academic journals or book publishers, by organizing panels at meetings, or by serving on committees or holding secondary offices in the discipline’s national, regional, or specialty organizations. We also recognize contributions to the community related to the candidate’s area of professional expertise.

II. Tenure and promotion to Full Professor

General Criteria: the candidate must show excellence in research and teaching, and sustained contributions to service (as defined below). The candidate must show evidence of continued major contributions since promotion to associate professor.

Research

For promotion to Full Professor we expect the candidate to have established an international or national reputation in the discipline based on a body of scholarship that is recognized as making a significant contribution to the field. We expect the candidate to have made a distinct and substantial contribution to the discipline in at least one of the following ways:

- a second book published by a reputable press,
- a second book manuscript accepted for publication by a reputable press,
- an equivalent body of articles in journals,
- articles in edited collections,
- production of original historical research in other media (such as public exhibitions, hypermedia productions, film documentaries, aural documentaries)

The candidate’s scholarly work, regardless of genre, should be subjected to peer review.

Publication varies in history because the discipline encompasses so many geographical, topical, and methodological fields; thus a strict quantitative standard is impossible to define and apply.

Teaching

Candidates are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. We expect that all faculty members will teach well-organized courses that expose students to the current state of historical knowledge at levels appropriate for those students. We also expect faculty to offer graded assignments that challenge students at
appropriate levels. We recognize that the large numbers of undergraduate history majors and of non-majors who take history classes will influence the pedagogy and the kind of work faculty can offer in many courses.

We also expect faculty members to play a significant role in advising masters and doctoral students, including chairing committees, and serving on comprehensive examination committees.

Teaching evaluations of candidates will be based on course materials, grade distributions, course ratings and qualitative evaluations, and faculty classroom observation, and may also be based on student letters. We interpret those ratings in conjunction with our evaluation of course materials and also recognize that candidates may contribute by developing new courses for the department or beyond the department.

Service

We expect that, normally, candidates will have served in one of the major posts in the department, either as director of graduate studies or director of undergraduate studies, or provided other significant service; that candidates will have been regular contributors to the department through continuing service on one or more of the department’s committees; that candidates will have played leadership roles in service beyond the department, including both serving on and chairing college and/or university committees or councils. We also expect faculty members to play a significant and ongoing role in service to the discipline in such activities as reviewing for academic journals or book publishers, organizing panels at meetings, or holding offices in the discipline’s national, regional or specialty organizations. We expect faculty at this level to be showing evidence of sustained leadership in professional activities. We recognize contributions of service to the community related to the candidate’s area of professional expertise.
Example 2.

General Internal Expectations for Promotion and Tenure
Department of Health Policy, Management, and Behavior, School of Public Health

This document was approved by all tenured faculty with primary appointments in the Department of Health Policy, Management, and Behavior on March 21, 2010.

In order to be successful in being recommended for continuing appointment and promotion to associate professor, the Department of Health Policy, Management, and Behavior expects the following with respect to research, teaching, and service.

Research

Excellence in research is indicated by (1) independence as a scholar, (2) quality of research, (3) research productivity as measured by quantity of peer-reviewed publications, and (4) an appropriate trajectory of external funding and external funding attempts. These indicators are further described as follows.

The overarching expectation is that there will be convincing evidence of independence as a scholar. This independence is indicated by:

- Scholarly work that is innovative and thematically independent from the work led by one's mentor or other collaborators;
- A preponderance of first-author papers, especially as one moves closer to the tenure review period;
- Sole-authored publications (although it may be the norm in some fields that co-authorship of papers is a more regular occurrence);
- Publications without a graduate school mentor as a co-author;
- Programmatic scholarly work that is centered around a small (1-3) number of thematic areas;
- At least some meaningful external funding that in which the candidate functions as the Principal Investigator or strong evidence of attempts to obtain funding as PI

In terms of quality of research, we expect that candidates, by the time they come up for tenure, will be conducting work that is generally recognized as being significant and innovative by their peers. External reviewers are heavily relied upon to evaluate this aspect of excellence in research. But quality is also indicated by the majority of publications in tier one or tier two journals in the candidate's discipline or field of study, as well as by evidence that the candidate is beginning to make a name for him/herself, which may include invited presentations, participation on grant review panels, membership on journal editorial boards, etc. It is not expected that candidates will have a national reputation at this stage, but it is expected that candidates will be beginning to be recognized within their specific field for their work.

In terms of quantity, we generally expect a fairly consistent pattern of 2-3 publications per year, with at least 12-15 total publications by the time one submits the tenure package. The
candidate should be first or senior author on a high proportion of these. The total number of publications would be expected to be higher if a candidate had a significant number of publications prior to their UAlbany employment. In addition, the total number of expected publications is slightly dependent upon both the candidate’s efforts in pursuing external funding, and the type of research the candidate conducts. For example, the lower range noted above might be appropriate if the candidate has had relatively more success gaining external funding, or conducts research which necessitates either the pursuit of external funding or time-intensive primary data collection.

With respect to external funding, we expect successful candidates for promotion and tenure to demonstrate a trajectory of funding success and funding attempts that provides convincing evidence of future success in attracting meaningful, consistent external funding. This trajectory should demonstrate the receipt of small seed funding (e.g. internal UAlbany pilot grants), as well as publications and larger grant proposals stemming from this seed funding. Ideally, candidates will have been successful in receiving Federal, foundation, or corporate funding as a PI, but because of the growing competitiveness of funding, and the economic reality of some funding institutions, this is not a strict condition for tenure and promotion. At the very least, however, there should be evidence of appropriate effort at seeking substantial external funding (competitive and peer-reviewed), and evidence of positive reviews of such attempts.

Teaching

We expect teaching to be excellent. This translates to SIRF scores near or above our department averages (which are generally around 4 out of a possible 5). In the case of lower SIRF scores, there should be evidence of explicit efforts aimed at improving courses and teaching quality (e.g. consultations with ITLAL, professional development activities related to teaching, significant course revisions to address deficiencies) and subsequent improvements in SIRF scores.

Teaching excellence also means a commitment to quality improvements in teaching. For example, we expect that course content will be revised to remain current in their content, new courses will be developed as appropriate, and qualitative course evaluations will be utilized for course revisions.

Service

We expect junior faculty members to be meaningfully engaged in service to the institution. This means meaningful contributions to the work of committees they serve on, and not mere presence on the committee. We expect that in the early years, service will be mostly at the local department and school) level, and that there should be at least some level of university service by the time of the tenure review.

Professional service should also reflect meaningful engagement with their field.
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COACHE tenure-track faculty satisfaction benchmarks related to tenure and promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Specific Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Practices</td>
<td>tenure process; tenure criteria; tenure standards; tenure body of evidence; sense of achieving tenure; consistent messages about tenure from tenured colleagues; tenure decisions based on performance; periodic, formal performance reviews; written summary of performance reviews; upper limit on committee assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Institutional Expectations for Tenure</td>
<td>as a scholar; as a teacher; as an advisor; as a colleague in department; as a campus citizen; as a member of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Home</td>
<td>paid/unpaid personal leave; child care; stop-the-clock; spousal/partner hiring program; elder care; modified duties for parental or other family reasons; part-time tenure-track position; institution makes having children and tenure-track compatible; institution makes raising children and tenure-track compatible; colleagues make having children and tenure-track compatible; colleagues make raising children and tenure-track compatible; colleagues are respectful of efforts to balance work/home; ability to balance between professional and personal time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate, Culture, and Collegiality</td>
<td>formal mentoring; informal mentoring; peer reviews of teaching or research; fairness of immediate supervisor's evaluations; interest tenured faculty take in your professional development; opportunities to collaborate with tenured faculty; value faculty in your department place on your work; amount of professional interaction with tenured colleagues; amount of personal interaction with tenured colleagues; amount of professional interaction with pre-tenure colleagues; amount of personal interaction with pre-tenure colleagues; how well you fit; intellectual vitality of tenured colleagues; intellectual vitality of pre-tenure colleagues; participation in governance of institution; participation in governance of department; on the whole, institution is collegial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6

University of Wyoming Document Discussing Promotion to Full Professor

(See next page)
The task of the university is the creation of the future, so far as rational thought, and civilized modes of appreciation, can affect the issue. Alfred Lord Whitehead
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PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR: PHILOSOPHY, STANDARDS, STRATEGIES, AND BEST PRACTICES FOR CANDIDATES

Strong full professors are essential to the effective functioning, the quality, the reputation, and the wider relevance of the complex system that is a university. Healthy departments, colleges, and universities depend on a robust mix of collegial faculty. We value assistant professors, who bring freshness and the potential to develop and recreate the institution over a long career; associate professors, who are seasoned scholar teachers with an expanding university vision, and who thus provide a reliable core; and full professors, who manifest excellence in the attributes that define a university faculty, as well as ongoing strength in all areas of responsibility. In this mix, full professors serve as disciplinary and institutional leaders. The University of Wyoming aims to cultivate such a community by hiring faculty with the promise to be the best, encouraging them toward tenure, supporting them through the associate rank, challenging them toward full professorship, and drawing on their mature professorial expertise to shape the university.

