

Charge from Senate Council
(In Consultation with Provost Tim Tracy)

Charge

1. Determine the feasibility of changing to a system with two title series (tenure track and non-tenure track), with ranks in both series at assistant professor, associate professor and full professor.
2. Inclusion of multi-year contract for faculty in the non-tenure track series

Two title series system is feasible. Revisions to ARs and GRs would need to be made. AREA committees should remain as is with membership of the committees substantially representing the disciplinary base of the area being reviewed. For example, if a faculty member is being reviewed whose DOE has more of an extension, library or teaching component, AREA committee membership should reflect those areas.

Tenure-track Faculty

1. Description of tenured appointment: A faculty member is on full-time continuous appointment (GR X-B.1.a.2)
2. There would be one tenure track series.
3. Title series of regular, special, extension and library would be discontinued. Tenured faculty currently in these series would be designated as tenured faculty and the subtitles of title series would be removed.
4. Faculty currently in probationary period would be evaluated and promoted based on the statements of evidence they were hired under, unless opting into alternative ones.
5. New faculty would be hired in the tenure track as instructor, assistant professor, associate professor or full professor.
6. Letter of hire should explicitly state expectations for tenure and those expectations should be used as a guide to determine faculty member's DOE during probationary period. The DOE should be designed to facilitate success in meeting promotion/tenure. The percentage of effort in teaching, research/scholarship and service over the probationary period should be included in the letter of hire. Expectations and DOE should only change with mutual consent of the faculty and department chair and approval by the dean.
7. Each college/educational unit should be responsible for developing criteria/statements of evidence for promotion and tenure. These statements of evidence should explicitly state the types of evidence expected for teaching, research/scholarship and service for promotion to each rank.
8. DOEs would continue to include instruction (i.e. courses, advising, student committees), research/scholarship and service.
9. Types of scholarship should be based on Boyer's four domains of scholarship (i.e. Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, Scholarship of Application, Scholarship of Teaching). *Might want to add an appendix or something with example of each of the elements.*
 - a. Some faculty may have all of their scholarship in one domain (e.g. Discovery or Teaching) or their scholarship could be divided among all four domains.

Non-Tenure-track Faculty

1. Description of non-tenured track appointment: Faculty member is ineligible for tenure as a consequence of having been appointed (1) in the lecturer, research, clinical, adjunct, visiting, or voluntary title series or (2) on a part-time or temporary basis (GR X-B.1.a.1-2).
2. Non-tenure track faculty would be hired to perform in one area (teaching, research or service/administration) and expectations would not be for all three areas.

3. Non-tenure track series would remain as is now. *The committee has not discussed whether related titles would be included with the academic rank (i.e., Assistant Research Professor, Assistant Clinical Professor).*
4. Department chairs would perform formal progress reviews with full-time non-tenure track faculty at year 3 of employment to evaluate faculty member's progress for promotion.
5. Rolling contracts could be offered based on rank. The following are examples of how rolling contracts could be offered. The years listed with each rank were arbitrarily assigned and are only meant to be examples.
 - a. Lecturer – Year to Year until year 4, then 2-year rolling contract or a 5th and final year
 - b. Senior Lecturer – 3 year rolling contract as currently defined in AR 2:9
 - c. Instructor – Year to Year
 - d. Assistant Professor—If hired as assistant professor, contract would be year to year until formal progress review at year 3. Could then be appointed for 3 year rolling contract if satisfactory progress review.
 - e. Associate Professor – 5 year rolling contract
 - f. Professor – 7 year rolling contract

