

Revisions to Promotion policies approved by the General Faculty at its meeting of 4-26-2016

Motions 1-7 involve promotion to the rank of Professor. We forward them as a block, requesting a vote on them and their sub-parts as a group rather than as individual motions.

Motion #1, regarding eligibility for promotion to Professor

Create a new statement of eligibility in the Faculty Manual for promotion to Professor that entirely replaces its current statement of eligibility, as follows:

Proposed language: To be eligible to stand for promotion review for the rank of Professor, a faculty member normally will have completed at least four years of service in the rank of Associate Professor, at Union or elsewhere, and be tenured to Union College (the promotion review could occur as early as the fifth year of service). Promotion normally takes effect at the start of the academic year following a successful review. In exceptional cases, an Associate Professor who is tenured to the College may recommend himself or herself for promotion to the rank of Professor with no minimum number of years of service as Associate Professor, under the following conditions: 1) The candidate addresses in the research, teaching, and service statements how achievements in each of these categories fulfill the promotion criteria relative to the normal requirement of a minimum of four years in the rank of Associate Professor before standing for promotion review; 2) The Departmental Committee must similarly address fulfillment of the promotion standards relative to the normal requirement of a minimum of four years in the rank of Associate Professor before standing for promotion review.

Current Faculty Manual language to be replaced:

Faculty to be eligible for promotion must normally meet one of the following criteria:

- A minimum of ten years of professional work as a faculty member or equivalent professional service, and tenured to the College.
- A minimum of five years in the rank of Associate Professor at Union College, and tenured to the College.

Rationale for this motion:

We are recommending a flexible policy with respect to time requirements for eligibility that sets a norm while also allowing exceptions.

The current language poses the following challenges:

(1) The two alternative criteria are inconsistent with each other because the first requires ten years of professional service and the second requires eleven for faculty members on regularly-timed tenure track appointments (six years leading up to appointment as Associate Professor plus five additional years). Consequently, it would appear that the second criterion is effectively non-binding, and yet the presence of the second criterion suggests that the authors of the policy intended a period of service following the tenure review.

(2) The two alternative criteria create an ambiguity in the following sense: The criteria for the promotion review are as follows (FM section II, page 7): The Ph.D. or its equivalent; excellent performance as a teacher since the tenure review; continuing mature scholarship recognized by the profession...; continuing and sustained service to the College. These criteria suggest some passage of time between the tenure review and the promotion review and yet, under the ten-years-of-service criterion, the

promotion review could follow immediately upon the tenure review if the candidate had enough years of prior service before coming to Union.

(3) The current eligibility qualification, "Professional work as a faculty member or equivalent professional service" can potentially be interpreted in various ways. The College has consistently determined that tenure-track appointments, but not other types of academic appointments, satisfy this qualification. However, other interpretations are certainly possible. Our proposed eligibility language makes this question of interpretation moot as it simply permits Associate Professors to stand for promotion when nominated, to be evaluated according to the criteria laid out for promotion.

(4) The current language does not make clear whether the minimum time periods must elapse before a promotion review begins or before the promotion takes effect.

Note: For background reference, we have appended historical data showing time to promotion for current professors, in total, by division and by gender, as well as percentage promoted who were tenured between 2001 and 2010, in total and by division.

Motion #2, regarding the teaching standard for promotion to the rank of Professor

Proposed language:

Excellence in teaching, including the full range of the faculty member's teaching activities since commencement of the tenure review, which may be evidenced by contributions to the curriculum, the use of creative or innovative pedagogy, student course evaluations, course materials, peer observations of classroom visits, involvement in student research, advising and mentorship, teaching outside the classroom, pedagogical grants, other forms of educational engagement with students, and/or demonstration of pedagogical expertise.

Current language: Excellent performance as a teacher since the tenure review.

Rationale for this motion:

(1) "Excellence in teaching" would replace "Excellent performance as a teacher" to clarify that teaching quality is evaluated on a range of activities beyond student evaluations. Many examples of how excellence can be demonstrated are now included in the proposed language.

(2) This language clarifies that teaching after the start of the tenure review is included in the promotion review (since it is not included in the tenure review).

Motion #3, regarding the scholarship standard for promotion to the rank of Professor

Proposed language:

Significant and sustained scholarly achievement since commencement of the tenure review, recognized by the profession and normally demonstrated in publications and exhibitions, service to the profession, receipt of grants or awards, or similar marks of distinguished scholarly accomplishment.

Current Faculty Manual language to be replaced:

Continuing mature scholarship recognized by the profession and normally demonstrated in publications, exhibits, elections to office in national or international professional organizations, receipt of grants or awards, or similar marks of distinguished scholarly accomplishment.