UW's practice is to hire faculty members whose professional records indicate the promise to become full professors. The university shows its commitment to this principle by maintaining no quotas for tenure or for promotion from associate to full professor and by insisting upon no specific schedule for the latter promotion: the readiness is all.

This document aims to guide faculty in mapping out their long-term careers at the University of Wyoming. It focuses on the philosophy that underpins full professorship; the nature of the professorial role; and the strategies and practices that best support tenured faculty as they aim for promotion to full professor. Because a variety of circumstances can change the trajectory toward promotion, the document also addresses strategies for getting back on track toward promotion after an interruption, and strategies for maintaining a robust and meaningful faculty career as an associate professor.

The process that produced this document included extensive consultation with faculty at all stages in their careers; consideration of department, college, and university philosophies, policies, and practices; comparison with other universities; and review of the Harvard COACHE survey concerning junior faculty at this and other institutions. Specific criteria on scholarship, its development, dissemination, and application, as well as the nature, level, and distribution of teaching, are the province of academic units. Such matters can be difficult to quantify given the expansive and creative quality of the maturing faculty career—strong candidates for promotion to professor are often those who are changing a field and its expectations and pedagogies. However, academic units should develop and be able to communicate to candidates a clear understanding of their disciplinary philosophy and criteria for promotion. Those philosophies and criteria should reflect the university’s commitment to uniformly high standards for promotion. Units’ different responsibilities may change the flavor, but not the nature or the quality, of what constitutes the strength and excellence of a full professor.

What is a Research University? The research university is first and foremost an integrated system revolving around the generation, critical evaluation, and communication of knowledge. Dissemination of knowledge is, of course, at the core of any university’s mission. At a research university, the mandate to disseminate knowledge is tightly bound to exploration and discovery. Integration is key: faculty discover, develop, and create knowledge, perspectives, or art that they disseminate to disciplinary peers.

---

*COACHE stands for Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education. For UW survey results, see [http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/coache/default.asp](http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/coache/default.asp), retrieved 2 October 2010.
The advancing university depends on rigorous peer review by colleagues with national and international standing.

Full professors model the integrated, peer-reviewed intellectual life for the discipline, and for the institution and the society it serves.

Full professors create opportunity for the university community.

A full professor is collegial, capable of difficult but wise decisions.

Discovery, dissemination, integration, and peer review propel the university forward: what we researched yesterday we teach today, and build upon tomorrow, at the highest levels of refinement we can achieve. Every level of faculty work in some way includes the development and also the dissemination and application of new knowledge. Whether we work as artists, challenging undergraduates with the new and presenting our work to the public; as research scholars, pushing the boundaries of what is known and cultivating graduate students as partners and future leaders in spin-off fields; as extension scientists, developing knowledge from local data for Wyoming citizens and communities to apply but with national or international ramifications—the list can go on and on through every discipline, college, and constituency of the university—we share this crucial set of responsibilities. No matter the level of our students or where they are located, we work to advance knowledge and communicate that knowledge in ways that change our discipline and the wider world.

What is a Full Professor? Full professors manifest this integrated, peer-reviewed intellectual life par excellence. They model it for the discipline, the institution, and the society it serves. And they work with their colleagues so that they too can become disciplinary, educational, and institutional leaders, making the university ever new—and therefore, in the truest sense of the term, a university.

Full professors make an impact through their research, teaching, and service, and in other less quantifiable ways. In research, full professors have the opportunity to be flexible and exploratory, thus their work at its best pursues the big questions, and develops game-changing ideas. As teachers, full professors should be already thoroughly seasoned. Their experience and versatility give them a base from which to innovate—to explore different methods and modes for the most effective teaching across the spectrum of their curriculum, and to seek out and model the teaching for new audiences within and beyond the university. Effective service at the full professor level takes a wide range of forms: thoroughly grounded in their discipline, with extensive institutional knowledge, and the wisdom and flexibility of experience, full professors should have the capacity and willingness to serve, at least from time to time, as contributors to college- and university-level governance, as leaders in their discipline's professional societies, as department heads, and possibly as higher-level academic administrators. Faculty governance is a central tenet of the academy, and the capacity and willingness of full professors to fulfill such roles is essential to this principle's viability. Full professors may also be public intellectuals for the state or a wider audience, serving as ambassadors for their discipline, for higher education, and for all of us who together make up the University of Wyoming. With all their experience, and the increased funding and research possibilities that can come with an energetic full professorship, they create opportunity for the university community, from the freshest undergraduate, to the long-term colleague. To balance and fulfill their various roles, the full professor must be capable of inventive and effective leadership, but also of difficult and wise choices, with the human skills needed to implement their ideas collegially and effectively.

It is possible that a full professor will emphasize one aspect of a faculty career post-promotion—as an outstanding researcher, an administrator, or a mentor teacher. But professors do so not by isolating themselves from any of these dimensions of faculty experience nor, we hope, in a static way but springing...
from the full range of faculty abilities demonstrated and acknowledged at the time of their promotion. Full professors, that is to say, enact the big picture, understand it, and fulfill leadership roles within it. They are a unique engine for the university as a whole.

It is important to note that the university invests in its professors, and it gets a lot back from them. Full professors make opportunity for everyone. Still, maintaining their role demands UW's continued investment of time and resources. Senior faculty members earn our further commitment because full professorial status is not easy to achieve. Moreover, full professors now hold a hard and challenging job—not one, ultimately, suited to every faculty member. Once achieved, however, it is fulfilling, stimulating, and full of possibility for themselves and for the University of Wyoming.

The Trajectory Toward Full Professorship. Faculty paths toward promotion are necessarily unique. We are employed and tenured at a university because of our work's quality and promise, but also because of its originality. So there is no precisely replicable pathway toward full professorship. Furthermore, since readiness is the key factor in this promotion, there is no schedule that can work or should be applied for everyone. Nonetheless there are principles to bear in mind and strategies that can be deployed to help you map out your own track, move along it, and meet your goals.

This document necessarily addresses each element of faculty responsibility in isolation. Yet it cannot be emphasized enough that research, teaching, and service truly constitute a triad of interconnected responsibilities—and opportunities. Though they may take different forms according to our various disciplines, they must all be operative, visible, and successful to make a strong case for promotion to full professor. In the strongest cases, they are well integrated, working together. It is further important to realize that unlike candidacy for associate professor, candidacy for full professor is often a matter of negotiation about timing and readiness. Because there is no clock, when they feel ready to go forward, candidates discuss with colleagues and department heads whether each aspect of their packet is adequately robust to suggest likely success. Associate professors may choose not to initiate formal candidacy until their packet is strong in all its aspects. Similarly, a candidate may withdraw before the end of the promotion process. And even if promotion is denied, that simply means it is deferred until the candidate is thoroughly ready. For those of us pondering promotion, this part of the process can seem confusing—especially since it is often invisible unless you are the candidate or directly involved in the case. Discussions with Academic Affairs, deans, and department heads across the university confirm, however, what we might infer from the university regulations on promotion: nearly every year some candidacies are deferred. They are deferred for reasons that run the gamut, including the need to develop a genuinely national and international research profile; the need to demonstrate strength, not just adequacy, in teaching; the need to learn, participate in, and contribute to department and university culture (service and collegiality both apply here). That is, at the point of candidacy for full professorship, both the candidate and the university aim to live up to our vision of what the university is at its best.

