

Committee on Rank, Tenure and Promotion
Report to Faculty Council
May 10, 2011

In the fall of 2010, the Committee on Rank, Tenure and Promotion conducted an approval poll of the Faculty, asking each person to indicate approval or disapproval of each of six alternative tenure process scenarios. The Committee's plan was to draft a proposal based on the scenario that received the highest level of approval—which the Committee then did.

The Committee's draft proposal was discussed in a Faculty Meeting on November 17, 2010, in lieu of open hearings, which are frequently sparsely attended. The Committee then revised and refined the proposal, after consideration of the many comments that were made at the Faculty Meeting, and also taking into account comments that were heard at individual interviews with each of the eight Faculty librarians.

By a vote of 4 to 3, the Committee agreed to submit the revised proposal to the Faculty Council for presentation at a Faculty Meeting. At the Faculty Meeting on March 23, 2011, the Faculty voted to divide the question and return both parts to the committee for further study. Those two parts are, in brief: (1) whether to expand small department tenure committees by inclusion of faculty from cognate disciplines; and (2) whether to adopt a tenure process that includes review by college-level tenure committees.

As a first step in reconsidering the "small tenure committee" question, the RTP Committee contacted each Faculty member in those departments that would be affected by the proposed expansion of "small" tenure committees, and received nine responses. We recommend that the 2011-2012 RTP Committee consider those responses in deciding whether to pursue a policy whereby small departmental tenure committees would be expanded by inclusion of Faculty members from related disciplines.

The Committee has agreed that the second question on the tenure process, namely the creation of college-level tenure committees and a university tenure committee for Faculty librarians, deserves the consideration of the Faculty as it now stands, and should, after some minor clarifications and rewording, be presented to the Faculty for a vote.

It should be noted that implementation of either of the two issues now with the RTP Committee would require Faculty Handbook amendments, and so approval of either issue by the Faculty should be understood as a request from the Faculty for the Faculty Handbook Committee to propose suitable amendments to the Handbook. If such amendments were to be approved, then the Rank, Tenure and Promotion Committee would need to begin the process of amending Appendix J of the Handbook, which specifies the timetable and various other details of the tenure process.