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Executive Summary

Background

The Provost’s Task Force on Promotion and Tenure was appointed by then-Provost Dr. Timothy Sands and Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Dr. Beverly Davenport Sypher to examine promotion and tenure (P&T) policies at Purdue University. While practices and procedures surrounding P&T have evolved over the years to address changing issues and expectations, the policies themselves had not been comprehensively reviewed since the 1970s.

Purdue’s policies regarding promotion, tenure, and extensions of the tenure clock are currently addressed in several documents, namely an annual memorandum on promotion and tenure from the Office of the Provost (West Lafayette Campus); Executive Memorandum No. B-48 (issued under the administration of former Purdue President Arthur G. Hansen); Executive Memorandum No. B-50 (also issued under President Hansen); and the Tenure Clock Extension Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines, which were presented at the University Senate in January 2007.

The Task Force addressed its charge in the context of eight working groups.

1) Collegiality
2) Impact
3) Interdisciplinary Initiatives/Joint Appointments
4) Teaching & Learning
5) Review
6) Tenure Timeline
7) Concept of Tenure
8) Post-Tenure Review

The Task Force discussed and voted on findings and recommendations from each group. Additionally, other issues that did not fall under the purview of a particular group were
addressed and voted upon by the entire Task Force. Twenty-five resulting recommendations are listed herein.

The Task Force did not address grievances and appeals related to tenure. Additionally, while the Task Force recognizes the importance of defining policies for all faculty, this review was limited to policies related to tenure-track faculty.

Findings

Collegiality

At Purdue, collegiality is not mentioned or implied in any criteria used for promotion, nor is it mentioned specifically as one of the criteria for termination. Similarly, none of the 13 Committee on Institutional Cooperation Institutions (CIC) institutions has a formal policy to address collegiality as part of their promotion and tenure (P&T) process. However, many of these institutions address “concerns of civility” or “relations with colleagues” in their Human Resources (HR) faculty handbooks. At five other institutions investigated by the Collegiality Committee, collegiality is rarely addressed in direct regard to P&T.

Collegiality was raised as one of many factors in certain federal and state court cases where an individual was denied tenure or dismissed from a tenured position. Among these cases, some universities used collegiality as a separate criterion and others incorporated it into the traditional criteria of teaching, research, and service.

Many universities recognize the importance of collegiality and expect faculty members to be cooperative, constructive, and respectful. Furthermore, faculty place high importance on a collegial university environment. However, critics of collegiality policy suggest that inclusion of collegial behaviors in faculty evaluations could hinder academic freedom by not allowing for dissent and could be used to discriminate against professors with opposing viewpoints. The Collegiality Committee believes that these concerns could be addressed by careful specification of behavioral expectations.
Impact

Alternative, non-traditional forms of impact are being recognized more frequently at Purdue, requiring increased attention on how to assess candidates’ impact reliably, make the process fair, explain negative decisions, and develop some degree of standardization across the colleges and schools. Clarity about what will be valued, measured, and rewarded is important at all levels, but especially for junior faculty.

The Impact Committee believes that faculty in a particular discipline can best determine what should count as “impact.” Units should be able to determine what impact looks like in the fields represented, and deans and department heads/chairs should be informed about field context when presenting candidates.

Permission – Guiding principles should allow room for Purdue’s regional institutions to determine appropriate impact measures for their purposes and land-grant missions.

Constraints – Junior faculty are often inclined toward interdisciplinary activity and collaborative projects and could feel constrained by a culture that does not embrace these elements.

Engagement – Engagement should be distinguished from the kinds of service that constitute good citizenship in a college or school, department, land-grant university, and organization. There should be clarity regarding how it will be documented, measured, and rewarded.

Teaching, Scholarship, and Engagement – Current guidelines and categories on University forms do not invite documentation of certain activities.

Globalization and Diversity – Reference to international activity should be present and clear in pertinent policy, principles, guidelines, and forms, and should be encouraged for one or more of the teaching, scholarship, and engagement areas. Similarly, scholarly
activity with impact on enhancing and building respect for diversity on campus and beyond should be valued and rewarded.

**Interdisciplinary Initiatives/Joint Appointments**

Interdisciplinary efforts are needed to solve many of the most important problems and provide opportunities for faculty to move into new academic fields and learn new things while contributing to new applications. These activities also enhance the University’s ability to compete for external research funding.

Purdue does provide physical space for interdisciplinary research (Discovery Park) and emphasizes interdisciplinary activity in strategic planning. Additionally, Purdue formed the Interdisciplinary Initiatives Committee (under the leadership of the University Senate) to propose guidelines for the consideration of interdisciplinary activity in promotion cases.

Universities are traditionally organized by discipline. Hence, any truly interdisciplinary activity is generally neither commensurate with the goals of a discipline-focused organization nor to the incentive, reward, or promotion systems that support it. The Committee supports methods that formally recognize and reward interdisciplinary activities.

**Teaching & Learning**

Big Ten peers, aspirational peers, and other institutions have a clear commitment to teaching and learning in their P&T processes. At Purdue, there is only a brief mention of teaching in the Terms of Employment and Tenure policies. Purdue regional campuses and Purdue-West Lafayette colleges/schools vary in how they value and evaluate teaching and its effectiveness in promoting learning. The Committee recommends that the Purdue system adopt a clear commitment to teaching and learning in the P&T process, such as the inclusion of a statement that diligence and ability in teaching and learning are required for any tenure commitment.
Review

Within the framework of Purdue’s Terms of Employment and Tenure policies, each of Purdue’s system-wide campuses has implemented review committees differently, reflecting academic autonomy and differences in size, role, and mission. Similarly, colleges and schools have implemented review committees in ways that meet their unique needs.

An analysis of processes at seven peer universities suggests that the current system at Purdue is strong and provides reasonable representation of faculty. Within the policy, each college and campus should define and widely communicate its own process in order to maintain flexibility, allowing for individual differences such as faculty representation, adequate faculty and administrator balance, and how the department head/chair and number of full professors count toward the requisite numbers of reviewers.

Tenure Timeline

If a goal of an academic institution is to develop a first-rate faculty that excels in research, teaching, and service, then it is important to set policies surrounding the granting of tenure, a highly valued option among faculty.

Since the establishment of the standard seven-year tenure clock in the 1940s, requirements for scholarship and tenure have become much more rigorous (particularly in the sciences), demographics have evolved, faculty life has changed, and independent research support is occurring at a later age. As a result, many national leaders in higher education support the creation of a flexible tenure-track faculty career path, and a number of highly ranked academic institutions have either instituted or are considering instituting an 8–10-year tenure clock.

A flexible tenure clock would allow individuals who are able to demonstrate the required capabilities within a shorter period of time to be recognized and promoted when it is warranted to do so. An extended tenure clock would allow faculty sufficient time to demonstrate an ability to sustain extramural funding. Despite these apparent benefits, the
Committee also recognized that there are significant concerns about policy related to tenure clock extension. For example, an extended time clock could instead delay P&T for those who are qualified or could lead to ambiguity in tenure requirements. Furthermore, an extended clock could allow highly accomplished faculty to be recruited away from Purdue by other universities during that extended time.

**Concept of Tenure and Post-Tenure Review**

The Concept of Tenure Committee work was completed in conjunction with the Post-Tenure Review Committee, and the findings and recommendations are closely linked.

Well-defined processes for faculty annual review and merit conducted at the unit, school, or college levels have been in place for many years. Purdue should be proactive in establishing a process for continuous faculty performance assessment in an effort to maintain procedural transparency and public accountability.

Procedures for assuring and rewarding faculty continuous development are not new at Purdue. However, currently Purdue lacks a process for assuring sustained faculty performance or for providing faculty with important mid-career feedback for full and associate professors. Purdue should implement a constructive, unit-initiated and Provost-approved process of post-tenure reviews for all faculty.

**Final Recommendations**

**Collegiality**

1. Recognizing that creating a collegial academic working environment involves participation from all faculty at all ranks, we recommend including collegiality expectations for all reviews of faculty. These expectations would be part of the guidelines provided to department heads/chairs or appropriate personnel for annual reviews, named and distinguished chairs, and awards, promotion and tenure reviews and any other reviews normally done for faculty. While it is not envisioned that these expectations would be a dominant discriminator in the assignment of merit raises, it is anticipated that they will have a positive effect in
improving the social climate and collaborative environment. We would expect that research, teaching, and service would continue to be critical factors in any review discussions.

2. Recognizing the difficulties in specifying a set of collegial behaviors that promote a positive academic environment but do not hinder academic freedom or suppress the expression of opposing viewpoints, we recommend that indicators found throughout the literature serve as examples only. They are not meant to be a checklist but more of a sampling of non-collegial behaviors.

Impact

3. There is to be regular discussion and identification of indicators of impact and these indicators of impact should be clearly communicated to all faculty.

Interdisciplinary Initiatives/Joint Appointments

4. University promotion and tenure policy should explicitly recognize interdisciplinary activities. The university promotion policy should contain guidelines for considering interdisciplinary activities in promotion cases. To begin this process, the university promotion and tenure policy should explicitly recognize interdisciplinary activities in learning, discovery, and engagement and modify the form 36 instructions accordingly.

5. Candidates may also include a statement highlighting their interdisciplinary activities. This statement may include the candidate’s relative contribution to the projects that are listed. It should also describe how this work has led to new opportunities as well as how these efforts have influenced the candidate’s overall development as a faculty member.

6. It is recognized that the primary committee may have difficulty evaluating the strengths and significance of the interdisciplinary efforts. Therefore, departments/schools may wish to ask for additional advisory input on the
interdisciplinary accomplishments. This could include review from both Purdue and non-Purdue faculty. It may also include a statement of work and responsibilities from collaborators named by the candidate.

7. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be developed for all faculty hired through joint appointments. The MOU should define the processes and expectations for all parties, including teaching, research, engagement, and administrative loads, voting rights and responsibilities, and involvement of each tenure and promotion committee.

Teaching & Learning

8. Require documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role for any tenure commitment.

9. Implement policy on documentation of teaching effectiveness, using “University Senate Document 97-9” as a foundation. This policy must focus on student learning outcomes facilitated by appropriate content knowledge, sound pedagogical practices, valid assessment processes, and plans for improvement. This policy must be flexible and take a menu approach given disciplinary, college, individual, and campus variation. One size does not fit all. This policy would include the following:

a. Minimum requirements for documentation of teaching and learning effectiveness for promotion and tenure, which could include:
   - Information or data about course evaluations as appropriate
   - Enrollment by course
   - Syllabi
   - Self-evaluation of effectiveness in teaching and learning, including efforts to improve
   - Contributions to department/program student learning outcomes

b. A menu of evidence to document effectiveness in teaching and learning, adapted from “Scholarship and Excellence of Teaching for Learning from the
College of Agriculture, November 2010.” This would be an appendix to the Promotion and Tenure policy.

**Review**

The Committee concludes that levels of review are generally working well. As Purdue is a system with differentiated campuses it is appropriate for broad promotion and tenure policy to be system-wide, with campus-specific procedures and implementation. Within the broad policy each college and campus should define its own process, allowing for individual differences. For example, faculty representation, adequate balance between faculty and administrators, and how the department head/chair and number of full professors count toward the requisite numbers of reviewers, all should be determined by the college or campus to maintain flexibility.