Your Scholarly Career. Scholarship leads this triad because it is the piece on which the others are built, NOT because it is the only factor, or even the trump card, in a university career. From the newest undergraduate to the Nobel laureate, all of us at the University of Wyoming are part of an intellectual community devoted to developing knowledge as a generator for future achievement. The successful research career keeps to the fore its knowledge, methods, and discoveries, and also its

Full professors enact the big picture, understand it, and fulfill leadership roles within it.

Readiness is key. There is no schedule for promotion that fits all.

Research, teaching, and service constitute a triad of responsibilities—and opportunities.

Teaching, research, and service all must be operative, visible, and successful.

Candidate and university both aim for what the university is at its best.

Scholarship is the piece on which everything else is built.

Professioral-level scholarship is appreciated nationally and internationally for its difference, importance, and impact.
relevance, why it matters, and to whom.

Scholarly research is vastly different between one academic unit and another across the university. But work with professorial promise shares some features: it is thoroughly grounded in its discipline or disciplines; it is innovative; it has leadership potential in the field; it is well known and appreciated in the field both nationally and internationally for its difference, importance, and impact. There are some straightforward ways to develop these features in your work.

— Use the discipline, not your department, as your standard. That way, you are always moving forward and helping your department to advance also. Keeping your eye on what your department could be has a further advantage: you won’t be left behind should your department advance itself.

— Be innovative. Research and scholarship simply to meet the requirements of promotion, adding up publications as volume rather than quality, is not likely to make a successful promotion case (just as it was unlikely to be helpful at tenure time). Associate professors have secure employment and the opportunity that comes with it. That is to say, everything ramps up after tenure. So go for the big ideas that can make a real difference to the field, and fulfill your promise. Innovation will, along the way, make your national and international reputation—and vigorously engaging in the national or international scholarly debate itself helps to boost intellectual contributions to this level.

— Be versatile. Know your research area and its possibilities well enough to be able to shift emphasis and continue to move forward should the unexpected happen, either negative (a lab burn down; a research topic prove minor; or the field change direction) or positive (a collaboration arise; a grant come through; a government initiative materialize). This is also a virtue in itself, for having more than one perspective can generate innovation. Often the most fertile grounds for intellectual breadth lie at the boundaries between traditional academic departments. Even for assistant professors, the benefits of cultivating some interdisciplinary tastes often far outweigh the risks. For associate professors, the risks are few, and the opportunities at UW are plentiful.

— It may be that as your career progresses your interest turns toward the scholarship of teaching. This is an important contribution to the intellectual community. Such work can shade over into research when it moves beyond the textbook, and performs an intervention in the idea of pedagogy for a field. It is important to note that there is a huge difference between reflecting upon one’s own teaching, which we all must do, and thinking deeply, in a way that impacts one’s peers, about the structural connections between one’s discipline and how students learn it. Only the latter can effectively support the research aspect of your candidacy for promotion.

— If your field is collaborative, strive to make a substantial contribution to endeavors that bear your name. Where research outcomes depend on the accumulated work of many colleagues, what matters is the quality of your part, its innovation, and its crucial contribution to the shared project.

— If your field typically is funded by grants, be sure that you compete well. However remember that getting the grant is only one step, even though, through the peer review process, it demonstrates your project’s relevance and likely quality, and suggests your stature. What really matters about a grant is the work accomplished with it.

— Expand your intellectual community: specifically, seek out the appropriate disciplinary or interdisciplinary community for your innovative work. These are the people, inside and outside the institution, who should not just appreciate your research, but be keen to help you develop it. They will also then know you and be able to speak to your impact at promotion time. For full professorship, if you are truly a scholar of national and international stature, your readers will not be seeing your work for the first time.

— Connect to your UW colleagues through presentations, collaborations, etc. Your research really matters within your UW community. It can stimulate us all to think differently; it can integrate with your colleagues’ work to develop the intellectual community as a whole. And as a simple fact, your colleagues have to know about your work to help you develop it toward promotion, and to
A research career shows a constellation of achievements.

No UW faculty member can get promoted to full professor on the basis of scholarship or creative activities alone. The short answer is “No.”

Promotion to UW’s highest academic rank requires evidence of strong performance in all aspects of one’s job description. A world-renowned faculty researcher who cannot be troubled to serve as a role model for effective, versatile teaching belongs either in a different type of position or in a different type of institution. UW is large enough to accommodate a wide spectrum of job descriptions and a mix of relative professional strengths, but it is too small to harbor among the ranks of full professors scholars who exhibit a low level of commitment to teaching our students.

Your Teaching Career. At the university, our most direct professional responsibility is to share knowledge with our students, whatever their level, and whether they be on or off campus, taught in traditional classrooms, via distance technologies, during study abroad, in clinical settings, or in extension consultations around the state. In order to become tenured, we have all demonstrated sustained quality as teachers in the modes appropriate to our discipline. Strong teaching continues to be a requirement for all faculty, in whichever discipline, as we progress through our careers. And this is another area where, having got into gear, we now ratchet it up. Perhaps the best way for imagining professorial-level teaching is to see it as cultivating independent study and research ability in others. Our impact as successful teachers depends on how we enable others to make a further impact later.

Faculty teaching often is not adequately represented or celebrated at promotion time. Too often, it is assessed pro forma, and only through student evaluations or the occasional class visit, even though it plays a substantial part in promotion decisions. Inadequate and even mediocre teaching is a distinct counter-indication for promotion, and candidacies can be deferred for some considerable time if teaching is not at least committed, strong, and effective over a substantial range of courses. There have been cases at UW in which strong scholars postponed their own promotion cases in response to critical peer evaluations of their teaching.

It is crucial to share our knowledge with students, whoever they might be, and wherever they are.

Faculty teaching often is not adequately represented or celebrated at promotion time. Too often, it is assessed pro forma, and only through student evaluations or the occasional class visit, even though it plays a substantial part in promotion decisions. Inadequate and even mediocre teaching is a distinct counter-indication for promotion, and candidacies can be deferred for some considerable time if teaching is not at least committed, strong, and effective over a substantial range of courses. There have been cases at UW in which strong scholars postponed their own promotion cases in response to critical peer evaluations of their teaching.

It is to a candidate’s advantage to develop and to showcase teaching, for although teaching is but one aspect of a promotion packet, and innovative classroom materials typically derive from research, teaching is
where what we do becomes meaningful to the next generation. There are logical steps to develop strong teaching, and have it appropriately valued at the time of promotion.

— Teach creatively, in a wide range of courses. Such teaching indicates that you possess intellectual versatility and that your research is indeed an engine for innovative classes. It shows that you think your work is worth communicating with and relevant to the students who will make the next generation of scholars; that you are keen to share it, and excite others about your discipline; that you take all students seriously. It clearly demonstrates your contribution to the education project of the university.

— Teach at the highest level offered in your department. In departments that offer or participate in graduate programs, strong contributions to graduate education are a characteristic feature of successful cases for promotion to the rank of professor. Teaching at this level demonstrates the most direct nexus between your scholarly work and your teaching, and it establishes your role as a generator not just for knowledge, but also for other people's work. If your department or program lacks a Ph.D., or even a master's program, you should still strive to demonstrate commitment to and experience in working with advanced students. At UW, and elsewhere through your national research reputation and connections, strive to serve as an outside member on doctoral committees. Accept opportunities to lecture and give short seminars elsewhere.

— Teach at all of the various levels addressed by your department. For instance, teaching at the introductory level is both essential to student success later, and to recruitment to your discipline. The most seasoned faculty can make a substantial contribution to our academic community here, and such a contribution indicates your commitment, your reliability as a department member, and your versatility.

— Teach in a wide range of venues. At UW we teach for credit and in less formal settings, in lecture and seminar format, in labs and studios, by distance modalities through the Outreach School including video conferencing and online, in public settings, in the London Semester, and so on. Not every venue suits every discipline. But teaching in the range of venues appropriate to your discipline, and experimenting in new venues, speaks to the liveliness of your teaching, and your commitment to the variety of UW students.

— Serve as a mentor to students. Your undergraduate and graduate students today have the potential to accomplish all sorts of things, not least to become university faculty in the future—and even better than those of us who teach them, because that is the nature of the ever-advancing university. Our role is therefore not so much to fill students up with all we know, or to lament that they don't know things quite as we know them, but to open doors through which they may advance to new and different possibilities. Cultivate your students as stewards of the discipline, its potential, and its ethics in and beyond the university. Support them to perform in student, honors, and disciplinary conferences, putting them on track not just for a degree, but for future opportunity, and perhaps for a career.

