



## Frequently Asked Questions about the Proposed Tenure and/or Promotion Document

**Q. How will the CPT be used for evaluation of faculty for the purpose of promotion and tenure?**

A. The CPT that will be used to craft a faculty member's PSP will be used as a **tool** to help in providing a more consistent and robust evaluation of faculty members. The tool should be interpreted as providing **general guidelines** for assessing a faculty member's level of accomplishment for each of the elements that make up that faculty member's PSP. Like any evaluation tool, however, the CPT is only intended to help with the evaluation process and should **not be interpreted as the absolute criteria for determining a faculty member's level of accomplishment** for a particular element. **The professional opinion and expertise of the people evaluating the faculty member is of critical importance in the evaluation process.** Ultimately, any final assessment of the faculty member's level of achievement for a particular element, overall level of achievement, and tenure and/or promotion decisions are at the discretion of those involved in the evaluation process using their **best professional judgment after carefully examining all of the evidence provided by the faculty member.**

**Q. Can I change my PSP after it is finalized?**

A. Yes! **Faculty members can change their PSP at any time during the "pre-promotion" period and beyond.** However, the PSP will encourage a faculty member to have conversations with their department chair or mentor about their career, particularly when a new opportunity arises.

**Q. What is the purpose of a CPT?**

A. The purpose of the CPT is to help faculty understand more clearly what they need to do to be successful in being promoted. It is also there to help inspire faculty imagination of what they can do in their faculty role and be credited for. Lastly, the CPT because of its integral linkage to the University of Dayton mission seeks to help shape the development of faculty capable of advancing our mission.

**Q. What is the purpose of a PSP?**

A. The main purpose of the PSP is for **faculty members to have a better understanding of what they need to do in order to be successful in getting promoted or getting tenure.** The other purpose of a PSP is to **help a faculty member plan their career, engage in conversations with their department chair or mentor about their career, make informed decisions regarding their career, and prioritize their work.** The PSP also is an asset to faculty involved in the evaluation process of peers seeking promotion - enabling greater homogeneity and fairness in the assessment. The PSP can be compared to the flow charts we give our incoming students. We would not tell a first-year student when they come in that in order to graduate they have to be successful in technical courses, electives, and CAP courses but not give them guidance on the courses they need or should take and when they should take these courses. Instead, we give them a flow chart that provides some guidance on what courses they have to take (required courses are like the Core elements for faculty), courses that they have to take but have choice to take whatever they want (open elective courses are like the elected elements), and then, their CAP

courses, where they have some choice but they have to fit within certain categories (CAP courses are like the broader impact elected element). We also set some minimum level of threshold for graduating (must have a 2.0 in their major), which is similar to maintaining a certain level of achievement in the core elements. When we advise students, we use this flow chart as a conversation starter to help our students navigate their eight semesters at UD. We have conversations with them about what interests them and what they want to do with their career based on these flow charts. A faculty member's PSP would be used in a similar manner, where they would have conversations with the department chair or mentors about what interests them and what their goals are in selecting the various elements. Finally, students often make changes to their academic path. They may add or eliminate a minor, they may initially plan on taking one technical elective, but found their interests have changed, and they select another instead. They would make these changes in consultation with an adviser. A PSP is similar in that it can also be changed in consultation with the faculty member's department chair.

**Q. Can the CPT be modified or can additional elements be added to the CPT?**

**A. YES! The CPT is only a tool. It is not the tenure and/or promotion document.** Although the CPT was thoughtfully developed over a significant amount of time, vetted by numerous faculty from both within and outside the School and University, and "validated" by using it to evaluate 20 faculty members at UD; the Re-visioning Committee acknowledges that it would be impossible to identify all of the contributions and activities that faculty members engage in, or to create guidelines for the various levels of accomplishment that can universally apply for all faculty members. Elements can be added to the CPT at any time. These additions are initiated by a faculty member, approved by the faculty member's department chair and the School Faculty Development Committee. The elements then become part of the CPT and can be used by other faculty members in the School. Finally, the descriptions of the various levels of accomplishment for any element are only to be used as a tool or guidelines for evaluation purposes. If a faculty member feels that they have achieved a certain level of accomplishment for a given element, but the evidence does not wholly align with the description for that level of accomplishment, the faculty member can provide an explanation as to why they believe they have met that level of accomplishment. The various people involved in the evaluation processes (annual performance reviews through promotion and tenure evaluations) will use their professional expertise to make the final assessment.

**Q. Isn't the new document just a lot of box checking?**

**A.** Any evaluation policy can be interpreted as "box checking." Our current promotion and tenure policy lists scholarship, teaching and service. Under each of these categories, it lists various activities that "count" for that particular category. When faculty members fill out their application for promotion and tenure, they will provide a list of activities or their SET scores under these different activities. The proposed policy and proposed application would be similar. However, for both the current and proposed policies, faculty members supplement these lists with narratives and other evidence in their portfolios. **Therefore, the proposed policy is no more of a box checking exercise than our current policy.**

**Q. How would faculty members present their information for each element? Wouldn't this take a lot more documentation?**

**A.** The form used for faculty members to present their information is organized by element (see the forms) in the proposed policy. **Therefore, faculty members would simply provide the information and**

**evidence under the relevant element. This is very similar to the current Faculty Activity Report that we use, but the information is organized differently. No additional evidence would be required than what is currently required on the Faculty Activity Report or Application for Promotion and Tenure.** Furthermore, the proposed form (Summary of Evidence) is cumulative. Faculty members would add to this form each year. Therefore, when they go to apply for promotion or tenure, their summary of evidence form will be complete. This is much different than what we currently do. Currently, there is a separate application for tenure that takes a great deal of time to fill out. It requires that a faculty member provides evidence for each of the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service for the six years since they were hired or since their last promotion. This takes a significant amount of time to do this. Under the proposed system, this information would already be compiled saving faculty members a significant amount of time.