10. To foster clarity, procedures and processes used to determine review committee membership and the process of the review at all levels should be written and disseminated to all faculty.

11. Each college, school, or campus must determine and clearly disseminate expectations for letters of assessment that are to be included in a candidate’s documentation for promotion. Minimally, such guidelines must include expectations for the number of letters, internal versus external referees, and the acceptability of the nature of referees’ relationships with the candidate (e.g., collaborators, co-authors, former mentors).

12. Conflict of interest should be specifically addressed in the promotion and tenure committee review process. The Committee asks that the Provost’s Office obtain information on any such policies that may be in use at the campus or college level, which could be adapted for use system-wide.

13. The following addition (underlined) should amend Section III (in the paragraph that addresses voting) of the Provost’s annual promotion and tenure memorandum.
“All eligible members participating in promotion committee deliberations are required to vote on all candidates unless a conflict of interest with a particular candidate has been identified, in which instance the member should also exclude himself/herself from all discussion and deliberation of a candidate’s case.”

14. The current policy about granting tenure to new faculty appointments in which tenure is effective with the start-date of the contract, as described in Section III of the annual promotion and tenure memorandum from the Provost should be changed to “Primary and Area Promotion Committee” because of the importance of the individual’s relationship with faculty members that make up the department and its Primary Committee.

15. The following addition (underlined) should amend Section III (regarding the right to receive a copy the promotion document) of the Provost’s annual promotion and tenure memorandum. “A candidate should be given the opportunity to help create and review his/her promotion documentation and may receive a copy of any document (with confidential materials, including but not limited to letters; department head/chair statements; and Dean’s statements, omitted) that will be submitted to the primary, area, and/or University committee(s).”

**Tenure Timeline**

16. All assistant professors should be reviewed annually for progress toward tenure and promotion and be given written feedback.

17. All associate professors should be reviewed and provided with written feedback on their progress toward promotion at intervals not to exceed two years.

18. The guidelines for extension of the tenure clock should be incorporated as an integral part of the revised tenure and promotion policies.
19. The following addition (underlined) should amend Item #1 of the current guidelines for extension of the tenure clock in the January 2007 Tenure-Clock Extension Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines document. “…provided a Request for Tenure-Clock Extension form is submitted within one year of the occurrence and prior to July 1 of the penultimate year…”

20. The following addition (underlined) should amend the Principles and Policies for Academic Freedom, Responsibilities, and Tenure, and Procedures for Termination for Cause, No. B-48, to simplify the process that defines specific years. “II.C.2. Also eligible for tenure are professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who hold part-time appointments of not less than 50% of full-time and whose duties include the normal responsibilities of full-time faculty members, including teaching, research, and service. The procedures for obtaining tenure are the same as those for full-time faculty members as described in a. above. However, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period by following the tenure clock extension policy.”

Concept of Tenure


II. Tenure Policies

B. Purdue University is committed to excellence with an emphasis on equity within the process. Tenure ensures academic freedom and should promote creative, innovative pursuits. Tenure at Purdue University is a matter of policy and not a legal obligation binding on the University. Tenure policies are subject to change by the Board of Trustees, and it follows that all appointments to the faculty are subject to such changes. It is the policy of the University to renew appointments of faculty members who have attained tenured status,
subject always to the availability of funds, the continuance of activities in the area of employment, and the absence of circumstances which would otherwise entitle the University to terminate the appointment for cause. Tenure is effective only at the particular campus of the University where it was acquired.

22. The following addition should be made under item D of the Procedures in Cases for Termination for Cause section (III.D.1.) of the Principles and Policies for Academic Freedom, Responsibilities, and Tenure, and Procedures for Termination for Cause, No. B-48.

III. Procedures in Cases for Termination for Cause
   D. Formal Procedures
      1. Adequate cause for termination of the employment of a faculty member from a tenured position or before the expiration of the term of appointment of a non-tenured faculty member will include proven incompetence, gross neglect of duty, moral turpitude, or improper conduct injurious to the welfare of the University, or a record of sustained unsatisfactory performance as determined by Provost-approved [or Chancellor-approved], college-specific procedures. Other actions inconsistent with the responsibilities of a member of the academic community may provide adequate cause for removal, but the principles set forth in I. above shall not be violated. Improper conduct injurious to the welfare of the University either by individuals or by groups shall include (but not by way of limitation) obstruction or disruption of the teaching, research, administration, disciplinary procedures, or other University activities, or of other authorized activities on University premises, or inciting others to conduct having such effects.
Post-Tenure Review

23. Each unit will be asked to identify a constructive PTR process appropriate to the mission of the unit subject to Provost [or Chancellor] approval.

24. The process developed should build on processes already in place such as annual review.

25. The process is intended to be initiated at the College, School, or Campus level on the assumption that one process will not fit all Purdue University academic units.

Conclusion

The Task Force engaged in thorough analysis and deliberation over several months. It is the Task Force’s hope that the complete report will inform discussions and deliberations system-wide at Purdue. The findings of each working group and the final recommendations of the Task Force suggest that current promotion and tenure policies at Purdue can benefit from some changes in implementation and practice in order to meet the needs and expectations of the contemporary academic community. Such modifications should facilitate success of our faculty and, thus, that of the University as a whole. Purdue has many different academic environments that benefit from implementation flexibility. Thus, the recommendations focus on suggestions for common frameworks and development of expectations that are consistent across the University, while enabling the flexibility among units that is crucial for the preservation of an excellent academic institution.
Preface

The Provost’s Task Force on Promotion and Tenure was appointed by then-Provost Dr. Timothy Sands and Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Dr. Beverly Davenport Sypher to examine the promotion and tenure policies at Purdue University. While practices and procedures surrounding promotion and tenure have evolved over the years to address changing issues and expectations, the policies themselves had not been comprehensively reviewed since the 1970s. Purdue’s policies regarding promotion, tenure, and extensions of the tenure clock are currently addressed in several documents [Appendices 4-7], namely an annual memorandum on promotion and tenure from the Office of the Provost (West Lafayette Campus); Executive Memorandum No. B-48 (issued under the administration of former Purdue President Arthur G. Hansen); Executive Memorandum No. B-50 (also issued under the administration of President Hansen); and the Tenure Clock Extension Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines, which were presented at the University Senate in January 2007. The Task Force accepted its charge to address issues relevant to promotion and tenure and recommend modifications to current policies, which will support Purdue’s mission and 21st century goals.

The Task Force addressed its charge in the context of eight working groups, each of which examined a major issue. Findings and recommendation from each group were presented to the entire Task Force for discussion and subsequent vote. Additionally, other issues that did not necessarily fall under the purview of a particular working group were addressed and voted upon by the entire Task Force. Initial recommendations of each working group, brief accounts of discussion, “pros” and “cons” of recommendations, and, in the cases of recommendations that passed or rejected with split votes, the concerns of the minority opposition are included herein. Twenty-five final recommendations are compiled at the end of the report. It is the Task Force’s hope that this account will inform discussions and deliberations among Purdue’s system-wide faculty as they consider the recommendations presented in this report.
Given the scope of the charge and the desire to develop recommendations in a timely fashion, the Task Force did not address the issue of grievances and appeals related to tenure, suggesting that perhaps a separate group is required to study this issue and examine it carefully in the context of other existing University grievance policies. Additionally, it should be noted that while the Task Force recognizes the importance of defining policies for all faculty, including research- and clinical-track faculty, our charge was limited to review of and recommendations for policies related to only tenure-track faculty.

As the Task Force addressed its charge, we recognized that many of the processes that we believe represent “best practices” for promotion and tenure are also important for general faculty development and retention at Purdue and, as such, deserve mention. Collegiality and good citizenship were recognized by the Task Force as characteristics which should be valued. These attributes among members of the academic community contribute to the overall quality of the University, and enable effective and fair promotion and tenure processes that maintain standards of excellence while embracing individuality and diversity of achievement. Clarity of performance expectations and of the processes for review and assessment of achievements are critical aspects of faculty review at all levels. Similarly, timely, regular, and constructive feedback must be provided to all faculty members, both preceding and following consideration of tenure. Finally, an attitude of accountability among individuals and at all levels of the University organization is essential to ensure effectiveness of procedures and policies that are eventually adopted by the faculty and administration.

The reports of each working group and the final recommendations of the Task Force suggest that current promotion and tenure policies at Purdue can benefit from some changes in implementation and practice in order to meet the needs and expectations of the contemporary academic community. Such modifications should facilitate success of our faculty and, thus, that of the University as a whole. Purdue has many different academic environments that benefit from implementation flexibility. Thus, the recommendations focus on suggestions for common frameworks and development of expectations that are
consistent across the University, while enabling the flexibility among units that is crucial for the preservation of an excellent academic institution.
Charge

November 7, 2011

Over the past three or four decades, the nature and scope of university faculty work has become increasingly complex. Tenure policies have been slow to reflect changes. Evaluation processes also have changed slowly and not always reflected changing expectations. Globalization and commercialization are just two examples of changing faculty expectations and practices that are not clearly delineated in Purdue’s promotion and tenure policy. Interdisciplinary and joint appointments are also a contemporary reality and not addressed in our promotion and tenure policy. In the last decade, many universities have modified policies to extend the probationary period to help untenured faculty members meet the challenges of work-life balance (e.g., child birth, parental care, extended illnesses, etc.). More recently, universities have modified the probationary period to account for the time it takes those in some disciplines to demonstrate impact. Medical schools, for example, have led this recent move to extend the tenure clock to nine or 10 years, in part because it takes an average of eight years for most faculty members to land their first R01 award from the National Institutes of Health (NIH). At some universities, the time to tenure varies across colleges. Despite the tenure policy reviews undertaken in recent years at most of our peer institutions and the many changes in faculty work life, Purdue has not examined its entire policy since the late 1970s. It seems more than time to begin this work. We are charging the Provost’s Task Force on Promotion and Tenure to examine the issues below and any other issues deemed relevant to such a review. The goal is to recommend by April 1, 2012, a draft of suggested modifications to Purdue’s Tenure and Promotion policy.
Issues to be considered by the Task Force include:

9) **Impact and how it should be measured:** (e.g., citations in h-indices vs. number of publications in high impact journals; licensed technology instead of invention disclosures or both; impact on policy as well as or instead of participation on committees; outcomes of sponsored research instead of or in addition to dollars awarded; success of graduate students instead of or as well as number of graduate students guided to a degree; the number and kind of courses and students taught vs. how creative pedagogy changed the teaching and learning of a discipline; etc.).

10) **Time to tenure:** Eliminating the concept of early consideration; using impact instead of time elapsed to determine when one is considered for tenure; reconsidering the six-year timeframe.

11) **Teaching and learning:** How can we better value and evaluate teaching and its effectiveness in promoting learning? Should we explicitly highlight synergy between the discovery and learning missions (e.g., through undergraduate research; development of inquiry-based or authentic research experiences in coursework; more attention to intentional efforts to mentor and develop graduate students; etc.)?