— Serve as a mentor to faculty. By now, you are an experienced faculty member. One of the things you have an ability to teach is how to teach successfully given difficult subjects, occasionally hostile students, etc. Teach the teachers in your department or through the Ellbogen Center, and build your profile as a teaching asset for the department and the university.

— Be a curricular leader. Courses and curricula are not written in stone; in fact, they change as a result of disciplinary advancements, some shaped by our own research. They also change as we study and assess their outcomes. The university especially values those who take a leadership role in formulating what makes up a university or disciplinary education. This can be a rough road—curricular change is always difficult. But you can inform yourself and thus your department by participating in your discipline's conversations about pedagogy, and the institution's conversations about outcomes and assessment. You can serve on relevant Faculty Senate committees such as Academic Planning, University Studies, the Library Council, or the Graduate
Your teaching accomplishments must be visible. Some colleges have established practices to this end. The following make for an informative packet:

Develop a Teaching Portfolio. This should give evidence of your UW teaching, your aims for that teaching, and its standard UW assessment.

All promotion packets include:

— UW Student Evaluations. A strong packet evaluates every course, and includes courses taught as overload or off campus.

— Your syllabi. Effective syllabi foreground a course’s aims, methods, and outcomes, and bear in mind students’ varied needs and purposes, as well as their modes of learning.

— Peer evaluations of your teaching.

Some colleges add personal statements to explain the interests, commitments, and strategies that produce your successful teaching.

— You might explain a given course’s successes, problems, and potentials. UW rewards reflective and self-aware teachers. Not every classroom venture is a success, but as capable faculty, we learn from the difficulties posed by new constituencies, unpredictable technology, inadequate student preparation, new materials, etc., and craft a more successful course the next time. If there has been a problem, how you recognize and address it may be the most important aspect of that class.

— Explain your teaching philosophy. Teaching is a major part of your academic life, and both you and your colleagues can benefit from thinking about your philosophy and best practices. What are you trying to do when you teach, why, and for whom? What motivates you? What constitutes success for you in a student’s learning?

There is much more to a teaching career than is represented in even this, expanded portfolio. For an associate professor, teaching is likely to be varied, and not confined to the classroom. It is to your advantage to show how you teach in non-traditional modes, and to present your work from additional relevant perspectives. The following steps can yield important supporting information.

— Assemble data about your students’ subsequent achievements.

— Invite additional faculty to observe your teaching, and evaluate it.

— Seek out collaborative teaching opportunities, and have your team teacher speak to your work with a class and in collaboration over a semester.

— Invite Ellbogen staff to observe your teaching, and evaluate it.

— Ask colleagues you have mentored to evaluate your helpfulness.

— If you have served in any non-traditional way as a teacher (running an honors program; giving talks round the state), make sure it is recorded and evaluated.

— If you have worked on outcomes and assessment for a given class—and by the time you are seeking promotion to the rank of professor you should have—document it here.

— With your department’s cooperation, offer parts of this teaching packet for outside peer
No UW faculty member can get promoted to the rank of full professor for classroom teaching alone.

Can one get promoted to the rank of full professor on the basis of classroom teaching alone? Again, the short answer is “No.”

Promotion also requires demonstrated capacity for scholarly work, and service to the institution or discipline. In most disciplines, continued recognition as a research scholar is a necessary condition for the support of UW faculty colleagues and external referees alike.

For some faculty members the contributions to teaching may be extraordinary enough to undergird a solid promotion case, even in the face of slender recent contributions to the refereed journal literature, few competitive grants, or other traditional hallmarks of scholarly excellence.

Among the types of accomplishment that may signal teaching at this level is the development of a nationally or internationally used textbook. In the best cases, such textbooks constitute scholarly work in their own right, weaving concepts from the frontiers into what eventually becomes settled curriculum. Pioneering methods of instruction, or the reinvention of curricula, that have had significant and documentable impact on other institutions’ pedagogies and practices, are also relevant.

Still, a number of caveats highlight the risky nature of this as a primary strategy for pursuing a promotion:

- No number of textbooks and no amount of pedagogical innovation can substitute for mediocre teaching at UW.
- Textbooks offered as part of the research packet will not meet the standard if they are not driven by scholarship or by pedagogical research and if there is limited evidence of their impact.
- Only rarely do university reviewers outside one’s department consider standards that are different from those that prevail among one’s departmental peers.
- The standards for genuine excellence in teaching— not just competency—are the same as for research and creative activity: impact that is national or international in scope. The experience of most faculty members and trends in letters from external referees suggest that recognition at this level is much rarer and more difficult to attain in the teaching arena than it is in research.

Your Contribution in Service. The nature of service can vary considerably across the university and from person to person within a department. Yet there is no university-level career without some degree of service. Indeed, it is service that facilitates successful research and teaching in an intellectual community—for ourselves and for our colleagues. So the triad of responsibilities continues to apply here. Those who aspire to be full professors should be able to demonstrate that they share in shouldering the responsibilities of their department, college, university, or discipline. At the same time, just as with teaching and research, the issue is not quantity but quality, effectiveness, and impact.

Ideally, we have all developed good, collegial service habits pre-tenure, and are already strong disciplinary and university citizens who help to advance our academic units, the university, and the discipline beyond the university. If your department has “protected” you from service thus far, they were not doing you a favor. As a strong researcher and teacher, you should be helping to lead the university; and you should care enough about our joint educational project so to do, at the level appropriate for someone of your capabilities. Here, a major encouragement might be that if you don’t, someone else will. Moreover, when you are promoted to full professor, those tasks await. So it’s time to show willingness, capacity, and leadership. What, then, constitutes “service,” for a potential full professor?
— Service to the discipline. As an associate professor, you are probably a faithful and well-known figure in your national body. Are there administrative responsibilities you can shoulder, such as secretary, chairperson, conference organizer, editor? These leading roles are often a pleasure, if we care about our discipline and its advancement.

— Service to the university. Seasoned associate professors are essential to the leadership of university committees, especially at the University of Wyoming where faculty governance is a long, established, and often robust tradition. Indeed, because the university changes by its very nature, we often ask colleagues to draw on the inspiration that drives their research and the facility at communication that makes them successful teachers to map out new ventures. If you are called, serve; if you are not called, volunteer. And do work that is memorable because it is well-informed, up-to-date, efficient, effective, and good.

— Service to the State. We have a unique connection with the state as its only four-year institution. The state supports us with its largest budgetary appropriation. It does not govern what we do, but it seeks to understand and to benefit from what we do. We can serve the State-University partnership through work with community colleges, schools, the Wyoming Councils for the Humanities and the Arts, Extension, distance education, Wyoming Public Radio, state boards and agencies. We might serve as legislative assistants, or through pro-bono legal work, and so on. All these ventures are highly valued by the university, and speak to a candidate’s understanding not just of the University of Wyoming and the State, but of the larger relevance of our work, and of the project of Education, at its best.

— Administration. There are many substantial administrative roles that allow us to show our respect for, investment in, and vision for the educational project that is a university. These can range widely, supporting and leading our students, colleagues, and the institution in a myriad of ways. In committing to such leadership responsibilities, consider where your particular talents are most likely to make a productive difference, and how they can be usefully and efficiently deployed within your available time and your promotion schedule.

**Develop a Service Portfolio.** Service can provide an index for leadership potential—though it must be evaluated alongside teaching and research. It is in your interests to make sure that your service is strong, documented, and recognized. So when you are preparing your packet for promotion, ask those who have witnessed your strong service to speak to it in supporting letters. If there are documentable outcomes for your work, make sure they appear in your promotion packet.

Is it possible to get promoted to the rank of professor on the basis of service alone? Once again, the short answer is “No.”

Few are tempted to ask this question, except in cases where the service at issue consists of major administrative duties. The shortest, most reductionist statement of UW’s policy here is that the university does not promote faculty members for administrative accomplishments per se.