**Q. Why do we have to add diversity and inclusion in P&T and why is The Diversity and Inclusion core element simply require participation in workshops?**

A. The new University P&T document will have elements related to diversity and inclusion, therefore, diversity and inclusion will have to be part of our P&T document. **The Re-visioning Committee acknowledges that the bar for the Diversity and Inclusion Core Element is very low. This was intentional since this is a significant change to the policy. Since many people are just beginning their journey related to understanding diversity, equity, and inclusion, participation in various workshops is a good first step.** This element was vetted by experts from across campus and outside of UD, and they agree with this assessment. That being said, there are additional opportunities for a faculty member to engage with topics of diversity, equity and inclusion through their choice of various elected elements.

**Q. Doesn't the proposed policy make it easier for a faculty member to get promoted or to get tenure?**

A. NO! There are two things that ensure this. One is that a faculty member must maintain a minimum level of proficient in all of the Core elements. The second is that a faculty member must maintain an overall level of achievement (accomplished or demonstrated leadership depending on the rank they are applying for) in order to get promoted or get awarded tenure. **The policy, simply more explicitly, recognizes a broader range of contributions and provides evaluators on committees clearer guidance on the evidence needed to support promotion.**

**Q. Doesn't the proposed policy make it more difficult for a faculty member to get promoted or to get tenure and to do more things?**

A. NO! The activities listed as elements in the CPT are very similar to the activities or evidence listed in the current document, it is just that the CPT breaks down a single activity or evidence into smaller pieces. In order to ensure that the proposed policy did not do this, the CPT was vetted and tested. We used twenty different faculty applications for promotion and tenure and used the CPT to assess these. Based on this, faculty members had activity in anywhere from 14 to 28 elements. The proposed document only requires that a tenure track faculty member be assessed on ten elements. Furthermore, the outcomes were identical using the proposed system as compared to the current system.

**Q. The proposed policy requires minimal proficiency in a total of six Core elements for tenure track faculty, only two of which are directly related to teaching. Given that teaching generally comprises 75% of the workload of faculty, this seems to understate the importance of education as a primary faculty role. Is this true? Are all Core elements weighted equally?**

A. Yes, all core elements are weighted equally. However, **there is a statement in the document that indicates that a higher level of performance is generally expected in the Core elements related to teaching, scholarship or professional practice (dependent on faculty role: lecturer, faculty of practice, tenure track/tenured faculty, see sections 2.4.4., 3.4.4., 4.4.4.).** There is also a statement that states:

*It is important to note that all of the elements in a faculty of practice's PSP are considered to be of equal importance and value regardless of them being a core, an elected, or a broader impact element and regardless of them being from the area of scholarship, teaching, service, or leadership. This is not meant, however, to imply that the workload associated with each element is the same. It would be difficult to capture workload in a person's PSP, and all issues related to workload should be discussed between the faculty member and the department chair.*

Furthermore, although for a typical faculty member, teaching comprises 75%-100% of their workload, we have many faculty members where that is not the case. For example, we have faculty members that have course buy-out due to research funding. In this case, teaching may only comprise 25% of their workload. We have other faculty members that have buy-out due to some administrative duties, serving as a fellow, or serving as something like a faculty ambassador. The main thing to keep in mind is that a faculty member's PSP is not developed in isolation. **The PSP is developed in consultation with a faculty member's department chair.** Additionally, a faculty member's PSP has to be approved by the department chair and the Department Faculty Development Committee. The finalized PSP will include core, broader impact, and elected elements; actions that a faculty member will take to achieve a certain level of performance for each element; and a timeline for completing these actions. **There are also elected elements and broader impact elements that are directly related to teaching. Therefore, a faculty member can choose a PSP that is more focused on teaching if they so choose. Similarly, if a faculty member is more focused on scholarship, they can choose elected and broader impact elements that are directly related to scholarship.** The intent is to move from three rigid models (Teacher, Teacher/Scholar, and Scholar) to more shades of gray in between. This provides faculty members with the ability to not be locked into a single model and to better able align their activities with their interests and the needs of the department and School.

**Q. Why did the deadline for submitting the annual performance review move up?**

A. The cycle for performance review moved up **to allow the department chairs more time to do a thoughtful and thorough evaluation of faculty members and still meet the deadlines for merit review required by the University.** The new due date is mid-December, as opposed to very early January, but faculty members will be reminded of the need to complete their annual performance review much earlier (early October) as well. This will also help faculty members use the holiday break to relax and prepare for the next semester instead of working on their annual performance review.