12) **Alternative indicators of impact:** Although peer review is generally required of scholarly products used in evaluating faculty, should we also value reach and exposure beyond scholarly products? How do we value a lecture online that has “gone viral” or an online class that attracts thousands of students, or a blog that generates thousands of responses? Do we value contributions of faculty who serve as experts in popular news forums or testify before governing bodies? Do we limit consideration of such impact to those instances when the exposure is directly related to a peer-reviewed scholarly product or a body of scholarly work?
13) **Post-tenure review:** Should we institute post-tenure review, and if so, what form(s)? Should we develop a “ladder” or one or two additional levels for which an external review is performed and additional salary bonuses are offered? Should there at least be an opportunity for periodic reflection on career direction following promotion to professor?

14) **The concept of tenure:** Is it time to reconsider the nature of the tenured faculty position? In its present incarnation, tenured faculty members are expected both to develop new knowledge and disseminate existing knowledge through teaching and engagement, but the current policy only requires excellence in one area. We try to value synergy between these roles, and we expect excellence in research along with teaching and engagement. Is there a need to reconsider how excellence is defined and what categories will be reviewed and how? Or, is there a need to expand our definitions of faculty with more focused roles? Should we be more flexible in terms of leaves and joint appointments across institutions?

15) **Interdisciplinary work and joint appointments:** There are growing numbers of faculty who work at the crossroads between disciplines. Many would contend that the most important problems can only be solved through multiple perspectives focused together on them. Many of our faculty are educated in interdisciplinary ways, and many of our faculty have interdisciplinary affiliations. That was the explicit intent of Discovery Park centers. Despite increasing numbers of calls for interdisciplinary proposals and faculty working in interdisciplinary areas, our promotion and tenure policy does not account for these variations. Is it time to address both internal as well as external joint appointments? How would the policy be modified to capture our aspirations?
16) **External letters:** How many letters should be expected? Who should be exempt from writing external letters? What do we mean by “collaborators?” Should all collaborators be exempt?

17) **Review committees:** How should committees be populated? Voted on by peers, appointed by dean or the Provost, assignment by position (heads, deans, appointed/elected representatives from University Senate, colleges, departments, rank, etc.)?

18) **Appealing promotion and tenure decisions:** At present, tenure decisions are not grievable through the University Faculty Grievances policy. Only procedural grievances are allowable, and those are to be taken directly to the Provost. The procedures for such are not detailed. A number of our peers have policies that allow for appeals at each decision-making level, and others only allow for procedural appeals, but the process is detailed in the promotion and tenure policy. Should tenure decisions be grievable? If so, at what level and under what circumstances?

19) **Collegiality:** Should collegiality or civility be an evaluation criterion for promotion and tenure? If so, how might it be defined and evaluated?
In examining the issues on this list and others of interest, investigate how our aspirational peers have modified their promotion and tenure policies in the past decade. Talk with colleagues and administrators at peer institutions and examine materials provided online. Consider what we can learn from the early outcomes of their modified policies and procedures, and develop a revised policy that incorporates what appear to be the best practices that support Purdue University’s mission and 21st century goals.

Respectfully,

Tim Sands
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost

Beverly Davenport Sypher
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Collegiality

The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines collegiality as “the cooperative relationship of colleagues” and civility as “a polite act or expression.” For the purposes of the Promotion and Tenure Task Force Report, the term “collegiality” includes the concept of civility.

The Collegiality Committee approached the issue from many angles—through literature review; investigation of promotion and tenure practices at fellow CIC institutions; research from other institutions that are or have used collegiality as part of their promotion and tenure criteria; review of Purdue’s current policies; and legal analysis.

Current State

Purdue University

At Purdue, collegiality is not mentioned or implied in any of the criteria used for promotion. It is not bundled explicitly with the University’s missions of discovery, learning, or engagement. Also, collegiality is not mentioned specifically as one of the criteria for termination.

Academe

Committee on Institutional Cooperation Institutions

The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) was established in 1958 by the Big Ten university presidents to “build bridges of cooperation across state and institutional boundaries.”¹ The current CIC Member Institutions are listed below.

None of the CIC institutions have a formal policy to address collegiality as part of their promotion and tenure (P&T) process. However, many of these institutions address “concerns of civility” or “relations with colleagues” in their Human Resources (HR) faculty handbooks, most commonly under the heading of “Codes of Conduct” or “Rights and Responsibilities.” The only CIC institution to directly address collegiality in any form is Pennsylvania State University, which includes a few paragraphs about collegiality as part of its “Frequently Asked Questions About Promotion and Tenure” document.²

Other Institutions
Outside of the CIC, the Committee investigated documents and practices at several other institutions that included collegiality in their policies.

• Auburn University
• Utah State University
• Wake Forest University
• Washington State University
• University of Wyoming

The Committee found that the vast majority of these institutions have “Code of Conduct” or “Rights and Responsibilities” documents that stress the fair treatment of colleagues and relay the importance of academic integrity, particularly in collaborative efforts with colleagues. Despite this, collegiality is rarely addressed in direct regard to P&T.

Exceptions are notable. At Auburn University, policy states that a candidate should be able to demonstrate—in addition to the other primary areas of consideration (teaching, research/creative work, outreach, and services)—that he or she has the “potential to contribute as a productive and collegial member of the academic unit.”\(^3\) Auburn’s policy further explains that the candidate has the same standards of integrity, compatibility with long-term goals, and ability to share the academic and administrative tasks for his or her department. It is stressed that any issues of collegiality should be addressed as soon as they arise. Cautionary words are included that collegiality should not be used in substitution for being likeable. Additionally, Auburn’s policy makes it clear that only documented evidence of concerns regarding a candidate’s collegiality that clearly had an impact on one of the primary areas of consideration can be the basis for denial of tenure.

Literature Review

A preliminary survey of relevant literature [Appendix 1] shows that the use of collegiality in P&T decisions is not new. Yet, the concept of collegiality remains ill defined. Hatfield (2006) identifies three primary dimensions found in the literature. Johnston et al. (2010) suggest indicators that can help define better aspects of collegiality that impact P&T decisions. They provide a list of 27 indicators, which are classified under five organizational categories—altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, and civic virtue [Appendix 1]. Tillman (2007) documented and analyzed how new faculty at two universities experience collegial behavior in the first five years of their appointment. Based on the data collected during that time, she concluded that collegiality is best defined as an active governing process of interactions within higher educational research, teaching service, collaboration and mentoring that is bound by various changing cultures and structures.

At the same time, concerns have been documented about the use of collegiality in P&T decisions. Haag (2005) warns that lack of collegiality can be a disguise for discriminatory practices. She indicates that if collegiality is interpreted as “fitting in,” it can be a code name for gender discrimination. In particular, in disciplines where the majority of faculty are male, it can result in being used as an excuse for not diversifying the faculty.

6 Tillman, R. (2006). The communication of collegiality: An examination of advice faculty give incoming faculty. (Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations.)
Legal Analysis

In a survey of federal and state court cases [Appendix 1], collegiality was raised as an issue in certain lawsuits where an individual was denied tenure or dismissed from a tenured position. The majority of cases reviewed by the Committee were brought in federal court, but a few were brought in state courts.

In the tenure cases, there were some universities that used collegiality as a separate criterion and others that incorporated it into the traditional criteria of teaching, research, and service. Collegiality was not the only factor in the denial of tenure or in terminating a tenured professor in these cases.

The United States Supreme Court and most of the federal courts recognize that collegiality is a legitimate criterion for tenure decisions. However, they are opposed to having the courts viewed as “super tenure committees,” which would substitute their judgment in an academic decision, unless there is clear and convincing evidence that the plaintiff truly suffered a deprivation of rights under the United States Constitution or federal law (e.g., *Blessing v. Ohio University*).\(^8\)

Conclusions

Based on the Committee’s review and analysis, most universities appear to recognize the importance of collegiality and also expect faculty members to be cooperative, constructive, and respectful. Collegial behaviors among faculty members promote the effective functioning of academic organizations (Organ, 1988), and benefit universities in substantive and positive ways (Johnston et al., 2010).\(^9\)

Furthermore, faculty members place high importance on having a collegial university environment. Johnston et al. cite a Harvard survey involving 4,500 tenure-track faculty members from 51 colleges and universities in which the authors found that “tenure-track

---


faculty members care more about departmental climate, culture, and collegiality than they do about workload, tenure clarity, and compensation.\textsuperscript{10} A regression analysis of the responses indicated that climate was five times as important as compensation in predicting job satisfaction. These results have significant implications for retaining tenure-track faculty. If departments want to retain effective tenure-track professors, then this study suggests that they must create and value collegial environments.

As mentioned above, critics of collegiality policy have suggested that including collegial behaviors in faculty evaluations could hinder academic freedom by not allowing for dissent (AAUP), and that expectations of collegiality in promotion and tenure decisions could be used to discriminate against professors with opposing viewpoints (Connell and Savage, 2001), Haag (2005).\textsuperscript{11}

Weighing the pros and cons, the Committee found the arguments in favor of having expectations of collegiality to be overwhelmingly compelling and that the concerns articulated by collegiality critics could be addressed by careful specification of behavioral expectations.

**Initial Recommendations**

1. **Include collegiality expectations for all reviews of faculty**, recognizing that creating a collegial academic working environment involves participation from all faculty at all ranks.
   - These expectations would be part of the guidelines provided to department heads/chairs or appropriate personnel for annual reviews, named and distinguished chairs, and awards, P&T reviews, and any other reviews normally conducted for faculty.

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid.
While it is not envisioned that these expectations would be a dominant discriminator in the assignment of merit raises, it is anticipated that they will have a positive effect in improving the university’s social climate and collaborative environment. We expect that research, teaching, and service would continue to be critical factors in any review discussions.

2. **Use indicators found throughout the literature as examples only**, recognizing the difficulties in specifying a set of collegial behaviors that promote a positive academic environment but do not hinder academic freedom or suppress the expression of opposing viewpoints. The examples are not intended to be a checklist, but instead a sampling of non-collegial behaviors.

**Task Force Consensus**

At the March 27, 2012, meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Task Force, the group agreed that collegiality should be included in the document and voted to accept the Collegiality Committee’s two recommendations.

The Task Force felt that in recognition that a collegial work environment benefits faculty, staff, students, and the University as an entity, good citizenship and collegiality should be valued and expected of faculty members.

The Task Force also conducted further discussion on where and how collegiality will fit into the University’s overall policy. The majority voted to capture collegiality in the Promotion and Tenure Policy document, but not necessarily in the P&T criteria (17 for, three opposed, and zero abstentions). For example, it could be an item in a preamble, a section that defines overarching principles, or in guidelines that speak to annual faculty reviews.
Concerns from those opposed include:

- Uncomfortable with having collegiality included in the guidelines of the Promotion and Tenure document, but inclusion in a preamble may be okay.
- The terms are too difficult to define, and would prefer the term “good citizen.”
- People on primary committees who are not collegial themselves could misuse the inclusion of collegiality.
Impact

Purdue’s culture related to P&T—how impact is measured—has been evolving, albeit unevenly. Alternative, non-traditional forms of impact are being recognized, requiring attention focused on how to assess candidates’ impact reliably, make the process fair, explain negative decisions, and develop some degree of standardization across the colleges and schools. Clarity about what will be valued, measured, and rewarded is important at all levels, but especially for guiding junior faculty. Reflecting an already apparent trend, the Impact Committee concluded that the faculty in a particular discipline can best determine what should count as “impact”. Yet fundamentally, whatever is done, even though non-traditional, must be compatible with University policies concerning P&T. Policy language can give “permission” to consider alternative measures of impact, appropriate for particular disciplines. The responsibility for providing guidance to faculty and for making an informed case to departments, colleges/schools, and University committees rests with department heads/chairs and deans.