That said, it is necessary to point out a nuance: whatever their direct contributions to teaching and research may be, good academic administrators make significant and much appreciated indirect contributions to these arenas. They set priorities, craft persuasive visions, allocate resources, and establish reward structures that advance the curriculum, promote focused and high-level research and creative activity, and facilitate the hiring and retention of a highly capable faculty. These activities clearly are important to the teaching and research missions. If they were not, faculty members would not prefer so strongly that their department heads, deans, associate provosts, provost, and president come from the accomplished tiers of the professoriate. Thus, while “making the trains run on time” cannot suffice in and of itself for a promotion in...
Faculty with extension appointments emphasize particular aspects of their faculty career for the federal-state partnership.

In extension, every job is unique. No sound argument justifies leaving completely off-ledger the indirect but often institution-defining contributions that academic administrators make to teaching and research. They are part of the integrated career.

**Your Career in Extension.** Extension merits a separate section because it brings together our numerous and shared commitments to the university and state communities in a unique way. This section advises colleagues with an extension responsibility, but should inform us all as we evaluate one another for full professorship.

Faculty with extension appointments are required to emphasize particular aspects of their faculty career, and to do so for the federal-state partnership of Cooperative Extension mandated by the federal legislation that established the Land Grant Universities. Specific practices build a strong extension career.

---

- Extension contributions must be relevant to the needs of the state and region. To be successful, develop and cultivate a clientele; seek their feedback.
- Faculty with research-extension appointments should always seek to integrate their research and extension programs. Use issues and needs identified through extension interactions to drive your research agenda; use your research, integrated with others’, to inform and bring originality to your extension program.
- Extension programs must be science based. It's the access the university offers through extension to objective state-of-the-art science that gives UW a unique and key role in the state as one of many providers of information and technical assistance.
- Be innovative. Innovation makes your work important in itself.
- Be flexible. Flexibility allows you to stay abreast of changing needs and evolving science—and to innovate.
- Seek out peer reviewed opportunities for presentation and publication of your innovative research. Successful innovative work, in circulation, brings recognition to your unique contributions and to your program.
- Develop exemplary programs and present your information and findings in regional and national fora. Your work will serve as a model for extension research and service in other states or regions. This will also garner recognition for your accomplishments.
- Collaborate with colleagues at UW and at other universities. Extension programs are almost always more relevant and effective when they integrate the knowledge of researchers with diverse experiences in different disciplines. Effective collaboration across state lines or at the national level demonstrates a high level of performance and impact.
- Seek national awards for your extension activities and programs. (The national agricultural science associations all have extension awards.)
- Seek federal grants for collaborative extension projects that address multi-state or regional problems.
- Demonstrate leadership. Your leadership role should increase as you move through the ranks. Leadership can be demonstrated by requests for your services by clientele, collaborators, other states’ extension services, etc.; by your mentorship of peers and students (such as serving on graduate student committees); by your role as a collaborator and principal investigator on grant applications; by your service contributions at the college and the university levels; and by your professional service with your discipline or within the national extension community.

---

In extension, every job is unique. Make sure your work is fully understood within your

---

In extension, every job is unique.
Hold as examples the best full professors you have encountered.

Caveats and Encouragements. On the one hand, teaching, research, and service are the aspects of an integrated career within the professoriate. In all likelihood, as a faculty member you have the energies and commitments that make the evolution of your research, teaching, and service to the leadership level a seamless and (relatively) angst-free process. On the other hand, the ways and means separated out above may make the task seem extensive. So now we offer some basic advice on managing to stay on track, with as little difficulty and as much enjoyment as possible.

— Think about the best full professors you have encountered (inside and outside your department and the university). Consider the behavior these colleagues exhibited that made them successful.

— Think in terms of opportunity, flexibility, innovation, readiness.

— Talk to your colleagues, and your chair or head of department. Know what they are looking for in a full professor, and keep them informed about your many talents.

— Consult with your head of department about your job description. A job description sketches out our necessary responsibilities, but it is also a springboard for opportunity—job descriptions are really what we make of them. All faculty employment requires us to produce as scholar-teachers and members of the intellectual community, whatever the proportions listed on a job description. So we should beware of using the description reductively, merely checking the boxes. Still, it is worth confirming that immediately post-tenure, your job description as defined by your department is such that it allows your progress toward full professor. In speaking with your chair, you and they should understand how you will work your way to promotion given your job description. This is particularly important if you have cross-college responsibilities.

— Develop your own schedule. No one will enforce a schedule upon you, post-tenure, except yourself. So if you wish to move ahead expeditiously, it is up to you to make and meet your goals. If life intervenes in the form of other opportunities or difficulties, adjust your schedule in sensible ways, but try not to take your eye off your goal.

— Know what choices you are making. Teaching, Research, and Service all will need your attention to develop your case for promotion. At the same time, you may take on an administrative appointment, take a temporary outside opportunity, or commit to extra teaching beyond your usual load. These all can be worthwhile and necessary choices. It is quite possible that they will enhance your promotion packet. But if you make them, take into account how they may negatively affect your time, schedule, and even the prospect of promotion. Depending on your area of research, it may be hard to get going again. And there may be knock-on effects. For instance, a lengthy or majority-time administrative appointment may interrupt or even permanently hobble your research career. That will prevent you from proceeding to administrative positions (if such is your desire) when they de facto require full professors.

— If you pause in your career progress—and sometimes we must for reasons not of our choosing, for instance, to address personal or family matters—consult with your department head, dean, and colleagues about how best to do it and, if you can see ahead, for how long. For instance, it may be best officially to step off the ‘promotion track' for a short time. What will be required of you if you do? University employment at the faculty level presumes ongoing productivity. In your role as a university-level educator you will need to maintain some scholarly output and to continue with
teaching and service—just not with the volume and intensity that makes the case for promotion. This is the more important because when you are ready to return to the promotion track your ongoing engagement provides the base from which you will ramp up. So keep your eye on time; decide on a specific duration for your time off-track if that is possible; think about strategies for full reentry onto the promotion track.

— If you have paused in your progress, and want to get back on track for promotion, consult your colleagues and your administrators. Work out a strategy and a schedule for your future progress. Consider your eligibility for a sabbatical in order to get your research up to speed (but be aware that sabbaticals often depend on prior productivity). Pursue other options, too. For instance, if curricular flexibility allows, a department can rearrange your teaching schedule (loading it into one semester rather than another). You yourself should strategically abjure summer and extra teaching while you ramp up your work. You might also temporarily refocus your service toward more important tasks. Avoid unnecessary or excessive commitments. Try to teach courses that stimulate your research. If you stepped off track to undertake non-traditional responsibilities, such as leadership work in government, or in a national disciplinary organization, think about how to link what you have been doing to your plan for progress. Perhaps your work has shifted to the legislative implications of your field, or its pedagogical methods. Perhaps this is what you now want to pursue and express in your research. In other words, you have been doing important things in your time off track. Think about how you bring them back to the university as value added.

— Remember that you are aiming at a moving target. Given the nature of universities, with our responsibility and commitment to make and disseminate new knowledge that serves as the staging point for others’ advances, the terrain is always changing. It is easy to get out of date, and in some fields that can happen in the blink of an eye.

**The Career Associate.** If you see no prospect of advancing to full professor, or have no desire so to progress, it may make sense for the department and for you to make your ‘non-promotion track’ assignment more permanent. Here, it is important to know two things. First, so long as you are a faculty member, and not an Academic Professional, your responsibility to maintain an active scholarly career and bring to the classroom what is new in your field—which only you know and understand—remains undiminished. You are a university scholar-teacher. The university respects you and benefits from your work in that capacity. Second, the university highly values such associate professors. They serve well in our teaching mission, help mentor junior colleagues, and administer core elements of the institution. They are a vibrant part of the continuum, from students to senior professors, that is the university.

**After Promotion.** If you become a full professor, you are at the top of your game. The university stands to benefit substantially by your ongoing excellence, and greatly appreciates your efforts on behalf of our intellectual community. Still, the rewards will not always seem commensurate with the efforts you put in. Responsibilities will escalate even as your research program goes into overdrive; because you are a leader, everyone wants you in the classroom, and in university and disciplinary service. It may seem the worst of times, but really it is the best of times. All the work you have put in is paying off for you, for the institution, for the state—but most of all for your discipline and for your students. You have made an impact; you are a leader. This is a time of opportunity, and making a difference.

