

Faculty Senate Meeting
Promotion & Tenure Deliberations, 2012-2013:
Processes, Observations & Conclusions
Faculty Senate, Texas Tech University
January 16, 2013

Processes

- Key dates: 1) Faculty Portfolio Submittal to Department or Equivalent in September; 2) Departmental & College Review, September to Late November; 3) Provost & Presidential Office Review, December & January; 4) Presentation of Recommendations to TTUS Board of Regents (BOR), February-March Meeting.
- Reviews directed by OP 32.01 (currently in effect [May 18, 2012], time of last promotion [promotion only], or in effect at time of hiring) & Department P/T Policies.
- Provost Office Review & Beyond: 1) Review of electronic portfolios by Provost, Senior Vice Provost (Rob Stewart), Vice President for Research (Michael San Francisco [Interim]), Graduate Dean (Dom Casadonte [Interim]), Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (Juan Muñoz) & Vice Provost (Peggy Miller) (generally 50-75 hours); 2) Initial consultation with Provost & senior staff; 3) Individual meetings with deans (& in some cases, department chairs as well); 4) Provost decisions sent to President; 5) President sends his or her recommendations to Chancellor for presentation to the TTUS BOR; 6) Only the TTUS BOR has authority to grant tenure.
- In 2012-2013 review: 68 cases, 39 T & P, 6 T & 23 P; out of the 39 T & P cases, 14 (36%) choose policy currently in effect; 5/6 (83%) tenure only cases chose "policy currently in effect."

Observations

- Surprising (?) number of choices of "policy currently in effect."
- Relatively few "problem cases."
- Electronic portfolios are working out well; before & during meetings!
- Third-year review may well be working out better than in the past (now mandated by 2012 BOR-approved policy).
- P/T reviews offer opportunities to question disclosures & compliance matters (*e.g.*, safety, IRB concerns); also to review conclusions of former matters of concern.
- Occasionally offer suggestions to Deans about counsel to faculty about possible future P/T decisions.

Conclusions

- P/T process appears to be working successfully & smoothly.
- Need continued vigilance on third-year reviews & their inclusion in P/T packets.
- Some colleges need to do a better job of peer review of teaching.
- Faculty members need to be reflective, thoughtful & cognizant of conflict of interest & conflict of commitment matters & official disclosures.

