

Problems Revealed by 1999 Faculty P&T Review Process -by Collegial Evaluation Committee

1. Failures by Department Chairs to follow established personnel management procedures threaten viability of promotion / tenure process.
2. Ambiguous / weak letters of recommendation from supervisors place unreasonable burden on higher administration (the farther away from firsthand knowledge of the applicant's performance, the less reliable the decisions become).
3. Unclear, inconsistent directions in Handbook create climate for inconsistent and arbitrary decision-making at various administrative levels.
4. Handbook directions not followed by applicants, or not followed consistently (e.g., applicants for full professorial rank are supposed to supply evidence of peer observation evaluation reports on instructional performance; none did). Summaries of instructional performance vary widely from application to application - no consistent basis for evaluation of record presented by those reviewing the record.
5. Relative purposes of successive evaluations unclear. Redundancy? Multiple perspectives? Progressive pass-through? Gatekeepers?
6. Final evaluation by off-campus decision-maker (-breaker?) not accounted for in Handbook at all.
7. Three-legged stool (teaching / research / service) only has two real legs; evaluators of faculty applications have no clear comprehension of, & no consistent way to measure the value of, applicants' professional performance in terms of service.
8. Unspecified agendas / standards used in valuing various documentary evidence of "research": "publications" = in refereed journals only? "Proceedings" / publication?)
9. Volume of material submitted unmanageable by successive reviewers; a better way might be to make the screening process progressive & interactive, with reviewers at each stage culling weak or irrelevant materials from the application, advising how to strengthen it, and moving it forward only when it's most likely to be approved at the next stage.
10. Many faculty seemingly unaware of fate of packets so laboriously prepared - with final decision being based on perhaps no more than the narrative, the vita, and the letters of recommendation specified by the review process.
11. Time & logistical support for faculty evaluation committee not adequately planned or accounted for.