The Impact Committee solicited information from faculty surveys; Purdue’s Associate Deans for Engagement; Purdue documents; Purdue international programs; online resources; peer universities; and Committee and Task Force discussions.

Defining “Impact”

At Purdue, perspectives on impact varied across the colleges/schools, departments, programs, and campuses, although emphasis on discipline-specific values and measures was common. Generally, “significant influence [at least at the national level, or at the state and regional level for regional campuses],” “scholarly rigor befitting a top-tier research university,” “scholarly communication,” “stature,” “an authority,” and “scholarship” were commonly referenced in survey and interview responses, with the caveat that the candidate is fundamentally to be a scholar. Specific products and outcomes assessed as valuable in the context of specific fields varied, as listed below.
• Publications
  o Premier journals in particular fields
  o Books with notable publishers in general or in a field
  o World-regional journals
  o Scholarly work adopted as required readings in courses at other institutions
  o Monographs in rapidly changing fields
  o Applied journal publications geared to informing and altering practice
  o Trajectory of publications across time
  o First-authorships and sole-authorships
  o Book reviews in top journals
  o Web-based publications
  o Number of downloads of open-access journals

• Citation rates, recognizing that there are limitations of all databases, including that:
  o Major journals in some fields are not indexed
  o Strong metrics reflect impact, but weak metrics might reflect a small field, language other than English, or emphasis on books and chapters
  o Referencing errors and lack of aggregation may affect impact metrics

• Letters from external reviewers attesting to impact, national and/or international reputation

• Book or article awards

• Membership on editorial and grant review boards

• Amount of peer-reviewed external funding (and trajectory of funding over time), appropriate for the discipline

• Entrepreneurship, patents, inventions

• Excellence in extension activity

• Effects on practice (e.g., physical and mental health, adoption of methods by peers)

• Activities with impact on policy and law

• Interdisciplinary activity at Purdue and elsewhere
• High-profile, elected leadership positions in pertinent organizations
• High-profile, appointed committee work
• Invitations to speak at scientific meetings or consult at state, national, and/or international levels
• Awards for scholarship or service to scholarly organizations
• Evidence of dissemination of scholarship when the emphasis of the record is on scholarship of teaching and scholarship of engagement
• Graduate students’ success

A Shifting Culture
A cultural shift has already occurred in some colleges and schools in regard to an increasing openness to a wider range of impact measures, yet that shift is not evident in some disciplines nor among all levels of faculty. One emerging theme is that the forms of scholarship valued by P&T committees should be field-specific. Units should be able to determine what impact looks like in the fields represented, and deans and department heads/chairs should be obligated to be informed about field context when presenting candidates. It was noted that department heads/chairs may not be aware enough of a field to be able to choose “niche” experts to evaluate candidates for promotion.

Permission
In general, language in University-level policy about impact should be general, but should allow flexibility in how impact is assessed and support accomplishments and products that are unique, or somewhat unique, to a field. Guiding principles should also allow room for Purdue’s regional institutions to determine appropriate impact measures for their purposes and land-grant missions. Regardless of alternative measures of impact, scholarship is and should be a driving force for P&T in a university system like Purdue.

Constraints
Impact is difficult to achieve and assess in some fields during the first five years. For example, in the sciences establishing credibility through research publications is often
crucial to securing a grant from the National Institute of Health or the National Science Foundation, and is important for P&T, yet accomplishing that within a five-year timeframe may be difficult. In addition, contentiousness in committee discussions is common in several disciplines regarding interdisciplinary activity (e.g., when impact is to be viewed in only one field) and collaborative projects (e.g., when the candidate is not driving the work). Junior faculty are often inclined toward interdisciplinary work, collaboration, web-based products, and technology and may feel constrained by a culture that does not embrace these elements. The “best” may leave the University for a less constrained culture. A University policy that includes openness for alternative measures could contribute to faculty retention.

**Engagement**

Some Purdue units, such as the College of Education, are “cutting edge” in differentiating service from engagement and in emphasizing the scholarship of engagement and the scholarship of teaching. However, engagement was referenced as a major point of dissension in several units, even though it is a pillar of the current strategic plan. A significant concern was that engagement should be distinguished from the kinds of service that constitute good citizenship in a college or school, department, land-grant university, and organization. Ultimately, a consensus definition of engagement is needed. This definition could include characteristics such as the following:

- Embracing research and learning that address a problem
- Building a framework to be passed on to others
- Being sustainable
- Focusing on a “community” outside of Purdue
- Being synergistic
- Being mutually beneficial and reciprocal
- Having a positive consequence for that community

Engagement broadens the impact of funded research, and excellence in engagement reflects impact. The Committee noted that a few individuals have been promoted successfully on the basis of engagement, but in other units, that focus is considered “too
“risky.” If impact is to be more broadly considered in the future, clarity is needed regarding how it will be documented, measured, and rewarded.

Teaching, Scholarship, and Engagement

The Committee noted that it is problematic that current guidelines and categories on University forms do not invite documentation of activities, such as:

- High-impact projects that combine teaching, research, and engagement
- Applied work in the community, state, nation, and international community
- Consultation or program evaluation in other Purdue units or beyond
- Innovative application of theory and products
- Various kinds of dissemination of best practices
- Productive partnerships
- Activities that have impact on legislative actions

Globalization and Diversity

Purdue’s current P&T policy does not adequately reflect the University’s emphasis on globalization. Faculty in several units are involved in high-impact, large-scale applied projects—both domestic and abroad—that do not fit current valuing for P&T. Reference to international activity should be present and clear in pertinent policy, principles, guidelines, and forms, and should be encouraged for one or more of the teaching, scholarship, and engagement areas. Similarly, current University policy does not call appropriate attention to diversity. Scholarly activity with impact on enhancing and building respect for diversity on campus and beyond should be valued and rewarded.

Initial Recommendation

1. **Units should be required to identify impact criteria that reflect what is valued in fields represented in their respective units.** This process should generate a template for Form-36 with subcategories and indicators that reflect what is valued in the P&T process.
**Task Force Consensus**

At the April 24, 2012, Task Force meeting there was discussion about the implications of the inclusion of the phrase “subcategories and indicators that reflect what is valued in the promotion and tenure process” in the Committee’s recommendation. Would it create just another checklist and impart limits on faculty? Concerns arose over whether it may cause those going up for promotion to focus on a “checklist” instead of feeling free to pursue creative and innovative interests that exist beyond of the parameters of the checklist.

There was also some concern about requiring units to identify impact criteria. Many Task Force members felt that units should be encouraged to discuss and communicate areas of impact with their faculty.

A motion was made to revise the first sentence and remove the second sentence. The Task Force voted on the concept of impact and the understanding that there would be a revised statement included in the final policy document that would capture the following idea (13 for, three opposed).

> There is to be regular discussion and identification of indicators of impact and these indicators of impact should be clearly communicated to all faculty.

Concerns from those opposed were as follows:

- Criteria when assessing impact may become too narrow.
- Identification of indicators of impact would be driving performance and faculty activities, thus limiting creativity in other areas.
Interdisciplinary Initiatives/
Joint Appointments

Interdisciplinary efforts are needed to solve many of the most important problems faced by our society. These activities provide opportunities for faculty to move into new academic fields. Such activities can provide rich rewards because the scientific and curricular activities of faculty are not limited by a set of disciplinary boundaries (e.g., colleges, schools, departments). Among the richest of these rewards is the opportunity to learn new things while simultaneously contributing to new applications.

In addition to meeting the intellectual and educational needs of a university, facilitating interdisciplinary activities also enhances the university’s ability to compete for external research funding. This is especially true when federal funding priorities include initiatives that promote interdisciplinary activity.

As important as interdisciplinary activities are, the organizational structure of universities, and thereby colleges, schools, and departments, often run counter to the facilitation of interdisciplinary activities in general. Universities are traditionally organized by discipline. Hence, any truly interdisciplinary activity is generally neither commensurate with the goals of a discipline-focused organization nor to the incentive, reward, or promotion systems that support it.

Much of the information contained herein was modified from the following documents.

- 2008 Purdue University Report of the Interdisciplinary Initiatives Committee [Appendix 2]
• 2010 Education Advisory Board Custom Research Brief: Aligning Promotion and Tenure Policies to Promote Interdisciplinary Research\textsuperscript{12}
• Report from the National Center for Science Education (NCSE): Interdisciplinary Hiring, Tenure and Promotion: Guidance for Individuals and Institutions\textsuperscript{13}

**Current State**

Purdue’s Discovery Park provides a space for “interdisciplinary research teams [to] work at the frontiers of new science and technology” in order to harness our “world-class research capabilities to tackle global challenges and respond to the local, state, national, and global environment.”\textsuperscript{14} Additionally, Purdue-West Lafayette’s current strategic plan, “New Synergies,” emphasizes interdisciplinary activity.\textsuperscript{15}

*Purdue University will set the pace for new interdisciplinary synergies that serve citizens worldwide with profound scientific, technological, social, and humanitarian impact on advancing societal prosperity and quality of life.*

In direct response to this vision, the University Senate Steering Committee requested that the Faculty Affairs Committee form a subcommittee to propose guidelines for the consideration of interdisciplinary activity in promotion cases. The Interdisciplinary Initiatives Committee was formed in 2008 and considered issues that could be used to promote and encourage interdisciplinary activities.

Initial Recommendations

The following recommendations are specific to P&T activities; however, the Committee supports deliberate integration of these recommendations with other faculty activities.

1. **University promotion and tenure policy should explicitly recognize interdisciplinary activities.** The University promotion policy should contain guidelines for considering interdisciplinary activities in promotion cases. To begin this process, the University promotion and tenure policy should explicitly recognize interdisciplinary activities in learning, discovery, and engagement and modify the President's Office Nomination for Promotion form (Form-36)\(^\text{16}\) instructions accordingly.

2. **Candidates should include a statement highlighting their interdisciplinary activities.** This statement may include the candidate’s relative contribution to the projects that are listed. It should also describe how this work has led to new opportunities, as well as how these efforts have influenced the candidate’s overall development as a faculty member.

3. It is recognized that the primary committee may have difficulty evaluating the strengths and significance of the interdisciplinary efforts. Therefore, **departments and schools may wish to ask for additional input on the interdisciplinary accomplishments.** This could include review from both Purdue and non-Purdue faculty. It may also include a statement of work and responsibilities from collaborators named by the candidate.

4. **In recognition of the potential career risks for faculty hired through joint appointments, such hires should include a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that will specifically define the processes and expectations for all parties,**

---

including teaching and administrative loads, as well as the tenure and promotion committee.

**Task Force Consensus**

At the April 24, 2012, Task Force meeting, there were no objections and not much discussion on the Interdisciplinary Initiatives/Joint Appointments Committee’s Recommendation #1. The group unanimously approved the recommendation.