Rationale for this motion: The phrase, “since commencement of the tenure review,” is inserted to make explicit the currently implicit requirement that work not included in the tenure review window is to be included here and to focus on work subsequent to the tenure review window.

“Significant and sustained” establishes a standard to provide guidance in the absence of a firm time-in-rank eligibility requirement.

“Elections to office in national or international professional organizations” has been replaced by the more general “service to the profession.”

Motion #4, regarding the service standard for promotion to the rank of Professor

Proposed language: Significant and sustained college and department/program service since the commencement of the tenure review.

Current Faculty Manual language to be replaced: Continuing and sustained service to the College

Rationale for this motion:

Since junior faculty are sometimes encouraged not to devote significant time to service and since associate professors typically do more service, the word “continuing” may not give an appropriate indication of the standard implied by current associate professor service levels. The proposed standard would give recognition to the substantial amount of service that associate professors typically undertake.

Motion #5, rewording the summary paragraph of criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor to remove irrelevant criteria for promotion, to simplify the discussion of teaching, scholarship, and service, and to clarify the role of “time-in-rank” as a criterion for promotion.

Proposed language:

In reviewing a recommendation for promotion, the College primarily considers evidence since the commencement of the tenure review in accordance with the criteria for promotion: excellence in teaching, significant and sustained scholarly achievement, and significant and sustained service, as described in the definition of the rank of Professor above (section II.I.A.4). Beyond the years of service that normally establish eligibility to stand for promotion, time-in-rank itself confers neither an advantage nor a disadvantage in meeting the criteria for promotion.

Current language:

In reviewing a recommendation for promotion, the College considers primarily teaching ability and research activity (or comparable creative activity), for it regards teaching effectiveness and substantial professional achievement as inseparably related: each enriches the other. In addition, the reviewing committee (the FRB) considers professional involvement, services to the College, and in some instances, the rank structure within the department and the fields of competence of the teacher relative to the educational goals of the institution. Time-in-rank is not to be an arbitrary factor either for or against eligibility for promotion. All recommendations for promotion are transmitted to the Board of Trustees.

Motion #6, regarding four procedural clarifications: on the initial Union appointment at the rank of Professor, on the distinction between “nomination” and “recommendation,” on the role of the

President and the Board of Trustees, and a comment indicating to the reader the presence of alternate standards for associate professors promoted with fifteen years in rank.

Motion 6A: Faculty Manual language defining ranks should clarify that the criteria for full professor apply both to appointment at or promotion to the rank of Professor

Proposed language: Promotion or appointment to this rank normally requires these attainments:

Current Faculty Manual language to be replaced: Promotion to this rank normally requires these attainments:

Motion 6B: Clarifying the distinction between “nomination” and “recommendation” in the procedures for promotion to the ranks of Professor and Senior Lecturer

Proposed language: Nominations for promotion to professor, which consist of brief statements of interest or support in standing for promotion, shall originate with the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of Academic Departments and Programs, the Chair of the Faculty Review Board, the Chair of the Department, or the faculty member himself or herself.

Also, the sentence, “In submitting this recommendation, the factors that prompt the request should be listed” will be removed.

Current language: Recommendations for promotion to professor shall originate with the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of Academic Departments and Programs, the Chair of the Faculty Review Board, the Chair of the Department, or the faculty member himself or herself”

Rationale: The first step in the promotion process, normally referred to as a “nomination” is a very brief statement indicating interest in consideration. This is followed by a “recommendation” written by a department committee to the FRB. With the changes indicated in the proposed language above, this distinction will be clear.

Motion 6C: Appropriate placement and description of action by the President and the Board of Trustees. Currently, indication that the Board acts on promotion recommendations is out-of-place, in the middle of the description of procedures. Also, the Board acts on recommendations of the President, which should be noted. The proposed language is to be inserted at the end of the procedures section for promotion to the ranks of Professor and Senior Lecturer.

Proposed language: All recommendations for promotion are transmitted to the President of the College and, if approved, subsequently are transmitted to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Motion 6D: A clarifying clause to indicate the presence of standards for promotion under the fifteen-years-as-associate-professor guidelines is added in the definition of rank section, as follows: Review procedures for full-professor promotion reviews, **which include alternate standards for faculty members coming up for promotion following fifteen years in service as a tenured associate professor,** are described in Section B below. (The language in bold is the proposed addition.)

Motion #7, regarding the list of materials to be included in the portfolio

The outdated reference to annual reviews has been updated to “Faculty Activities Sheets” and the descriptions of optional scholarly and teaching materials have been clarified.