**Coda.** Candidates for promotion to full professor should familiarize themselves with relevant University Regulations and with Academic Affairs advice on related matters such as sabbaticals, collegiality, *et cetera.* Such information can be accessed from the Academic Affairs website under “Faculty Careers.” Department and college requirements should be sought directly from the relevant units.
Appendix 7

CLUE Promotion and Tenure Planning Group, Draft Statement on External Reviewers and Conflict of Interest*

In general, an external evaluator may not review a tenure/promotion case if one can reasonably perceive a conflict of interest (i.e., the reviewer has an identifiable interest in whether the candidate is tenured or promoted). Such conflicts of interest arise if the reviewer:

- is a member of the candidate’s immediate family, or is a business partner of the candidate;
- is currently employed by the same institution, or has an arrangement for future employment or is negotiating for employment at the same institution;
- has a financial interest in the outcome of the tenure or promotion case, or the reviewer’s employer or the organization where the reviewer is an officer, director, trustee, or partner has such an interest;
- is a current or former close collaborator (co-author or research partner), or former thesis student/advisor.

A disqualifying conflict may exist if a candidate’s case involves an institution or other entity with which the potential reviewer has a connection. Such potentially disqualifying connections include:

- a reviewer’s recent former employer,
- an organization in which the reviewer is an active participant,
- an institution at which the reviewer is currently enrolled as a student, or at which he/she serves as a visiting committee member, or
- an entity with which the reviewer has or seeks some other business or financial relationship (excluding the receipt of an honorarium for being a reviewer for said case).

However, the above cases do not necessarily qualify as conflicts of interest. Departmental committees and other bodies judging the tenure or promotion case should consider each reviewer in light of the following:

- Recognizing that academic and professional fields can be more or less small and restricted, and that it is in fact desirable that tenure and promotion candidates have established some prominence and corresponding relationships in their fields, professional associations—such as having contributed to the same edited volume or journal special issue, or having presented papers on the same panel at a conference, for example—do not necessarily disqualify a reviewer, unless an identifiable conflict of interest can reasonably be assumed.

Case reviewers should be from the same field as the candidate, but a diversity of reviewers is also necessary. In other words, reviewers should represent both peers who have no identifiable, close connection with the candidate, and peers who may have some connection, such as those outlined above. Tenure and promotion review committees should then weigh all letters together in considering carefully whether any evaluations are compromised by a potential conflict of interest. The department (or school) nominating a candidate for tenure or promotion is responsible for evaluating the independence of each reviewer, i.e., why the reviewer is in a position to deliver an objective evaluation. Chairs’ letters and committee reports at the department or school level should make these evaluations of reviewers’ disinterestedness explicit.
Resolution to Create a University at Albany Family Leave Policy

Whereas maternity leave presently is a disability benefit constructed as “sick leave with pay” for no more than four weeks before the anticipated delivery due date and six weeks after delivery (eight weeks for Cesarean) for female academic and professional faculty members, and

Whereas male academic and professional faculty members may take only 15 days paid family leave to care for a newborn if they have accrued the sick leave, and

Whereas adoptive parents may not use any paid sick leave for parental leave, and

Whereas the current maternity leave policy creates obstacles for expecting parents and departments in trying to cover semester-long courses, and

Whereas the current maternity benefits are distributed unevenly, as some department chairs are accommodating for expecting parents while others are less so, and

Whereas there is no clear set of guidelines for requesting a change in time to tenure or permanent appointment as a result of child bearing/rearing.

Therefore, be it resolved that the University Senate endorses the concept of a family leave policy to replace the “maternity” leave policy, thereby creating a more equitable distribution of benefits for female and male academic and professional faculty who give birth or adopt a child and which also allows for additional times to tenure as outlined in the attached proposal.

Be it further resolved that the University Senate encourages the President to implement such portions as are appropriate under his autonomous powers as CEO of the University at Albany, and

Be it further resolved that, recognizing that some of these proposals may be considered terms and conditions of employment negotiated through the United University Professions, the University Senate encourages the President to inform negotiators of University at Albany’s interest and support of these policies.

PROPOSAL

We recommend that the family leave policy outlined below be established for full-time academic and professional faculty members who have worked for the University for a minimum of 12
months (9 months for academic appointments). This policy will supersede the current maternity leave policy.

Academic appointees have the option of taking either of the following leaves:

A.  1. For the birth or adoption of a child by the academic and professional faculty member or the member's spouse or domestic partner, a partially-paid leave will be granted at two thirds pay for 15 weeks or one semester. For an academic faculty member, the leave will generally commence in the semester of the birth or adoption. For a professional faculty member, the leave will commence generally no earlier than four weeks before birth or adoption and 11 weeks after.

2. Such leave can be taken at the discretion of the academic and professional faculty member but must be concluded within twelve (12) months of the birth or adoption of the child.

3. If the birth or adoption of a child by an academic member or the member's spouse or domestic partner occurs within two weeks of the end of classes, then the appointee may take the time before the end of the semester under the terms of the Family Medical Leave Act and use accrued sick leave for this unpaid leave. The member subsequently may take the semester leave at two-third pay.

4. The portion of salaries and benefits that are not paid to the academic and professional faculty member who receive leave pursuant to this policy shall create a funding pool within the member’s department to hire temporary replacements as necessary.

B.  1. In accord with the federal Family and Medical Leave Act, academic and professional faculty members may take up to 12 weeks unpaid leave during any 12-month period to care for the birth or adoption of a child by the academic and professional faculty member or the member's spouse or domestic partner. Accrued sick leave can be substituted for the unpaid leave.

To assist in the planning and preparation of a leave, academic and professional faculty members must notify their department chair or college dean as early as possible to discuss the appropriate leave option and changes in teaching, service, research, and administrative duties.

Upon return to regular duties, the academic and professional faculty member shall not be required to assume a heavier teaching and service load than normal.

If both parents are academic or professional faculty members at the University at Albany, family leave is mandatory upon request for one parent at a time, and the parents may elect to split the leave into two separate blocks of leave with each parent entitled to one continuous period of leave not to exceed 15 weeks in total.

Academic and professional faculty members who take family leave are required to continue as an academic employee for a minimum of one year (12 months for professional staff, 9 months for academic appointments) upon return.
2. Proposed Extension of Time to Tenure

All colleges’ Procedures from Appointment to Tenure or Permanent Appointment should be amended to include the following grounds for variations in the normal time line to tenure:

Within one year of the birth or adoption of a child by an academic and professional faculty member or member’s spouse or domestic partner, the faculty member may request a one-year extension of time to tenure. Such requests will be granted automatically. Such requests may only be made once during the period preceding the tenure decision. Academic and professional faculty members are not required to take a family leave in order to exercise this request.

FAMILY LEAVE REPORT

I. Background

In September 2004 an Ad Hoc Benefits Committee was formed in the University Life Council to investigate the parental and family leave policies at the University at Albany, SUNY. During the year, the committee held meetings with representatives of United University Professions (UUP) and University at Albany administrators, invited feedback from faculty and professional staff, reviewed the University’s maternity leave policy, investigated child care facilities for faculty and staff, and reviewed the family leave policies of peer and aspirational-peer institutions. In that process we narrowed our task to questions specific to parental leave, setting aside for the time being the challenges raised by elder care. The pages that follow describe our findings. Resources cited in this document have been included at the end of the document with URLs to the original sources.