Regarding Recommendation #2, there was discussion as to whether the intent of the Committee was to make interdisciplinary activities required or optional. The Committee clarified that the intent was for this recommendation to be optional. Some Task Force members felt that the recommendation implied that one could not be promoted without having interdisciplinary activities. A suggestion was made to revise the recommendation as follows:

2. *Candidates may also include* a statement highlighting their interdisciplinary activities. *This statement may include the candidate’s relative contribution to the projects that are listed. It should also describe how this work has led to new opportunities as well as how these efforts have influenced the candidate’s overall development as a faculty member.*

The revised Recommendation #2 was approved unanimously.

Regarding Recommendation #3, some Task Force members felt that the meaning of “additional input” should be more explicit in order to clarify where the additional input would come from. A suggestion was made to revise the recommendation as follows:

3. *It is recognized that the primary committee may have difficulty evaluating the strengths and significance of the interdisciplinary efforts. Therefore, departments and schools may wish to ask for additional advisory input on the interdisciplinary accomplishments. This could include review from both*
Purdue and non-Purdue faculty. It may also include a statement of work and responsibilities from collaborators named by the candidate.

The revised Recommendation #3 was approved unanimously.

Regarding Recommendation #4, Task Force members felt that the MOU is an important part of the P&T process, but that the recommendation implied or dictated how each college would use it in their respective processes. A suggestion was made to revise the recommendation as follows:

4. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be developed for all faculty hired through joint appointments. The MOU should define the processes and expectations for all parties, including teaching, research, engagement, and administrative loads as well as the involvement of each tenure and promotion process.

The revised Recommendation #4 was approved unanimously.

Voting rights for faculty who hold joint appointments was discussed at the October 22, 2012 Task Force meeting. Voting practices vary widely among units in the extension of voting privileges to individuals with “minor” appointments. Thus, a recommendation was made to amend the previously accepted recommendation to ensure that the issue of voting rights and responsibilities also be addressed in the MOU generated at the time of hire. A suggestion was made to revise the recommendation as follows:

4 A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be developed for all faculty hired through joint appointments. The MOU should define the processes and expectations for all parties, including teaching, research, engagement, and administrative loads, voting rights and responsibilities, and involvement of each tenure and promotion committee.
Task Force members in attendance agreed unanimously that voting rights should be specifically addressed in the MOU as defined above; however, due to a lack of quorum, subsequent voting with opportunities for comment was conducted electronically. In the electronic vote, the recommendation was approved by the majority of respondents. Seventeen voted for the revised recommendation, with one comment that an MOU should have possibilities for change if mutually agreed upon. One voted against the recommendation, with the comment that a jointly appointed faculty member must only go through one promotion and tenure process, which should be in the department with which the majority appointment is held. The possibility of opposing votes was raised as a concern.
Teaching & Learning

How do we better value and evaluate teaching and its effectiveness in promoting learning? Should we explicitly highlight synergy between the discovery and learning missions (e.g., through undergraduate research, development of inquiry-based or authentic research experiences in coursework, more attention to intentional efforts to mentor and develop graduate students, etc.)?

The Teaching & Learning Committee engaged in web searches for relevant Purdue documents and review of Purdue-West Lafayette college documents. In addition, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academic Affairs Dale Whittaker shared his perspective on the scholarship of teaching and its role in the P&T process.

The Committee researched P&T policies at select Purdue-West Lafayette public, aspirational peer and Big Ten institutions, as well as other public state institutions, especially those that are part of a system.

- Pennsylvania State University
- Texas A & M
- University of Arizona
- University of California
- University of Illinois Urbana Champaign, Chicago, and Springfield
- University of Maryland
- University of Kentucky
- University of Texas-Austin
- Wayne State University
Purdue-West Lafayette’s 2008 strategic plan describes the following University-level benchmarking characteristics for aspirational peer institutions:\textsuperscript{17}

- Quality that is regarded as comparable to or greater than that of Purdue
- Carnegie Foundation Research-Extensive classification
- Strengths in the sciences, engineering, liberal arts, and management
- Major public institution
- Flagship institution in the state
- Geographic distribution
- Membership among AAU (American Association of Universities)
- Mechanism for collaborative information exchange

A committee member also conducted a site visit to the University of Texas-Austin.

**Current Status**

Through its review of the universities above, the Teaching & Learning Committee found that most of these institutions have a clear commitment to teaching and learning in their P&T processes. For example, a University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign P&T document states, “All promotion and tenure recommendations must include a thorough evaluation of the candidate’s teaching. While departments may use different methods to evaluate teaching quality, strong performance in teaching cannot be simply presumed; it must be demonstrated as convincingly as measures allow.”\textsuperscript{18}

At Purdue, the only mention of teaching in the Terms of Employment and Tenure policies (Principles and Policies for Academic Freedom, Responsibilities, and Tenure,

By accepting appointment to the faculty, the faculty member assumes the responsibilities of teaching, administration, or research as assigned by the proper University authorities.

Purdue regional campuses and Purdue-West Lafayette colleges/schools vary in how they value and evaluate teaching and its effectiveness in promoting learning. The Committee feels that the Purdue Promotion and Tenure Policy should include a statement that diligence and ability in teaching and learning are required for any tenure commitment.

Two Purdue documents are especially applicable and provide suggested approaches and categories for the assessment and documentation of teaching performance that may be applied to the P&T process:

- Teaching Effectiveness at Purdue University (University Senate Document 97-9), which was passed by the University Senate in 1998
- Guidelines for College of Agriculture Promotion & Tenure (p. 5, “Scholarship and Excellence of Teaching for Learning”), November 2010

---

Initial Recommendations

The Committee recommends that the Purdue system adopt a clear commitment to teaching and learning in the P&T process. This commitment must align with the public aspirational and Big Ten peers examined throughout this process. For example, the University of California provides such a statement: “Clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion. Under no circumstance will a tenure commitment be made unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role.”

We support building upon existing Purdue structures and documents as much as possible. We recommend the following:

1. **Implement a Purdue system policy for documentation of teaching effectiveness.** “University Senate Document 97-9” should be used as a foundation. This policy must focus on student learning outcomes facilitated by appropriate content knowledge, sound pedagogical practices, valid assessment processes, and plans for improvement. This policy must be flexible and take a menu approach given disciplinary, college, individual, and campus variation. One size does not fit all.

2. **Establish minimum requirements for documentation of teaching effectiveness system-wide.** The minimum requirements would be:
   - Course evaluations for every course
   - Enrollment by course
   - Syllabi
   - Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness, including efforts to improve teaching and learning
   - Contributions to department/program student learning outcomes

3. Adapt the menu of evidence in “Scholarship and Excellence of Teaching for Learning from the College of Agriculture, November 2010” for use as an appendix to the Promotion and Tenure Policy. Some changes would need to be made to the document to be appropriate for the Purdue system.

Task Force Consensus

At the May 8, 2012, Task Force meeting there was discussion about whether or not the paragraph that preceded the Committee’s three recommendations was to be part of the actual final recommendation. The Committee clarified that this paragraph would be part of the recommendation, but Task Force members requested that the recommendation be revised and that the information from the University of California be used as background content.

A suggestion was also made to revise Recommendation #1 to include learning and to make a strong statement about the importance of teaching and learning, as follows:

1. The committee recommends that the Purdue system adopt a clear commitment to teaching and learning in the promotion and tenure process. There should be clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role.

There was also discussion regarding the minimum requirements listed in Recommendation #2. Some felt that evaluations for every course should be required, in part due to the fact that there are many “team taught” courses with more than one instructor. There was also overall concern about requiring departments or schools to use these minimum requirements as part of their P&T process. Most felt that the list included useful information, but still wanted to allow departments to determine what they would require or recommend. A suggestion was made to revise Recommendation #2 as follows:

2. Implement a Purdue system policy for documentation of teaching effectiveness. “University Senate Document 97-9 should be used as a foundation. This policy must focus on student learning outcomes facilitated
by appropriate content knowledge, sound pedagogical practices, valid assessment processes, and plans for improvement. This policy must be flexible and take a menu approach given disciplinary, college, individual, and campus variation. One size does not fit all.

a. Establish minimum requirements for documentation of teaching effectiveness system-wide. The minimum requirements could include historical data and background information such as:
   - Course evaluations for every course
   - Enrollment by course
   - Syllabi
   - Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness, including efforts to improve teaching and learning
   - Contributions to department/program student learning outcomes

Regarding Recommendation #3, a question was asked as to whether this would be optional or required for everyone who is going up for P&T under teaching. The Committee clarified that the intent was for it to be optional. It was also suggested that Recommendations #2 and #3 would work better as a sub-set of Recommendation #1. A suggestion was made to revise Recommendation #3 into a sub-set of Recommendation #2.

2b. Consider the use of the menu of evidence in “Scholarship and Excellence of Teaching for Learning from the College of Agriculture, November 2012” for use as an appendix to the Promotion and Tenure Policy. Some changes would need to be made to the document to be appropriate for the Purdue system.

The revised recommendation was approved unanimously.
Review

The Review Committee engaged in web searches on peer institutions; review of relevant Purdue system documents; and one member made a site visit to the University of Texas-Austin. Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and the Regional Campuses Dr. Audeen Fentiman provided information about the implications of P&T for regional campuses. The Committee also reviewed Dr. Alice Pawley’s (College of Engineering) research findings on Purdue-West Lafayette junior faculty.  

Current Status

Within the broad and flexible framework of Purdue’s Terms of Employment and Tenure policies (Principles and Policies for Academic Freedom, Responsibilities, and Tenure, and Procedures for Termination for Cause, No. B-48, and Terms and Conditions of Employment of Faculty Members, No. B-50), each campus (Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne, Purdue University Calumet, Purdue University North Central, and Purdue University West Lafayette) has implemented review committees somewhat differently, reflecting academic autonomy and differences in size, role, and mission. Similarly, colleges and schools have implemented review committees in ways that meet their unique needs.

An analysis of committee processes at seven peer universities suggests that the current review system at Purdue is strong and provides reasonable representation of faculty as the policy current exists. The Committee noted that several institutions such as the University of Iowa, Michigan State University, the University of Texas-Austin, and Texas A&M are

---

24 Beddoes, Kacey, Alice L. Pawley, and the ADVANCE-Purdue Research Team. “Request for data on ADVANCE review processes and committees.” Memo to Purdue Provost’s Promotion and Tenure Taskforce Review Subgroup, 3/27/12. Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
heavily weighted with administrators. Additionally, several institutions do not use a university-wide review committee structure. Based on data from current Purdue-West Lafayette junior faculty, their major concerns relate to clarity of how the process works and clarity of expectations.27

At some institutions, review committees include an appeals or grievance committee. Grievance procedures for P&T exist at all of the examined institutions and tend to focus on procedural grounds. Purdue maintains a Faculty Grievance Policy, which provides the structure for grievances related to tenure and promotion.28 As is common at other institutions, “this policy applies only to issues of procedural fairness, and does not apply to substantive decisions” regarding tenure or promotion.29

Conclusions

The Committee concluded that levels of review are generally working well at Purdue. As a system with differentiated campuses it is appropriate for broad P&T policy to be system-wide with campus-specific procedures and implementation. Within the broad policy each college and campus should define its own process in order to maintain flexibility, allowing for individual differences such as faculty representation, adequate faculty and administrator balance, and how the department head/chair and number of full professors count toward the requisite numbers of reviewers.

