

UNIVERSITY SENATE
ANNUAL COMMITTEE REPORT 2019-20

Committee Name: University Senate Promotion Committee

Number of meetings held this year: one

Committee Chair: Edward J. Schoen

Committee Members: (list here)

Bonnie L. Angelone

Xiufang Chen

Jennifer E. Courtney

Jess W. Everett

Paul Grossman

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Supervises the election of college promotion committees, develops procedures for receipt and processing of promotion materials from candidates and college promotion committees, reviews applicant portfolios in light of the procedures established by the institution and the department and approved by the dean, certifies to provost that the procedures have or have not been correctly carried out by both the department and college committees.

Summary of Activities this Year:

Provided oversight in the election of college promotion committees; made one presentation on the promotion process to candidates; responded to numerous inquiries from faculty applying for promotion and members of department and college promotion committees; reviewed promotion application folders of two faculty members who received a negative vote from a department or college promotion committee; and certified to the provost that the promotion procedures outlined in the 2019 Faculty Promotion MOA (“the Promotion MOA”) were followed in the case of one candidate for promotion but were not followed in the case of another candidate for promotion.

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Suggestions:

The University Senate Promotion Committee suggests that the University and the Rowan AFT 2373 address or clarify the following issues in negotiating the 2020 Faculty Promotion MOA:

1. The Promotion MOA provides in ¶5.644 that, in the case of a negative vote at either the department or college promotion committee level, the University Senate Promotion Committee will send its report on adherence to Promotion MOA procedures to the Provost. This is not the case in applications for promotions submitted by faculty in the Cooper Medical School of Rowan University. Those reports are sent to Senior Vice President for Medical Initiatives and Affiliated Campuses.
2. The Cooper Medical School at Rowan University Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions suspended its deliberations to confirm that the candidate for promotion met the “time in rank” requirement for promotion. The Promotion MOA does not explicitly address the authority

of a department or college promotion committee to suspend its deliberations to investigate whether the candidate meets a requirement for promotion.

3. The chair of a college promotion committee asked to see a copy of prior college committee promotion recommendations that she might use as a template for her committee's recommendation. Fortunately, Bonnie Angelone, a member of the University Senate Promotion Committee, was able to provide two letters from sample files for people who were successfully promoted and who agreed to their use as sample letters. Sample letters for use by department and college promotion committee members might be included in the "Promotion Forms or Formats" section of the MOA.
4. The chair of a department promotion committee also served as a member of the three person college promotion committee and was recused from the college promotion committee deliberations in accordance with ¶5.3313. The remaining two members voted to promote the candidate, and a minority report explaining the recusal was provided in accordance with ¶5.4231. The Promotion MOU addresses the possibility of a majority vote against promotion in ¶5.4233, but does not address the possibility of a tie vote in the case of a two member promotion committee.
5. The chair of a college promotion committee encountered serious difficulties in finding a suitable time to schedule the meeting of the college promotion committee. The Promotion MOA does not address how the college promotion committee should proceed in the event it is impossible to arrange a meeting in which all members can attend, *i.e.*, proceed with the members who actually are able to attend the meeting or schedule two meeting of the committee.
6. The Humanities and Social Sciences Promotion Committee had six members; the College of Education Promotion Committee had four members. The Promotion MOA contemplates college promotion committees having three members (¶5.4132) or five members (¶5.4133), but does not address the issue of college promotion committees having a different membership.
7. The College of Education Promotion Committee experienced difficulties in assembling a sufficient number of candidates for election, put together a three-member ballot containing the name of a faculty member who planned to retire before the committee initiated its work, and obtained two additional volunteers whose names were placed on the ballot. This occurred the weekend before the promotion applications were to be delivered to the college committee. The Promotion MOU does not address how the college or the University Senate Promotion Committee should proceed when it discovers that a candidate for the college promotion committee may not be able to serve and there are fewer than three candidates on the college committee.
8. ¶5.424 provides that, in the case of unanimous votes by the college committee, the college committee recommendation is routed to the college dean and the Provost, and that, in the case of nonunanimous votes by the college committee, the college committee recommendation is routed to college dean and the University Senate Promotion Committee. Because ¶5.424 does not specify who is responsible for to route the recommendation, the chair of a college committee requested clarification on whether the chair of the college committee or the candidate was responsible to route the recommendation. The Chair of the University Senate advised her that the chair of the college committee was responsible to do so. If that advice was correct, ¶5.424 should be clarified accordingly.
9. ¶3.143 provides: "Recommendations from evaluators outside the institution must attest to the appropriateness of the individual's research and scholarly activities to the rank of professor. Evidence for this body of work must reflect a consistent pattern of scholarly accomplishments since the date of application for promotion to associate professor." The chair of a department

promotion committee asked for clarification of the term “date of application for promotion to associate professor.” The Chair of the University Senate advised her that he interpreted the text to mean research and scholarly activities that came into existence after promotion to Associate Professor, *i.e.*, research and scholarly activities that were included in the application for promotion to Associate Professor cannot be considered, and hence only research and scholarly activities that accrue after promotion to Associate Professor are reviewed and assessed by the external evaluator. If that advice was correct, ¶3.143 should be clarified accordingly.