Proposed language

- A current curriculum vitae.
- All published material or the disciplinary equivalent.
- Other scholarly materials the candidate wishes to provide such as unpublished papers and grant applications.
- Copies of the triennial reviews since the tenure review plus Faculty Activity Sheets following the last triennial review.
- Other teaching materials the candidate wishes to provide.
- Any materials in support of service activities.
- Research, teaching, and service statements.

Current language:

- A current curriculum vitae.
- Any published material or the disciplinary equivalent.
- Other scholarly work such as papers, grant applications, etc.
- Copies of the triennial reviews since the tenure decision with annual reviews attached.
- Any other relevant materials to support teaching the candidate wishes to provide.
- Any materials in support of service activities.
- A research, teaching, and service statement.

Motions 8 and 9 involve promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer. We forward them as a block, requesting a vote on them and their sub-parts as a group rather than as individual motions.

Motion #8, regarding length and nature of service for eligibility for promotion to Senior Lecturer

Proposed language:

A Lecturer must normally complete the equivalent of six years of full-time faculty appointments, not including adjunct and “overload” appointments, at Union College to be eligible for promotion, of which at least three years must be at the rank of lecturer (the promotion review can take place in the sixth year). In exceptional cases, a Lecturer may recommend himself or herself for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer with no minimum number of years of service, under the following conditions: 1) The candidate addresses in the teaching and service statement how achievements in each of these categories fulfill the promotion criteria relative to the normal requirement of a minimum of five years in the rank of Lecturer before standing for promotion review; 2) The Department report must similarly address fulfillment of the promotion standards relative to the normal requirement of a minimum of five years in the rank of Lecturer before standing for promotion review.

Current language to be replaced:

A Senior Lecturer must serve six years of full-time teaching (or the part-time equivalent of six years of full-time teaching) at Union College before being recommended for promotion.

AND it will replace this language: Faculty to be eligible for promotion to senior lecturer must normally have taught for the equivalent of six years full-time, in a capacity other than an adjunct professor, and must currently hold an appointment as lecturer.

Rationale for this motion:

Current Faculty Manual language related to this motion is as follows:

FM Section II, page 6: A Senior Lecturer must serve six years of full-time teaching (or the part-time equivalent of six years of full-time teaching) at Union College **before being recommended for promotion.**

And this on p.10: **Faculty to be eligible for promotion** to senior lecturer must normally have taught for the equivalent of six years full-time, in a capacity other than an adjunct professor, and must currently hold an appointment as lecturer.

Here the phrases “eligible for promotion” and “being recommended for promotion” are used interchangeably. Our practice for the past few years in the instance of promotion to Professor has been to consider faculty members eligible for a review in the last year of service required to establish eligibility for promotion. Previously, the number of years required for eligibility was typically before the review started.

If lecturers are eligible to stand for review in the sixth year, then in most cases the review can be concurrent with a contract renewal review, thereby allowing those reviews to be conducted concurrently, economizing on reviews.

Also, the FRB wishes to have at least three years at Union in the position of lecturer (as opposed to visitor or tenure-track) to establish a record of co-curricular activities.

Motion #9, regarding the standards for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer

Motion 9A: Insert language in the section on procedures for promotion to Senior Lecturer that makes reference to the standards for promotion articulated in the description of the Senior Lecturer rank.

Proposed language

In reviewing a recommendation for promotion to senior lecturer, the College considers primarily teaching ability and service to the faculty member’s department and to the College, including any co-curricular duties specified in the candidate’s appointment letter, in accordance with the criteria for promotion: demonstrated teaching excellence and commitment to departmental and college service, as described in the definition of the rank of Senior Lecturer above (Section II.I.A.5c).

Current language

In reviewing a recommendation for promotion to senior lecturer, the College considers primarily teaching ability and service to the faculty member’s department and to the College, including any co-curricular duties specified in the candidate’s appointment letter.

Motion 9B: The following language is redundant with the language discussed in motion 9C and should be deleted.

Current language to be deleted:

Departments may recommend for such promotions only those who are distinguished teachers and who make important contributions to their departments or to the college through service or co-curricular activities.

Motion 9C: The criteria for promotion are reworded to include co-curricular activities. Reference is made to the definition of teaching and service criteria that are considered for promotion to the rank of Professor to indicate that the same criteria apply here.

Proposed language:

Promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer requires demonstrated excellence in teaching, including co-curricular activities, and significant accomplishment in departmental and college service. The teaching and service criteria that are considered for promotion to the rank of Professor apply (see section II.I.A.4).

