

2018-2019  
**UNIVERSITY SENATE ANNUAL COMMITTEE REPORT**

**Committee Name: *University Senate Promotion***

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 1

Committee Chair: Jess W. Everett

Committee Members: (list here)

Edward Schoen	Jennifer Courtney	Xiufang Chen
Bonnie Angelone		

**Purpose of/Charge to Committee:**

Facilitate election of college committees. Provide guidance to candidates. Collect all applications and send to Provost. Identify candidates receiving unanimous favorable votes at the department and college levels and provide their names to the Provost. REVIEW portfolios of applicants who received mixed votes or who request a review. For those candidates, determine if approved and established procedures were followed and transmit the findings to the Provost.

**Summary of Activities this Year:**

- The Chair gave one presentation on the promotion process to candidates.
- The Chair & Bonnie Angelone helped candidates interpret the application process.
- The Chair and Senate Office facilitated the Election of College Committees
- The Chair reviewed all candidate packets and identified those candidate receiving unanimous favorable votes at the department and college levels.
- The committee reviewed the portfolios of one candidate that received 2 favorable votes, zero negative votes, and one abstention.
- The committee discussed recommendations for improving the application process. The approved recommendations given below.

**2018-2019 COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS**

**SUGGESTIONS: NONE**

**RECOMMENDATIONS: See next page**

## **Lecturer Promotion Criteria Recommendation**

As departments develop their criteria for recontracting and/or promotion of Lecturers we want to be sure there is as much clarity as possible. Here are our comments and questions.

- 1) On the front cover of the current Promotion MOA it states one of the major changes made was “Added Lecturers (NTTF) to Instructor section for Professional Development (Appendix A: 1.2B)”, indicating that Lecturers will be evaluated on Teaching, Service, and Professional Development. However, in the current NTTF Letter of Agreement within the section of Professional Responsibilities only 2 areas are stated (1. Teaching Load and 2. Service) – as such, this could be confusing. Is the professional development part of promotion and not part of recontracting? Assuming professional development is expected for both, it should be narrowly defined, e.g., maintenance of teaching excellence (pedagogy and content mastery).
- 2) In the current Promotion MOA there is no information on the movement through the levels of Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Master Lecturer) – are these considered Promotion levels and if so, should they be included in the Promotion MOA? Should departments include this movement in their document development?

We recommend that MOAs relevant to Lecturers all specify evaluation based on Teaching, Service, and Professional Development (PD), that PD be narrowly defined, and that the three levels of Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Master Lecturer) be described in the Promotion MOA only.

## **Sending paper copies to Senate or Provost Recommendation**

This year some college committees sent paper copies of candidate applications to the Senate Office and others to the Provost. The confusion was caused by the Promotion MOA, where page 2 indicates:

College Committee concludes work and transmits folders to Senate office and to College Deans in cases of split or negative college votes (*including candidate response to evaluation if provided*). Unanimous positive assessments from Department and College are transmitted directly to the Provost.

But if you look into the MOA, it still says the college committee:

5.424 Routes recommendations to the College Dean and the University Senate Promotion Committee unless the candidate withdraws the application. The chair of the committee will ensure that, for each applicant forwarded, the portfolio containing supplemental materials is in the hands of the Dean.

And the Senate committee shall:

5.64 RECEIVE, RETAIN, AND REVIEW the portfolios of applicants who received negative recommendations or mixed votes, and/or who request a review. A mixed vote can occur within a Department or College Promotion Committee when there is less than unanimous agreement, or between the two promotion committees when they fail to reach the same conclusion regarding a portfolio.

We recommend that the Union make ‘Page 2’ consistent with 5.424 and 5.64.