A. Current Family Leave Policies

At the University at Albany, policies of family leave are negotiated at the state level between UUP and the State of New York. The University’s Human Resources website

http://hr.albany.edu/content/HRM90-1.asp

explains that:

Pregnancy is treated like any other temporary disability under both the classified and unclassified rules and policies. Pregnant employees are presumed to be medically disabled from the performance of job duties for a period commencing approximately four weeks prior to delivery and continuing for six weeks following delivery. This period may extend based upon documented medical necessity. Should accrued leave credits prove inadequate to cover the period of disability, then the foregoing provisions for either leave at half-pay (classified) or extended sick leave (professional), will apply”

Based on interviews with UUP Representatives, with administrators in the Provost’s office, Human Resources Management, and in reading the latest UUP contract (2004-2007), this committee understands that:

1 http://hr.albany.edu/content/HRM90-1.asp
• Maternity leave presently is “sick leave with pay” for no more than four weeks before the anticipated delivery due date and six weeks after delivery (eight weeks for Cesarean). Any additional accrued sick leave cannot be expended unless indicated by a physician and approved by a “chief operating officer.” If the academic and professional faculty member does not have enough accrued sick leave (which may often be the case with recent hires), additional sick leave may be requested at reduced salary or without pay.
• Male academic and professional faculty members may take 15 days paid family leave to care for a newborn if they have accrued the sick leave.
• Adoptive parents may not use any paid sick leave for parental leave.
• Academic and professional faculty members may take up to seven months leave without pay following childbirth and adoption (this duration includes any sick or disability leave taken after childbirth). This is “mandatory upon request” for either parent. Additional leave due to medical disability will be granted at the discretion of the chief administrative officer. The “seven month” period does not include any time the infant or adopted child is hospitalized.
• The University at Albany, SUNY also abides by the federal Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 [See Appendix A]. This mandate requires large employers to provide up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for family members caring for sick relatives or caring for new infants, as well as adoptive parents.
• Academic and professional faculty members may take up to 15 days of paid family sick leave, which is leave to care for sick family members, including care for elderly parents, if the faculty member has accrued enough paid sick leave.
• There is a donation program where calendar year or college year appointees who accrue annual leave credits are eligible to donate such leave credits to other appointees who are eligible to receive it. This process allows professional appointees to donate annual leave credits, but there is no provision for academic teaching faculty to participate in the program as they do not accrue annual leave.
• There is no clear set of guidelines on requesting a change in tenuring status as a result of childbearing/rearing. At present a request to extend the tenure clock by one year is presented to the Dean of the associated College, and it is up to his or her discretion to grant such requests.

In sum an academic and professional faculty member (male or female) may take up to 7 months unpaid leave for maternity-related issues. For female faculty members, they may take up to ten weeks of paid leave (12 weeks for Cesarean) if they have accrued enough sick leave. There is no clear guidelines on tenure extension requests.

B. Changes the Proposed Bill Makes to Current Policy

The University at Albany should have a “parental” leave policy, rather than a “maternity” leave policy. Constructing maternity as a “disability” and tying all leave benefits to it restricts who is eligible for such a leave and constructs child rearing as a disability rather than an essential part of a healthy, functioning society. Moreover, it fails to recognize that giving birth is only one element of the parental process. Building bonds between parent and child are critical the first months of an infant’s life. In constructing the policy as “parental” leave, both male academic and professional faculty members and adoptive parents become eligible for paid leave time to bond with and nurture their new children.
This committee has concluded that the leave time for teaching faculty ideally should extend for an entire semester. This would solve the major obstacles expecting parents face as highlighted in the feedback from faculty of trying to cover courses for parts of the semester. Faculty, under this policy, would be allowed to take the leave within a year of birth or adoption. This policy attempts to increase flexibility to faculty and professional staff by letting them choose to utilize a semester leave at 2/3rds pay or to take up to 12 weeks leave with the option of using accrued sick leave for pay.

In order to ensure that teaching faculty who are expecting parents can take the semester and not leave departments scrambling to replace the instructor—especially small departments and those with few resources—this bill proposes establishing a specific fund for department chairs to use for the purpose of hiring adjunct faculty.

In following the Princeton University example, an automatic one year extension to the tenure decision should be granted for academic and professional faculty members who have a new child (either through birth or adoption) in order to ensure fair, equitable extensions for all who seek it.

UUP representatives have indicated to members of this committee that individual campuses can negotiate campus-based family leave benefits, and need not only be negotiated through the formal UUP Agreement with the State of New York.

C. Limitations of the Current Family Leave Policy

The motivation to investigate the University at Albany’s family leave policy resulted from observations that the policies for faculty concerning child rearing and child care are inadequate. The current policy does not give mothers or fathers enough time with their children before having to return to work, positions female academic and professional faculty member who are new to the University to take a maternity leave without pay, and does not extend paid leave to adoptive parents. The present leave policy situates teaching faculty who are expecting parents in the difficult position of having to start a course and then leave half way through the semester to give birth, or if they give birth at the beginning or end of the semester to teach a few weeks of the course before or after taking their leave. Department chairs and expecting parents must juggle teaching responsibilities, sometimes requesting other faculty in the department to take an “overload” and fill in for the expecting parent. Some department chairs are quite accommodating; others are not. The result is an uneven experience and sometimes an unfair distribution of benefits for new parents.

D. Negative Implications of the Current Policy

There are several negative consequences of an inadequate parental leave policy. First, President Hall has provided a five year vision for this campus that includes hiring 100 junior academic appointees. This University’s ability to recruit and retain talented junior faculty is hampered by the current policy, especially given that several of our peer and aspirational institutions have a more accommodating parental leave policy.

Second, the issue of recruitment and retention is especially pressing for female academic appointees. Female tenure-track faculty face great obstacles in trying to juggle the demands of the tenure process while having a family (Wilson 2003). It is still the case in U.S. culture that women primarily carry the task of childrearing. In addition, female academic and professional faculty member have to coordinate
semester-long course commitments, service, administration, and research with end-of-pregnancy complications, child birth, recovery, and breast feeding.

Research by Mason and Goulden (2002) on the employment patterns at the University of California – Berkeley suggest that fewer female faculty compared to men are tenured. Their research suggests that having children directly affects female faculty’s ability to achieve tenure. Untenured male faculty with children are more likely to achieve tenure compared with female faculty who have children before tenure. In a follow-up study (2004) the researchers found that female faculty are more likely to opt out of having children than their male counterparts, even though they might wish to have children, because they do not believe they can manage the competing demands of their family and their academic obligations. According to their study, 44% of tenured women had children within 12 years of earning their Ph.D. In comparison 70% of tenured men had children during that time.

An analysis of the Survey of Doctorate Recipients (as reported by the University of California Faculty Family Friendly Edge report, 2003) indicate “at nearly every stage of an academic career – from securing a tenure track position to achieving associate and full professor status – married women (both with and without young children) leak out of the academic pipeline at a disproportionately high rate” (para. 1). According to the study, women with children are 29% less likely than women without children to enter a tenure-track job. Women are 23% less likely than men to become an associate professor, and they are 25% less likely than men to become a full professor within a maximum of 16 years.

Third, without a comprehensive parental leave policy, the University fails to cultivate a supportive environment for fathers and adoptive parents. Although women still carry the majority of family caregiving tasks in the United States, men increasingly are taking on parental duties at home. Male academic and professional faculty members who desire to be involved in the rearing of newborns and infants have fewer options than their female counterparts under the current leave policies. They are granted fewer paid leave days and have no stated option to extend the tenure decision due to family obligations. Adoptive parents may take only unpaid leave through the Family and Medical Leave Act and have no stated option to extend the tenure period.

The work-family balance has become a major topic of discussion across campuses and at university-oriented think tanks in the United States. Universities, such as Princeton and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, have pioneered policies that offer more flexibility in the tenure process and in family leave policies to ensure that faculty can have children while working toward tenure. Organizations, such as the American Council on Education, have investigated alternative and flexible career opportunities in an effort to retain faculty. They explain the problems facing faculty in this way:

In the promotion and tenure processes, tenure-track and tenured faculty frequently encounter ambiguous and contradictory criteria, conflicting messages between institutional rhetoric and the reward structure, murky and secretive review procedures, and unmitigated stress. Added to this inhospitable combination, tenure-track and tenured faculty often find difficulty successfully navigating the promotion and tenure processes while simultaneously striving to fulfill personal

\(^2\) This disproportion between male and female faculty is evident at the University at Albany. The Office of Institutional Research reports the following: Lecturer: Males 30%, Females 70%. Assistant: Males 55%, Females 45%. Associate: Males 64%, Females 36%. Full: Males 82%, Females 18%.

\(^3\) http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/leaks.html
responsibilities. These factors cause many talented academic to choose non- or marginal academic career paths. (American Council on Education “Creating Paths,” para 1)

II. Faculty Responses to Committee Survey

A. Introduction

The Ad Hoc Benefits Committee, under the umbrella of the University Life Council and University Senate, sent out an email query to voting members of the University faculty on March 29, 2005 regarding the University’s current family leave policy. The survey not only included seven suggested questions to guide faculty members, but also welcomed general feedback. By the end of a three-week period the committee received 41 responses from both faculty and professional staff sharing their “questions, concerns, feedback, or stories about maternity and family leave” at the University at Albany.