Initial Recommendations

1. There are several improvements that would foster clarity:
   a. Procedures and processes used to determine review committee membership and the process of the review at all levels should be written and disseminated to all faculty.

27 Beddoes, Kacey, Alice L. Pawley, and the ADVANCE-Purdue Research Team. "Request for data on ADVANCE review processes and committees." Memo to Purdue Provost’s Promotion and Tenure Taskforce Review Subgroup, 3/27/12. Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
29 Ibid.
b. All faculty should receive annual written feedback, regardless of rank and tenure status.

c. Sample forms or models for providing feedback should be made available as resources to academic units and department heads/chairs.

2. **Conflict of interest should be specifically addressed in the promotion and tenure committee review process.** For example, the University of Illinois has the following principle: “any individual with a conflict of interest, or the appearance of a conflict of interest, should not participate (e.g., review, evaluate, advocate, vote) in a candidate’s promotion and tenure review. In general, a conflict of interest would exist if an individual shared a common grant or was a close collaborator on a number of common projects with the candidate. The guiding principle is that an individual should recuse herself/himself from involvement in a case when that individual stands to benefit personally from the outcome of the case.”

3. **Language should be added to the process to address redundancy,** to assure that there is not a double vote due to administrative position/full professor rank.

**Task Force Consensus**

At the May 8, 2012, Task Force meeting a suggestion was made to revise Recommendation #1a as follows so that faculty are informed of specific procedures in their respective academic units, which are guided by University policy:

1a. **To foster clarity of procedures and processes used to determine review committee membership and the process of the review at all levels should be written and disseminated to all faculty.**

The revised recommendation was approved unanimously.
Regarding Recommendation #1b and #1c, there was discussion about whether Recommendation #1b was contradictory to what was adopted in the Tenure Timeline Committee recommendation. The Tenure Timeline Committee recommendation that was approved by the Task Force states that associate professors only have to be reviewed at intervals of every two years, as opposed to annually. A suggestion was made to revise and/or replace Recommendation #1b and #1c to be consistent with the Tenure Timeline Committee recommendation.

Regarding Recommendation #2, there was discussion about what would truly constitute a conflict of interest. Most disagreed with what was provided in the recommendation and suggested that the recommendation be consistent with any existing Purdue statements about conflict of interest. The Task Force agreed to withhold approval on this recommendation until revisions were completed.

Regarding Recommendation #3, the Task Force consensus was that this issue was rarely a problem, so they did not approve Recommendation #3.

Following adoption of the above recommendations at Task Force meetings held on October 8, 15, and 22, 2012, the entire Task Force discussed several issues (listed below) that are present in existing documents related to tenure and promotion that had not been specifically addressed by the working groups. For each of these issues, consensus and minority opinions were determined at the October 22 Task Force meeting and subsequent votes, with opportunities for comment, were conducted electronically.

**Reference Letters**

The issue of reference letters is raised in Section III of the West Lafayette Campus annual promotion and tenure memorandum that is issued by the Office of the Provost\(^30\), but no further guidance is offered regarding the expectations for such letters. The Task Force discussed and recognized variability among disciplines and recommended that candidates

(as well as those who assist in preparation and assessment of promotion documents) must be provided with additional guidance. A suggestion was made to include the following recommendation:

*Each college, school, or campus must determine and clearly disseminate expectations for letters of assessment that are to be included in a candidate’s documentation for promotion. Minimally, such guidelines must include expectations for the number of letters, internal versus external referees, and the acceptability of the nature of referees’ relationships with the candidate (e.g., collaborators, co-authors, former mentors).*

All Task Force members in attendance at the October 22, 2012, meeting approved the recommendation; however, due to a lack of a quorum, subsequent voting with ability for comment was conducted electronically. In the electronic vote, the recommendation was approved unanimously (18/18).

**Conflict of Interest**

Task Force members in attendance agreed with the previously approved recommendation that existing policies on conflict of interest be adapted for use in the tenure and promotion policy, but there was consensus that particular care should be taken in cases of tenure and promotion. In Section III of the West Lafayette Campus annual promotion and tenure memorandum from the Provost, the following statement is made in the paragraph that addresses voting:

*All eligible members participating in promotion committee deliberations are required to vote on all candidates unless a conflict of interest with a particular candidate has been identified.*
A suggestion was made to include the following recommendation:

*The following addition (underlined) should amend Section III (in the paragraph that addresses voting) of the Provost’s annual promotion and tenure memorandum, “All eligible members participating in promotion committee deliberations are required to vote on all candidates unless a conflict of interest with a particular candidate has been identified, in which instance the member should also exclude himself/herself from all discussion and deliberation of a candidate’s case.”*

All Task Force members in attendance at the October 22, 2012, meeting approved the recommendation; however, due to a lack of a quorum, subsequent voting with ability for comment was conducted electronically. In the electronic vote, the recommendation was approved unanimously (18/18).

**Endorsement of Tenure**

In Section III of the West Lafayette Campus annual promotion and tenure memorandum from the Provost there are statements about granting tenure to new faculty appointments in which tenure is effective with the start-date of the contract. The Task Force discussed these statements, specifically whether the endorsement of tenure by the “Primary (or Area) Promotion Committee” was appropriate, or if in all cases, the Primary Committee should be involved.

The majority of Task Force members in attendance proposed a change to “Primary and Area Promotion Committee” because of the importance of the individual’s relationship with faculty members that make up the department and its Primary Committee. The minority opposition cited difficulties in implementation, especially when appointments are made in summer session, as well as constraints that would be placed on negotiations, particularly in cases of administrative and dual-career hires.
The current policy about granting tenure to new faculty appointments in which tenure is effective with the start-date of the contract, as described in Section III of the Provost’s annual promotion and tenure memorandum, should be changed to “Primary and Area Promotion Committee” because of the importance of the individual’s relationship with faculty members that make up the department and its Primary Committee.

Due to a lack of a quorum, subsequent voting with ability for comment was conducted electronically. In the electronic vote, the recommendation was approved by the majority of respondents. Sixteen members voted for the recommendation as written; one voted against the recommendation because of the belief that only the primary—not the area—committee should be considered at the time of hire; and one agreed conditionally, with the caveat that both committees could be considered, but that a “negative” endorsement should also satisfy the requirement.

Also in Section III, regarding the promotion documentation itself, a statement is included regarding a candidate’s right to receive a copy of his/her promotion document:

A candidate should be given the opportunity to help create and review his/her promotion documentation and may receive a copy of any document (with confidential statements omitted) that will be submitted to the primary, area, and/or University committee(s).

The Task Force discussed the importance of candid and honest assessments by external reviewers, department heads/chairs, and Deans. While the Task Force recognized that legal proceedings could result in an unsuccessful candidate gaining access to his/her entire document, a suggestion was made to include the following recommendation:

The following addition (underlined) should amend Section III (regarding the right to receive a copy the promotion document) of the Provost’s annual promotion and tenure memorandum. “A candidate should be given the
opportunity to help create and review his/her promotion documentation and may receive a copy of any document (with confidential materials, including but not limited to letters; department head/chair statements; and Dean’s statements, omitted) that will be submitted to the primary, area, and/or University committee(s).”

All Task Force members in attendance at the October 22, 2012, meeting approved the recommendation; however, due to a lack of a quorum, subsequent voting with ability for comment was conducted electronically. In the electronic vote, the recommendation was approved by the majority of respondents, with 17 respondents voting for and one against.
Tenure Timeline

The seven-year tenure clock has been the standard in academia since the 1940s.\(^{31}\) During that period of time, requirements for scholarship and tenure have become much more rigorous, particularly in areas related to the sciences.\(^{32}\) As a result, many national leaders in higher education are calling for change. The National Panel of Presidents and Chancellors (NPPC), composed of 10 heads of major research universities or state university systems, supports a national move to create flexible tenure-track faculty career paths at American colleges and universities.\(^{33}\) The NPPC feels that the current rigid structure of the traditional tenure track and should not be retained, and the panel recommends that universities “develop policies and programs that encourage flexible career paths to help faculty members balance work-life issues, avoid stagnation and burnout, and remain productive in various facets of scholarship.”\(^{34}\)

The demographics of academia have evolved, and faculty life is quite different, than when the tenure system was first adopted.\(^{35}\) More women, minorities, and dual-career couples work in academe than ever before, diversifying the faculty and changing the balance between family and career for both men and women. These changes and this increased diversity have generated an increased need for flexibility in faculty policies.\(^{36}\)

Further, independent research support is occurring at a later age than in the past. For those for whom the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is a major funding source,

---

\(^{31}\) Danoski M, Palmer M, Bogdewic S., “Flexibility in the tenure clock: why the time is right to adopt a 10-year tenure probationary period at the Indiana University School of Medicine.” Office of the Dean, School of Medicine, Indiana University. 2008.

\(^{32}\) Ibid.


\(^{34}\) Ibid.

\(^{35}\) Danoski M, Palmer M, Bogdewic S., “Flexibility in the tenure clock: why the time is right to adopt a 10-year tenure probationary period at the Indiana University School of Medicine.” Office of the Dean, School of Medicine, Indiana University. 2008.

\(^{36}\) Ibid.
funding rates from the NIH have dropped from 32 percent of proposals submitted in 1999 to as low as 10 to 12 percent for some institutes.\textsuperscript{37} The average age for independent NIH research support is 42 years (compared with 37–38 years in the early 1980s).\textsuperscript{38} Many faculty require three to five years to receive their first grant and two to three years for renewal.\textsuperscript{39} Therefore, a decision regarding tenure based on a dossier prepared at the end of five years of work may not allow sufficient time to determine whether that faculty member is capable of successfully obtaining a significant grant, successfully renewing it, and/or expanding it into additional areas of investigation.\textsuperscript{40} An extended tenure clock would allow sufficient time to demonstrate an ability to sustain extramural funding. A flexible tenure clock would allow individuals who are able to demonstrate these capabilities within a shorter period of time to be recognized and promoted when it is warranted to do so. By the same token, a more realistic set of expectations could allow for the current time frame to be adequate.

Investing in new faculty members is expensive. Startup expenses can range from $300,000 to $500,000 or more in some circumstances. The loss of a faculty member results in the loss of much or all of this initial investment. In view of the investment costs for new faculty members, it seems prudent to provide that faculty member with a sufficient, but reasonable, amount of time in which to be successful.

The granting of tenure is highly valued by faculty members, as tenure awards the faculty member the option of essentially “lifetime” employment at their academic institution, although key terms of the employment contract, such as compensation and responsibilities, remain at the discretion of the academic institution. If the goal of the academic institution is to develop a first-rate faculty that excels in research, teaching, and service, then it is important to set policies surrounding the granting of such a valued option (tenure) that achieves this goal. Below the Committee considers specific changes

\textsuperscript{37} http://report.nih.gov/award_mapping.aspx
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{39} Danoski, M., Palmer, M., Bogdewic, S., “Flexibility in the tenure clock: why the time is right to adopt a 10-year tenure probationary period at the Indiana University School of Medicine.” Office of the Dean, School of Medicine, Indiana University. 2008.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
in Purdue’s existing policies with respect to length of the probationary period and process of P&T that we believe enhances the ability of an academic institution to “attract,” “identify,” “motivate,” “mentor,” and “retain” the highest quality faculty.