10. There is uncertainty among instructors who were recently tenured about the scope or period of review, more specifically whether it starts from the time they were hired as instructors or from the time they received tenure. While the Promotion MOU addresses the period of review for candidates seeking promotion to Professor, the Promotion MOU does not address the period of review for candidates seeking promotion to Assistant Professor. The Chair of the University Senate Promotion Committee advised one candidate for promotion to Assistant Professor that the review period is measured from the time the candidate was hired at the rank of Instructor. If that advice was correct, ¶3.12, which defines the rank of Assistant Professor, should be clarified accordingly.
11. The Promotion MOU specifies that certain materials may be included in the Supplemental folder. ¶1.32 provides: “Letters of testimony attesting to the quality of the service may be referenced in the document and placed in the supplemental folder.” ¶4.112342 provides that additional classroom observations may be included in the Supplemental folder. ¶4.11241 provides that additional student evaluations may be included in the Supplemental Folder. ¶5.22 provides: “Complete documentation (e.g., chapter or book) supporting an individual’s request for promotion may be incorporated by reference in the portfolio and included as supplementary documentation in the Supplemental folder.” There are no other directions given to candidates for what materials may be included in the supplemental folder. One candidate for promotion to Professor asked whether or not copies of his “grants and papers” should be included in the Supplemental folder. A member of the University Senate Promotion Committee advised him not to include copies of his grants and papers in the supplementary folder, to reference his grants and papers in his application for promotion, and to be prepared to provide copies of his grants and papers if the department or college committee requested them. Information on what materials, in addition to the four references noted above, should be included in the Promotion MOU.
12. Appendix A of the Promotion MOU delineates the materials that should be provided in the promotion packet to document teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative activity, contribution to the university community, and contribution to the wider and professional community. Contributions to the University community (¶1.3) refers to second, third, fourth and fifth year of service reviews and hence seems to have been incorrectly appropriated from the Recontracting MOU. Contributions to the Wider and Professional Community (¶1.4) also refers to second, third, fourth and fifth year of service reviews and hence seems to have been incorrectly appropriated from the Recontracting MOU).
13. ¶5.24 provides: “All letters soliciting external reviews should contain common language describing Rowan University, the promotion process, and the parameters of the requested evaluation.” This language implies that the “common language” exists somewhere, but the University Senate Promotion Committee was unable to locate it. Greater guidance should be provided in the content of the letters soliciting external reviews, e.g., whether to include the institution’s, or the college’s, or the department’s criteria or expectations for faculty research.
14. ¶1.5 provides: “Standards [for promotion] are updated regularly to provide appropriate guidance to faculty. A faculty member applying for promotion must be evaluated based on the approved

promotion document in effect when they were last promoted (or hired if they have yet to receive a promotion).” The first quoted sentence implies that the faculty member is judged by the promotion criteria in place at the time of the candidate’s application for promotion. The second sentence states the candidate for promotion is judged by the promotion document in place at the time the candidate applies for promotion. Clarifying language should be provided.

15. ¶4.11241 directs the candidate to provide "student evaluations from at least two (2) sections within two (2) academic years of the time of applying for promotion." That directive is contradicted by Appendix A Section 1.13, which says: "student responses . . . collected in at least 50% of the sections taught by the candidate (of the candidate's choice) . . .two academic years preceding the promotion application." This contradiction should be corrected.
16. Item 5 on the Faculty Promotion Checklist requires the submission of “Job Description (from initial job posting).” This is the only mention of the original job description appearing the Promotion MOU. Either the Promotion MOU should be amended to require the original job description or Item 5 should be removed from the Checklist.
17. Two paragraphs of the Promotion MOU address the selection of the external reviewer in applications for Professor:

¶5.24 “For only applicants to the rank of Professor: An external university faculty member or university official will be identified to review the applicant’s Scholarly and Creative Activities and accomplishments (only) and to comment in writing on the significance of such accomplishments. Consensus among the applicant for promotion, the Department Promotion Committee, and the College Dean must be reached on who the external reviewer will be, with the Dean having final approval of the external reviewer

5.341 The Departmental Committee will verify the qualifications and eligibility of three or more proposed external reviewers for Promotion candidates for the rank of Professor, notify the candidate of any individuals who are not acceptable for replacement, and provide the list of vetted candidates (with CVs) to the Dean for selection and approval of the external reviewer.

Both ¶ 5.24 and ¶5.341 reference the external reviewer in the singular, *i.e.*, implying that only one external reviewer is ultimately selected.

Both the Provost, the Dean of the College of Business, and members of the Accounting and Finance Department promotion committee have opined that it would be useful to have more than one external reviewer. Jerry Hough, the former AFT negotiator, has opined that the Promotion MOU limits the candidates for promotion to Professor to one external reviewer. The Promotion MOU should address whether or not the candidate for promotion to professor may obtain evaluations of their research by more than one external reviewer.

Recommendations: None.