B. Summary of Responses

In response to the survey a number of faculty members shared their personal experiences with navigating the policies as beneficiaries. Others spoke to the challenges they faced as department chairs trying to balance a faculty member’s needs with department staffing issues. Most agreed that the vagaries of our current policy added to the challenge. Overwhelmingly, the respondents felt that the University’s current policy needs some augmentation. What follows is a summary of the faculty responses to the questions as well as their suggestions.

Overall, respondents consistently and overwhelmingly emphasized the following five points:

- The university should grant a semester leave for faculty rather than 10 or 12 weeks given that the university has a 15 week semester.
- The university should automatically extend or stop the tenure clock for faculty who give birth.
- Male faculty should also receive paternity leave benefits.
- Adoptive parents should have the option of using accrued sick leave for a parental leave with pay.
- The university’s policies need to allow academic appointees to use paid leave to also care for elderly parents and sick spouses.

Several respondents raised questions about how sick leave is accrued. The survey revealed that there is overall confusion about the university’s policies and their relation to the FMLA. A number of respondents wondered whether the accrual rate puts new and or untenured faculty at a disadvantage, since they are the ones who are more likely to need to take advantage of this policy and have had less time to accrue leave. Others mentioned the gender disparity in use of sick leave amounts.

Although it was not a representative sample, department chairs indicated that they need more information about the university policy. As it stands faculty felt it was incumbent upon them to educate their chairs, and/or negotiate with the dean and advocate for their leave on a case-by-case basis. Repeatedly, respondents mentioned the disparity between the 10-week leave and the 15-week semester. In some instances faculty were called upon to recruit their own teaching replacement. Many untenured faculty members felt uncomfortable with being forceful about advocating for themselves. Several comments made it clear that untenured faculty are concerned about how those requesting maternity leave are perceived in terms of their professional commitment. Those who have given birth
express that they are also concerned about bridging the time missed at work and maintaining a consistent flow of professional activity.

In addition to their answers to the suggested questions, a number of respondents mentioned other areas that need examination. More than a few felt that out of fairness the university should recognize that adoptive parents have many of the same needs and concerns as those who give birth. Others mentioned that the committee should also consider additional areas of concern such as bereavement leave, the needs of single faculty without children, the needs of staff members as well as the creation of a system of rewards for those who “fill in” for faculty taking advantage of leave.

III. Policies of Peer and Aspirational Institutions

Universities around the country are obligated by federal law to give employees 12 weeks unpaid leave due to childbirth or adoption. Universities may supplement additional family leave benefits for their academic appointees. Below is a summary of research of family and maternity leave policies at the University at Albany’s peer and aspiration institutions.

- The University of Delaware, a peer institution, extends the family federal leave through an academic semester.
- One peer institution, Virginia Tech, follows the federal family leave act of unpaid leave, and also gives adoptive parents 10 paid leave days, if they have accrued paid sick leave.
- Most of our peer and our aspiration institutions allow academic appointees and staff to use accrued sick leave during their FMLA leave to care for a new child. Because the federal leave covers both men and women who are coping with a new birth or an adopted or foster child, the policies allow birth mothers and fathers, as well as adoptive or foster parents, to take up to 12 weeks unpaid or substitute their unpaid time with paid sick leave.
- Of our aspiration institutions, Indiana University has the most extensive policy on family leave. Academic appointees may take up to 15 weeks or through the end of the semester (whichever comes first) for maternity leave (including adoption) for both male and female academic appointees. The leave is 2/3 pay. Leave requests are determined by a panel of academic appointees and administrators. The salaries and benefits not paid out are used to hire adjuncts to fill in for the academic appointees.

None of the human resources websites documented changes in tenure status for female academic appointees who have given birth. News coverage of university policies on family and maternity leave indicate that some universities, such as Princeton University, automatically extend the tenure appointment by one year for female academic appointees who have given birth (Cliatt 2005).

Other universities, such as Ohio State University, now allow tenure-track female academic appointees who have children to work part-time on the tenure track. This extends the time to tenure by a few

4 http://www.udel.edu/ExecVP/polprod/4-24.html
5 http://www.hr.vt.edu/leave/manual/
6 http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/policies/familyleave.htm
7 http://web.princeton.edu/sites/dof/pubs/rpfac94/fchap4.htm#chap4c
8 http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/ii_reducefte.html
years, and allows female academic appointees the flexibility to both raise children and have research and teaching careers.

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology\(^9\) has one of the most progressive policies concerning family leave. Male and female academic appointees may take a semester of full paid leave from teaching and service obligations after childbirth or adoption.

**WORKS CITED**


---

\(^9\) [http://web.mit.edu/facfamily/policies/1parentalSupport.html](http://web.mit.edu/facfamily/policies/1parentalSupport.html)
The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA; Public Law 103-3) is a federal law enacted in February 5, 1993. This law requires employers of 50 or more employees to grant their employees up to 12 workweeks of unpaid leave during any 12-month period for one or more of the following reasons:

- The birth and care of the newborn child of the employee;
- Placement with the employee of a son or daughter for adoption or foster care;
- Care for an immediate family member (spouse, child, or parent) with a serious health condition; or
- Medical leave when the employee is unable to work because of a serious health condition.

An employee is eligible if he or she:

- Has been employed by the employer for at least 12 months; and
- Has worked at least 1,250 hours during the 12-month period immediately preceding the commencement of leave; and
- Is employed at a worksite where 50 or more employees are employed within 75 miles of the worksite.

Notes:

1) This is unpaid leave, but offers job protection. Accrued paid leave (e.g. sick-time or vacation-time) can be substituted.
2) Leave can be taken on an intermittent basis, or the employee may work part-time.
3) An employee on FMLA leave is entitled to have health benefits maintained as if employee had continued to work.
4) The employee has the right to return to the same or equivalent position.
5) The employer has the right to 30 days advance notice from the employee.
6) The employer may require an employee to submit certification from a health care provider to substantiate the leave, and/or to establish the employee’s fitness to return to work.
7) Leave taken due to pregnancy complications, pregnancy disability, or maternity leave can be counted as part of the 12-week FMLA leave entitlement.
8) An immediate family member does not include in-laws, or children over the age of 18 unless they are “incapable of self-care”.
9) FMLA permits employees to take leave in order to receive continuing treatment by a health care provider (e.g., physical therapy).
10) Employers may have established policies regarding outside employment while on paid or unpaid leave that may be applied to employees on FMLA leave.
Appendix 9

Additional Resources

Best Practices in Tenure and Promotion


Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. Toolkit: Key Resources for Administrators, Faculty and Students. The Alfred P. Sloan Projects for Faculty Career Flexibility. Retrieved from http://www.acenet.edu/AM/PrinterTemplate.cfm?Section=fcf_toolkit&Template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=43390&FuseFlag=1


Assessing the Scholarship of Teaching


Assessing and Documenting Engaged Scholarship


Evaluating Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Scholarship


Different Ways of Publishing and How that Interacts with T&P


Flexibility in Tenure and Promotion


Examples of Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (may be good overall examples, or may provide useful language related to evaluating teaching, flexible arrangements, etc.)

**University of Notre Dame**

[https://www3.nd.edu/~provost/academic-resources-and-information/AcademicResourcesandInformationOfficeoftheProvostGuidelinesforPreparingaCaseforRenewa.shtml](https://www3.nd.edu/~provost/academic-resources-and-information/AcademicResourcesandInformationOfficeoftheProvostGuidelinesforPreparingaCaseforRenewa.shtml)

[https://www3.nd.edu/~provost/academic-resources-and-information/documents/TRReappointment.pdf](https://www3.nd.edu/~provost/academic-resources-and-information/documents/TRReappointment.pdf)

**Indiana University**


**Syracuse University**

[http://provost.syr.edu/provost/Faculty/policies/facmantoc.aspx](http://provost.syr.edu/provost/Faculty/policies/facmantoc.aspx)

**University at Buffalo**

Faculty staff handbook section on personnel actions [http://www.business.buffalo.edu/UbbContent/Hrs/facultyhandbook/III.htm](http://www.business.buffalo.edu/UbbContent/Hrs/facultyhandbook/III.htm)


**University of Connecticut**


General info about tenure and promotion from faculty/staff resource guide, mostly focusing on process: [http://resource.uconn.edu/ptr/index.html](http://resource.uconn.edu/ptr/index.html)