Current language:

The Senior Lecturer rank is associated with demonstrated teaching excellence and commitment to departmental and college service.

Motion 9D: The following language on definition of rank and criteria for promotion conflicts with the nomination procedure laid out in the section on procedures:

Current language to be deleted:

Department chairs nominate lecturers for promotion and submit supporting materials, including evidence of teaching and service excellence, to the Faculty Review Board, which can make a recommendation of promotion to the Dean of the Faculty.

Motion #10, regarding the role of department chair in the promotion review process when the chair is an associate professor

Insert language into the Faculty Manual's process for promotion to full professor that clarifies the role of the department chair when the chair holds the rank of associate professor, as follows: (to be inserted as a paragraph just before the paragraph that begins, "If a candidate has been nominated for consideration and wishes to proceed, he/she should provide the Department Chair with a portfolio containing the following information"):

Proposed language:

If the department chair of a nominee for promotion is not a full professor, the chair shall convene a meeting of all full professors of the department, at which the chair provides information about the promotion process and then turns the process over to the full professors, excusing him or herself from the remainder of the process. The full professors will then determine who will serve as chair of the promotion committee. The department chair or the full professors may call upon the Dean of Academic Departments & Programs for assistance with the selection of a promotion committee chair if necessary. The promotion committee chair will then serve in any capacity designated for the department chair throughout this review process. This process also applies in an instance of the department chair being the nominee for promotion as an associate professor.

Rationale for this motion:

The Faculty Manual seems to assume that the department chair is a full professor, which has led to confusion in the past regarding the role of the department chair when the chair is not a full professor.

Motion #11, regarding the annual meeting of the chair of the FRB and the dean of the faculty regarding associate professors eligible for promotion

Current language

The Dean of the Faculty and the Chair of the FRB shall review annually the list of Associate Professors for the purpose of selecting candidates for promotion. The record of achievement since the last promotion or since the original appointment to the Faculty of Union College determines eligibility for promotion.

Rationale for this motion:

Regarding the first sentence, the Chair of the FRB and the dean have had a meeting every summer for the purpose of reviewing lists of associate professors and lecturers eligible for promotion. The Chair of the FRB then sends messages to department chairs informing them of who is eligible for promotion to Professor according to the criteria of being fifth or fifteenth year from receiving tenure and who is eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer. The placement of the second sentence immediately following implies that the dean and chair will review faculty members' records at this time. We think this is inappropriate (and it has not been done, at least in recent years,) as there is very incomplete information at hand to do so.

Proposed changes (to be voted on as a block):

Motion 11A: The first sentence would be replaced with this sentence, "The Dean of the Faculty and the Chair of the FRB shall meet annually to ensure that relevant department chairs and program directors are accurately informed of which faculty members are associate professors with at least four years of service and which associate professors are eligible for promotion review according to the fifteen-years-from-tenure promotion process."

Motion 11B: A sentence would be inserted into the lecturer promotion language as follows, "The Dean of the Faculty and the Chair of the FRB shall meet annually to ensure that department chairs are accurately informed of which lecturers are eligible for promotion review."

Motion 11C: The second sentence, "The record of achievement since the last promotion or since the original appointment to the Faculty of Union College determines eligibility for promotion" will be moved to the beginning of the next paragraph, which outlines the basis for review. It should be reworded as follows for clarity and to be consistent with the eligibility criteria proposed in Motion #1. A reference to the location of the full description of eligibility criteria is added. "Eligibility for promotion will be determined by the record of achievement as a tenured Associate Professor, at Union or elsewhere, including achievement subsequent to the commencement of the tenure review. Eligibility criteria are outlined in section II.I.A.4 above, defining the rank of Professor."

To be voted on only if Motions 1-7 pass:

Motion #12, regarding the promotion criteria for the rank of Professor using the fifteen-years-from-tenure process: The description of teaching criteria in Motion #2 should be extended to promotion via the fifteen-year process, along with indication of how the current standard of "exemplary" teaching and service is to be addressed and established. Also, indication that scholarly materials need not be included in the portfolio has been added, noting that service to the profession may be included in the service record. Finally, explicit recognition of the fifteen year process being an option for those who have had fifteen years of service, as opposed to a requirement, has been included.

Proposed language:

If the candidate has been in the rank of Associate Professor for at least fifteen years, the FRB may consider the candidate for promotion, at his or her request, on the basis of exemplary teaching and service. The normal teaching and service criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor apply (see

section II.I.A.4,) with the addition of articulation in both the candidate's statement and the department committee recommendation of the impact of the teaching and service records that establish these as "exemplary." Scholarly work need not be included in the portfolio of materials; however, service to the profession may be included in the service record. The FRB will assess the portfolios of candidates in this group and recommend for or against promotion on this basis to the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of the Faculty.