Ad hoc Committee on Title Series
Member List

Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure	
Bollinger, Chris Gatton College of Business, Dept. of Economics Regular Title Series	Isaacs, Steven College of Ag, Dept. of Agricultural Economics Extension Title Series
Carter, Craig College of Ag, Veterinary Diagnostic Lab Special Title Series	Lock, Sharon, Chair College of Nursing Special Title Series
Finkel, Raphael College of Engineering, Computer Science Dept. Regular Title Series	Marshall, Robert College of Health Sciences, Dept. of Rehab Sciences Regular Title Series
Harders, Faith Libraries Librarian Title Series	McKenzie, Robert College of Education, Early Childhood, Special Ed and Rehab Counseling Special Title Series
Hatton-Kolpek, Jimmi College of Pharmacy Special Title Series	Speck, Dexter College of Medicine, Dept. of Physiology Special Title Series
Academic Area Advisory Committee Chairs	
Harley, Debra College of Education, Early Childhood, Special Ed and Rehab Counseling Regular Title Series Chair, AAAC-Extension Title Series	Tagavi, Kaveh College of Engineering, Dept. of Mechanical Engineering Regular Title Series Chair, AAAC-Physical & Engineering Sciences
Lennie, Terry College of Nursing Regular Title Series Chair, AAAC-Health Care Clinical Sciences	Lisa Vaillancourt College of Ag, Dept. of Plant Pathology Regular Title Series Chair, AAAC-Biological Sciences
Invited	
Deaton, Marcy Associate General Counsel, Senior Office of Legal Counsel	Ann Vail Interim Dean, College of Social Work Extension Title Series
Lineberry, GT Associate Provost Office for Faculty Advancement	Watt, David College of Medicine, Molecular & Cellular Biochemistry Regular Title Series

Provost Tracy,

Attached is a preliminary report and most recent draft response to your charge to the ad hoc Committee on Title Series. The committee has had very lively discussions about the pros and cons of two title series. Before we go further, we wanted to get your thoughts on what we have done so far. Listed below is a brief summary of our activities to date.

March: Committee met on March 7, 21 and 28. Reviewed benchmarks for APT criteria, role of area committees, tenure and non-tenure track. Reviewed Boyer's criteria and some primary literature submitted by SACPT members. Report to University Senate on March 20.

April: Committee met on April 11, 18 and 25. Decision to keep area committee process. Introduction of DOE's, offer letter criteria, need for Evidences of Excellence to reflect Boyer criteria within each unit. Discussions of impact of 2 track system replacing the current system (see challenges document).

May: Committee met on May 9 and 15. Decision to support 2 track system in initial draft (see attached). Decision to send preliminary report to Provost and request feedback prior to scheduling next meetings as some SACPT members are off campus during the summer.

Challenges to be Considered

1. **Changes in DOE:** How can the University prevent departments from “gaming the system” by reassigning duties to junior faculty in the tenure track (maybe also in the non-tenure track) in contradiction to the original contract letter? Such reassignments could be especially problematic for junior or non-tenure track faculty who have limited ability to say “no” to substantial changes. Changes would not be necessarily bad unless they deprived junior faculty of the opportunity to demonstrate abilities in all three areas of expectation (teaching, research, service) or prevented junior faculty from establishing a record of independent scholarship. Should changes to the original contract letter should be approved at higher levels (e.g. the dean).
2. **Voting rights:** What are the ramifications for voting rights, not only within departments, but also within colleges, in the University Senate, and as members of the Graduate School Faculty (this is important for participating in advisory committees for students)? Voting rights for non-tenure track faculty should be decided by the departments. Non-tenure track faculty could have university wide voting rights
3. **Statements of Evidence(1):** Would the statements of evidence for faculty in a tenure track still have categories such as research (now subdivided into Boyer’s four areas), teaching and service or would those categories be superseded by Boyer’s areas? All three areas would stay but research/scholarship could be considered broadly as Boyer’s areas.
4. **Statements of Evidence(2):** If a department houses tenure track faculty who would previously be in both regular and special title series, would the department employ different statement of evidence for these faculty? If so, what’s the point of combining the tracks? Statements of evidence could be defined by Boyer’s domains of scholarship.
5. **Tenure Deliberations:** How can the University enforce the policy that tenure deliberations at all levels take into account the statements of evidence, not a preconception of the importance of the discovery component of scholarship? Should this be the responsibility of committee chairs?
6. **AR’s and GR’s:** Changes would have to be made. AR’s should be revised/created to address the expectations for dossiers, documentation and reviews at all University levels.