A number of highly ranked academic institutions, such as the University Michigan, Yale University, and Brown University, have either instituted or are considering instituting an 8–10-year tenure clock. The extra year recognizes that the current period of time is sometimes not sufficient for junior faculty members to have enough of an impact to qualify for tenure and promotion. At the same time, it is important not to allow the extended time become the “standard” time for promotion. It is critical that the extended time does not prevent the promotion of a faculty who has attained the level of accomplishments deserving tenure and promotion. Thus, we propose a flexible policy, which builds on the current process and timeline.

**Initial Recommendations**

1. **Annual evaluations and written feedback**

   The Committee’s informal inquiries across campus showed that typically individual units perform annual reviews to determine merit raises, but not all have the primary committees annually review untenured assistant and tenured associate faculty members to assess their progress. We strongly feel that this is a critical opportunity for the primary committee to provide guidance and feedback regarding the progress of pre-tenure as well as mid-career faculty members toward their next promotion. Our first recommendation is intended to accomplish that goal.

   *We recommend that all assistant and associate professors be reviewed for possible tenure and/or promotion consideration annually [Appendix 3] and that they be given written feedback from the primary committee about their progress and the committee’s advice for continued professional development.*

   Implementation:
• This feedback will be communicated by the head, thus protecting confidentiality of primary committee deliberations. The written feedback will help pre-tenure and mid-career faculty members make decisions regarding their allocation of time and efforts, and it will provide transparency in promotion and tenure process. It also will identify faculty who have made sufficient progress to be put forward for consideration for tenure and/or promotion regardless of the number of years serving in his/her current position. Both of these factors will make faculty positions at Purdue more attractive to prospective faculty members, as well as make faculty members more successful and secure once arriving at Purdue, which is expected to contribute to increasing overall retention.

• This recommendation would be implemented across Purdue and all its campuses.

2. Flexible promotion and tenure timeline
The Committee’s review of existing practices indicates that there is limited information regarding the advantages and disadvantages of extending the tenure clock. However, it does appear that some highly ranked universities (e.g., the University of Michigan, Yale University, and Brown University) are introducing the potential for a longer tenure clock, either university-wide or at the discretion of individual colleges. This suggests that retaining the current “one size fits all” approach with respect to the length of the tenure clock may put Purdue at a disadvantage in the future. In this context, our second recommendation is to grant individual colleges the flexibility to experiment with changes in the length of the tenure clock, within limits and subject to the approval of the college’s faculty and the Provost. Such flexibility can allow individual colleges and schools within Purdue to develop a competitive edge in attracting, identifying, and retaining first-rate faculty.

Each college/school may adopt a flexible tenure clock applicable to all faculty within that college/school, not to exceed nine years. The process and procedures
must be approved by the college’s/school’s faculty and dean, and the Provost. If adopted, these new timelines would not alter the already existing procedures for extension of time clock based on parental leave or other Provost-approved special considerations.

Task Force Consensus

At the April 10, 2012, Task Force meeting Recommendation #1 was discussed and approved.

At the May 8, 2012, Task Force meeting, members expressed a wide range of opinions regarding the possible benefits and disadvantages of an extended time clock and consensus could not be reached.

Regarding Recommendation #1, the Task Force suggested revisions to keep the recommendation consistent with other Committee recommendations.

1. We recommend that all assistant professors be reviewed annually for progress toward tenure and promotion and be given written feedback.

We recommend that all associate professors be reviewed and provided with written feedback on their progress toward promotion at intervals not to exceed two years.

Regarding Recommendation #2, the Task Force had concerns about the flexible promotion and tenure timeline:

Each college/school may adopt a flexible tenure clock applicable to all faculty within that college/school, not to exceed nine years. The process and procedures must be approved by the college’s/school’s faculty and dean, and the Provost. If adopted, these new timelines would not alter the already existing procedures for
extension of time clock based on parental leave or other Provost-approved special considerations.

The Tenure Timeline Committee would like to caution that if a college adopts this policy, nine years to tenure should not become the new norm for promotions. In fact, this proposed policy is meant to emphasize that a faculty member should be promoted when ready, not considering their time in rank.

Many Task Force members still had significant concerns with approving a flexible time clock. After discussion, the Task Force voted against the Recommendation #2 (six for, including one absentee vote, and 12 opposed).

Concerns from those opposed include:

- Even though faculty will have the opportunity to come up for promotion and/or tenure early, the tendency will be to wait the nine years. More can be accomplished and recorded in nine years, so it is the feeling that most primary committees would eventually lean toward not promoting early; thus, the time clock would naturally become nine years instead of anything shorter.
- If the time clock is extended to nine years, there is a much greater chance that faculty will get recruited away while waiting to be promoted.
- The process of implementation would be complicated and smaller departments would have no voice.
- There could be potential legal issues.
- It causes a more ambiguous set of expectations.
- Not sure this change would address the issue of faculty not being allowed to be promoted early and would actually delay the promotion even longer.

Those in favor of the recommendation felt that the flexible time clock would keep Purdue competitive with other institutions and would attract faculty who may need more time to get their research up and going.
A question was raised as to whether there are already policies and procedures in place that would allow someone’s tenure clock to stop for a period of time due to certain circumstances. Currently, there are guidelines on tenure extensions contained in the January 2007 Tenure-Clock Extension Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines document that was approved by the University Senate. The Task Force will revisit the topic of the tenure clock extensions before additional final decisions are made.

Following adoption of the above recommendations at Task Force meetings held on October 8, 15, and 22, 2012, the entire Task Force discussed several issues that are present in existing documents related to tenure and promotion (listed below) that had not been specifically addressed by the working groups. For each of these issues, consensus and minority opinions were determined at the October 22 Task Force meeting and subsequent votes, with opportunities for comment, were conducted electronically.

**Tenure Clock Extension**

Currently at Purdue, the January 2007 Tenure-Clock Extension Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines document has been widely implemented. A recommendation was made to ensure that the option for faculty to seek extensions of the tenure clock—when justifiable conditions or interruptions impair or prevent progress toward tenure—remain available.

_The guidelines for extension of the tenure clock should be incorporated as an integral part of the revised tenure and promotion policies._

In order to avoid ambiguity, it was also proposed that Item #1 of the current guidelines for extension of the tenure clock, which states that the request for a tenure clock extension be submitted within one year of the occurrence and prior to the penultimate year” be amended to include a date.

---


42 Ibid.
The following addition (underlined) should amend Item #1 of the current guidelines for extension of the tenure clock in the January 2007 Tenure-Clock Extension Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines document. “…provided a Request for Tenure-Clock Extension form is submitted within one year of the occurrence and prior to July 1 of the penultimate year…”

All Task Force members in attendance at the October 22, 2012, meeting approved the recommendation; however, due to a lack of a quorum, subsequent voting with ability for comment was conducted electronically. In the electronic vote, both recommendations were approved unanimously (18/18).

Partial Appointments and Extensions of Probationary Period

Partial appointments and extensions of the probationary period (i.e., tenure clock), as stated in the Principles and Policies for Academic Freedom, Responsibilities and Tenure, and Procedures for Termination of Faculty Appointments for Cause, No. B-48 (Section II.C.2.43), was also discussed. The policy addresses eligibility for tenure of faculty with part-time appointments of “not less than 50% of full-time” and allows requests for extensions of “one, two, or three years.”

II.C.2. Also eligible for tenure are professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who hold part-time appointments of not less than 50% of full-time and whose duties include the normal responsibilities of full-time faculty members, including teaching, research, and service. The procedures for obtaining tenure are the same as those for full-time faculty members as described in a. above. However, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period by one, two, or three years. This request shall be made by a letter to the dean, with a copy to the department head, prior to the meeting of the primary committee during the penultimate year of the probationary period for full-time faculty as defined

---

in a. above. In the event of an adjustment to full-time status during the probationary period, the request for an extension of probationary time will be restricted as follows:

If the adjustment to full-time status occurs during the

a. first or second year, there will be no extension of probationary time
b. third year, there will be a maximum extension of one year
c. fourth year, there will be a maximum extension two years
d. fifth or sixth year, there will be a maximum extension of three years.

A member of the faculty whose initial appointment is on a full-time basis and whose appointment is adjusted to a part-time basis during the first three years of service to the University may request an extension equivalent to the probationary time for those who begin with a part-time appointment. If the adjustment to part-time status occurs during the fourth or subsequent year of initial appointment, the probationary period will be the same as that of a full-time faculty member as stated in a. above.

Task Force members in attendance were unclear about implementation of this policy and the possible relationships that might exist between the percentage of the appointment and the years of extension granted. It was suggested that the policy be simplified and be consistent with tenure extension policies for full-time faculty.

*The following addition (underlined) should amend the Principles and Policies for Academic Freedom, Responsibilities, and Tenure, and Procedures for Termination for Cause, No. B-48, to simplify the process that defines specific years. “II.C.2. Also eligible for tenure are professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who hold part-time appointments of not less than 50% of full-time and whose duties include the normal responsibilities of full-time faculty members, including teaching, research, and service. The*
The procedures for obtaining tenure are the same as those for full-time faculty members as described in a. above. However, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period by following the tenure clock extension policy.”

The remaining portion of section II.C.2, which addresses the timing of adjustments to full-time status, was not discussed.

All Task Force members in attendance at the October 22, 2012, meeting approved the recommendation; however, due to a lack of a quorum, subsequent voting with ability for comment was conducted electronically. In the electronic vote, the recommendations was approved unanimously (18/18).
Concept of Tenure

The Concept of Tenure Committee work was completed in conjunction with the Post-Tenure Review Committee, which is described in the next section.

As part of its review, the Concept of Tenure Committee considered several documents in its analysis:

- Purdue University Faculty Senate document on Post-Tenure Review and Faculty Development (2003)44
- 2010 Education Advisory Board Custom Research Brief: Aligning Promotion and Tenure Policies to Promote Interdisciplinary Research46
- 2009 Education Advisory Board Custom Research Brief: Promotion & Tenure Review Processes for Regional Campus Faculty: Granting Autonomy while Maintaining Quality Control47

Initial Recommendations

The Concept of Tenure Committee recommends two modifications to the current Principles and Policies for Academic Freedom, Responsibilities and Tenure, and Procedures for Termination of Faculty Appointments for Cause, No. B-48.49

1. An addition to the Tenure Policies section (II.B.), as follows (boldface):

   **II. Tenure Policies**

   **B. Purdue University is committed to excellence and equity within the tenure granting process. Tenure ensures academic freedom and should promote creative, innovative pursuits.** Tenure at Purdue University is a matter of policy and not a legal obligation binding on the University. Tenure policies are subject to change by the Board of Trustees, and it follows that all appointments to the faculty are subject to such changes. It is the policy of the University to renew appointments of faculty members who have attained tenured status, subject always to the availability of funds, the continuance of activities in the area of employment, and the absence of circumstances which would otherwise entitle the University to terminate the appointment for cause. Tenure is effective only at the particular campus of the University where it was acquired.