Current language:

If the candidate has been in the rank of Associate Professor for at least fifteen years, the FRB may consider the candidate for promotion on the basis of exemplary teaching and service to the college and the profession. The FRB will assess the portfolios of candidates in this group and recommend for or against promotion on this basis to the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of the Faculty

Please see the attached data appendix

Data Appendix: These historical data showing time to promotion for current professors, in total, by division and by gender, as well as percentage promoted who were tenured between 2001 and 2010, in total and by division. Henceforth, these data will be updated annually and distributed to the faculty.

1. Length of time as Associate Professor for current Professors, by academic division, gender and promotion system

- The data presented here exclude those hired at full professor rank (4 cases) and associate professor rank (1 case).
- The "new" system replaced the "old" system in 2000.
- The number of faculty members in each section is indicated in parentheses in each column heading.

On average, how long did full professor* (old rank) or associate professor, in years?
 *Excluding those hired at full professor rank (4 cases) and associate professor rank (1 case)
 How does this vary according to academic division, gender, and promotion system (old or new)?

| Old and New System | | | | New System | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | All Divisions (91 faculty) | All Divisions, Female (32 faculty) | All Divisions, Male (59 faculty) | | All Divisions (58 faculty) | All Divisions, Female (25 faculty) | All Divisions, Male (33 faculty) |
| Mean: | 8.77 | 7.75 | 9.31 | Mean: | 8.88 | 7.64 | 9.82 |
| Median: | 8 | 7 | 8 | Median: | 7 | 7 | 9 |
| StDev: | 4.25 | 3.17 | 4.65 | StDev: | 4.08 | 3.21 | 4.45 |
| | Division I (19 faculty) | Division II, Female (7 faculty) | Division III, Male (12 faculty) | | Division I (11 faculty) | Division II, Female (5 faculty) | Division III, Male (6 faculty) |
| Mean: | 9.16 | 8.14 | 9.75 | Mean: | 10.64 | 8.6 | 12.33 |
| Median: | 8 | 8 | 8.5 | Median: | 9 | 9 | 11.5 |
| StDev: | 3.82 | 2.12 | 4.52 | StDev: | 4.20 | 2.30 | 4.84 |
| | Division III (27 faculty) | Division III, Female (10 faculty) | Division III, Male (17 faculty) | | Division III (18 faculty) | Division III, Female (8 faculty) | Division III, Male (10 faculty) |
| Mean: | 9.07 | 7.1 | 10.11 | Mean: | 8.33 | 6.88 | 9.5 |
| Median: | 8 | 7 | 7 | Median: | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| StDev: | 4.19 | 2.60 | 4.54 | StDev: | 3.66 | 1.96 | 4.35 |
| | Division III (36 faculty) | Division III, Female (13 faculty) | Division III, Male (23 faculty) | | Division III (21 faculty) | Division III, Female (10 faculty) | Division III, Male (11 faculty) |
| Mean: | 8.31 | 8.15 | 8.39 | Mean: | 8.29 | 7.9 | 8.64 |
| Median: | 7 | 7 | 8 | Median: | 7 | 7 | 9 |
| StDev: | 4.62 | 4.24 | 4.91 | StDev: | 4.26 | 4.58 | 4.13 |
| | Division IV (9 faculty) | Division IV, Female (2 faculty) | Division IV, Male (7 faculty) | | Division IV (8 faculty) | Division IV, Female (2 faculty) | Division IV, Male (6 faculty) |
| Mean: | 8.89 | 7 | 9.43 | Mean: | 9.25 | 7 | 10 |
| Median: | 7 | 7 | 6 | Median: | 7 | 7 | 9 |
| StDev: | 4.26 | 0.00 | 4.76 | StDev: | 4.40 | 0.00 | 4.94 |

2. Percentage promoted, in total, and by division, for faculty members tenured in 2001-2010.

- These faculty members are unambiguously eligible for promotion and form a group that has equal numbers of men and women (52 in all; 26 men and 26 women).
- Overall, 44% of faculty members in this group have been promoted; 46% of the men have been promoted and 42% of the women have been promoted.

| | Division | | | |
|-------------------------|----------|-----|-----|-----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Number of faculty | 17 | 14 | 15 | 6 |
| Percent promoted | 18% | 57% | 67% | 33% |
| Avg. years as associate | 8.4 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.5 |