

## University Planning (aka Faculty Success) Committee Chair Report

Report of December 11, 2024, submitted by Erik Lehnhoff

The committee met on December 11, 2024 with five members present. There were no guests.

We finalized our recommendations for changes to ARP 9.3, Promotion and Tenure policy.

The University Planning Committee suggests that all of ARP 9.2 be archived, and the Committee has made suggested revisions to ARP 9.30 – 9.36, COMBINED PROMOTION AND TENURE RULES. A summary of suggested revisions follows.

- Some of the edits have slightly corrupted the document formatting. We apologize for this, but cannot fix the issue in OneDrive.
- To improve clarity, extensive, but minor, revisions have been made in terms of grammar, punctuation, etc.
- Some sections have been slightly reorganized. As one example, in 9.31 Part 3, Leadership has been moved from B to E. This was to keep the section parallel with the four areas of faculty effort: teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, extension and outreach, and service. Leadership was moved to follow these four areas.
- More substantial language revisions have been made throughout to improve clarity.
- Because most faculty do not have a formal advising role, advising was changed to mentoring throughout.
- 9.31 Part 3 B and C. References to Boyer's Scholarship have been removed. The committee felt that including Boyer's Scholarship in the document did not increase clarity or functionality of the document. Further, it was unclear how Boyer's concepts are used in evaluation of candidates, and thus inclusion does not serve a purpose.
- 9.34 Part 3 S. The committee felt that in the case of non-unanimous promotion and tenure decisions at the department level, it is important to have a mechanism by which a "minority report" detailing the alternate viewpoint can be submitted. Language was added stipulating that such a mechanism be included in department's promotion and tenure guidelines.
- 9.34 Part 3 BB 6 C. The statement that candidates will have the opportunity to review external letters was removed and replaced with, "Notification that, in cases of appeal, the candidate will have an opportunity to read the letter of assessment. Such letters will only be made available to candidates once all identifying information that might reveal the letter's author has been removed by the department head."
- 9.35 Part 5 B, E, and F. Language was added stating that if the recommendation on promotion and/or tenure by the department head, dean, or provost differs from the decision at the previous level, rationale and justification must be provided.
- 9.35 Part 9 B. For cases of faculty grievance review and resolution, the committee has added language stating the composition of the Faculty Grievance Review Board shall be as stipulated in ARP 10.60, and additionally will include at least one member from the same college as the grievant.
- 9.35 Part 10. It is recognized that the existing timeline of procedural steps for the promotion and tenure review process is problematic, specifically because the current timeline calls for department heads to solicit letters from external reviewers in August, when such reviewers may be off-contract or otherwise unavailable. The committee proposes the solution of having candidates complete their portfolio by the end of August, and the department head soliciting

external letters in September. We acknowledge that this compresses the timeline, but it still allows all of October for the department P&T committee and department head review, and November and December for college P&T committee review. The timeline for the dean's and provost's review is unchanged.

The committee also discussed, but did not implement, the suggestion of adding a University level P&T review committee.