2. An added statement under item D of the Procedures in Cases for Termination for Cause section (III.D.1.), as follows:

   **III. Procedures in Cases for Termination for Cause**

   **D. Formal Procedures**

   1. **Adequate cause for termination of the employment of a faculty member from a tenured position or before the expiration of the term of**

---

appointment of a non-tenured faculty member will include proven incompetence, gross neglect of duty, moral turpitude, or improper conduct injurious to the welfare of the University, or a record of sustained unsatisfactory performance as determined by Provost-approved, college-specific procedures. Other actions inconsistent with the responsibilities of a member of the academic community may provide adequate cause for removal, but the principles set forth in I. above shall not be violated. Improper conduct injurious to the welfare of the University either by individuals or by groups shall include (but not by way of limitation) obstruction or disruption of the teaching, research, administration, disciplinary procedures, or other University activities, or of other authorized activities on University premises, or inciting others to conduct having such effects.

Task Force Consensus

At the April 10, 2012, Task Force meeting, the Concept of Tenure Committee recommended two modifications to the current Academic Freedom, Responsibilities and Tenure, and Procedures for Termination of Faculty Appointments for Cause, No. B-48.50

3. An addition to the Tenure Policies section (II.B.), as follows:

II. Tenure Policies

B. Purdue University is committed to excellence and equity within the tenure granting process. Tenure ensures academic freedom and should promote creative, innovative pursuits. Tenure at Purdue University is a matter of policy and not a legal obligation binding on the University. Tenure policies are subject to change by the Board of Trustees, and it follows that all appointments to the faculty are subject to such changes. It

is the policy of the University to renew appointments of faculty members who have attained tenured status, subject always to the availability of funds, the continuance of activities in the area of employment, and the absence of circumstances which would otherwise entitle the University to terminate the appointment for cause. Tenure is effective only at the particular campus of the University where it was acquired.

4. An added statement under item D of the Procedures in Cases for Termination for Cause section (III.D.1.), as follows:

III. Procedures in Cases for Termination for Cause

D. Formal Procedures

1. Adequate cause for termination of the employment of a faculty member from a tenured position or before the expiration of the term of appointment of a non-tenured faculty member will include proven incompetence, gross neglect of duty, moral turpitude, or improper conduct injurious to the welfare of the University, or a record of sustained unsatisfactory performance as determined by Provost-approved, college-specific procedures. Other actions inconsistent with the responsibilities of a member of the academic community may provide adequate cause for removal, but the principles set forth in I. above shall not be violated. Improper conduct injurious to the welfare of the University either by individuals or by groups shall include (but not by way of limitation) obstruction or disruption of the teaching, research, administration, disciplinary procedures, or other University activities, or of other authorized activities on University premises, or inciting others to conduct having such effects.

During discussion there were concerns about both recommendations. Some Task Force members felt that some revisions should be made, particularly the use of the word “equity” in Recommendation #1, because it could be interpreted as though one would not
be able to achieve tenure based on excellence alone. The Task Force voted on the concept of “a commitment to excellence with an emphasis on equity within the process,” with the understanding that the Concept of Tenure Committee provide a revision. The motion passed with 20 for and one opposed.

Regarding Recommendation #2, the Task Force had concerns about the phrase “sustained unsatisfactory performance.” There was discussion on how this statement would affect the future of tenured faculty and how “sustained performance” would be measured. A motion was made to accept the concept of requiring sustained performance, subject to change pending the Post-Tenure Review Committee’s recommendations. The motion passed unanimously.
Post-Tenure Review

Public universities are subject to procedural transparency and public accountability. Purdue should be proactive in establishing a process for continuous faculty performance assessment or Post-Tenure Review (PTR) before processes are demanded or imposed by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education (ICHE) or the State Legislature.

The need for implementing a PTR process is closely linked to the recommendation of the Concept of Tenure Committee recommendation to modify No. B-48,\textsuperscript{51} which was discussed earlier in this report. The Concept of Tenure Committee’s changes to the policy are noted in bold below:

\textit{III. Procedures in Cases for Termination for Cause
D. Formal Procedures
1. Adequate cause for termination of the employment of a faculty member from tenured position or before the expiration of the term of appointment of a non-tenured faculty member will include proven incompetence, gross neglect of duty, moral turpitude, improper conduct injurious to the welfare of the University, or a record of sustained unsatisfactory performance as determined by Provost-approved, college-specific procedures. Other actions inconsistent with the responsibilities of a member of the academic community may provide adequate cause for removal, but the principles set forth in I. above shall not be violated. Improper conduct injurious to the welfare of the University either by individuals or by groups shall include (but not by way of limitation) obstruction or disruption of the teaching, research, administration, disciplinary procedures, or other University procedures.}

\textsuperscript{51}Ibid.
activities, or of other authorized activities on University premises, or
inciting others to conduct having such effects.

As part of its review, the Post-Tenure Review Committee considered two documents in its analysis:

- Purdue University Faculty Senate document on Post-Tenure Review and Faculty Development (2003)\textsuperscript{52}
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP): Reviewing Post-Tenure Review (2008)\textsuperscript{53}

## Challenges

Procedures for assuring and rewarding faculty continuous development are not new at Purdue. Well-defined processes for faculty annual review and merit conducted at the unit, school, or college levels have been in place for many years. Currently, contract extension and annual reviews for merit consideration are conducted at the unit level. Unit primary committees also conduct P&T reviews and are responsible for providing feedback to their candidates. Candidates for tenure or promotion are subsequently reviewed by school or college area committees, and ultimately by the University Promotion Committee (or similar processes at regional campuses). However, currently Purdue lacks a process for assuring sustained faculty performance or for providing faculty important mid-career quality feedback for full professors and associate professors not seeking promotion. Therefore, there is a need to implement a comprehensive unit-initiated and Provost-approved process of post-tenure reviews that integrate both the unit annual review process and the primary committee promotion and tenure review process.


Initial Recommendations

Establish local processes

1. Each unit will be asked to identify a Post-Tenure Review process appropriate to the mission of the unit, subject to Provost approval.
2. The process developed should build on processes already in place, such as annual review.
3. The process is intended to be initiated at the college or school level on the assumption that one process will not fit all Purdue academic units.

Logistics

1. Review all tenured faculty in some way, providing peer review feedback (using established primary committee, peer review committee, or other appropriate body established by the unit).
2. KIS (Keep It Simple) – The process should not create significant additional burdens for large departments with concern for return on committee effort investment.

Potential Approaches

1. Annual Review Trigger Model
   - Annual reviews result in a rating of exceeds, meets, or does not meet unit standards for each faculty member. After N negative annual reviews a more comprehensive peer review process is triggered.
   - Process should protect academic freedom and be primarily based on performance improvement
   - Chronic and unmediated low performance could trigger a job action following concern for due process.
   - Positive results could include a range of recognitions or financial rewards (unit or Provost funded).
2. Cycle Model
   • Review all tenured faculty on a five-to-seven-year cycle.
   • Could become a time consuming activity and may not produce much return on investment.

3. Super-rank model
   • Add ranks beyond current full-professor rank providing incentives for additional promotion reviews based on performance every N years after promotion to full professor.

4. Department-head- or faculty-member-review request model
   • Faculty member seeks peer review of performance for pay adjustment or career redirection.
   • Department head/chair requests peer review of a faculty member’s performance for award programs or performance improvement investments.

**Task Force Consensus**

At the May 8, 2012, Task Force meeting the Post-Tenure Review Committee clarified that its intent is that each unit would define and decide how their annual reviews would be handled. The Task Force suggested a revision to Recommendation #1 as follows:

1. *Each unit will be asked to identify a *constructive Post-Tenure Review process appropriate to the mission of the unit subject to Provost [or Chancellor] approval.*

With this revision, all three recommendations were approved unanimously.
Final Recommendations

Collegiality

26. Recognizing that creating a collegial academic working environment involves participation from all faculty at all ranks, we recommend including collegiality expectations for all reviews of faculty. These expectations would be part of the guidelines provided to department heads/chairs or appropriate personnel for annual reviews, named and distinguished chairs, and awards, promotion and tenure reviews and any other reviews normally done for faculty. While it is not envisioned that these expectations would be a dominant discriminator in the assignment of merit raises, it is anticipated that they will have a positive effect in improving the social climate and collaborative environment. We would expect that research, teaching, and service would continue to be critical factors in any review discussions.

27. Recognizing the difficulties in specifying a set of collegial behaviors that promote a positive academic environment but do not hinder academic freedom or suppress the expression of opposing viewpoints, we recommend that indicators found throughout the literature serve as examples only. They are not meant to be a checklist but more of a sampling of non-collegial behaviors.

Impact

28. There is to be regular discussion and identification of indicators of impact and these indicators of impact should be clearly communicated to all faculty.

Interdisciplinary Initiatives/Joint Appointments

29. University promotion and tenure policy should explicitly recognize interdisciplinary activities. The university promotion policy should contain
guidelines for considering interdisciplinary activities in promotion cases. To begin this process, the university promotion and tenure policy should explicitly recognize interdisciplinary activities in learning, discovery, and engagement and modify the form 36 instructions accordingly.

30. Candidates may also include a statement highlighting their interdisciplinary activities. This statement may include the candidate’s relative contribution to the projects that are listed. It should also describe how this work has led to new opportunities as well as how these efforts have influenced the candidate’s overall development as a faculty member.

31. It is recognized that the primary committee may have difficulty evaluating the strengths and significance of the interdisciplinary efforts. Therefore, departments/schools may wish to ask for additional advisory input on the interdisciplinary accomplishments. This could include review from both Purdue and non-Purdue faculty. It may also include a statement of work and responsibilities from collaborators named by the candidate.

32. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be developed for all faculty hired through joint appointments. The MOU should define the processes and expectations for all parties, including teaching, research, engagement, and administrative loads, voting rights and responsibilities, and involvement of each tenure and promotion committee.

**Teaching & Learning**

33. Require documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role for any tenure commitment.

34. Implement policy on documentation of teaching effectiveness, using “University Senate Document 97-9” as a foundation. This policy must focus on student learning outcomes facilitated by appropriate content knowledge, sound
pedagogical practices, valid assessment processes, and plans for improvement. This policy must be flexible and take a menu approach given disciplinary, college, individual, and campus variation. One size does not fit all. This policy would include the following:

c. Minimum requirements for documentation of teaching and learning effectiveness for promotion and tenure, which could include:
   • Information or data about course evaluations as appropriate
   • Enrollment by course
   • Syllabi
   • Self-evaluation of effectiveness in teaching and learning, including efforts to improve
   • Contributions to department/program student learning outcomes

d. A menu of evidence to document effectiveness in teaching and learning, adapted from “Scholarship and Excellence of Teaching for Learning from the College of Agriculture, November 2010.” This would be an appendix to the Promotion and Tenure policy.

**Review**

The Committee concludes that levels of review are generally working well. As Purdue is a system with differentiated campuses it is appropriate for broad promotion and tenure policy to be system-wide, with campus-specific procedures and implementation. Within the broad policy each college and campus should define its own process, allowing for individual differences. For example, faculty representation, adequate balance between faculty and administrators, and how the department head/chair and number of full professors count toward the requisite numbers of reviewers, all should be determined by the college or campus to maintain flexibility.

35. To foster clarity, procedures and processes used to determine review committee membership and the process of the review at all levels should be written and disseminated to all faculty.
36. Each college, school, or campus must determine and clearly disseminate expectations for letters of assessment that are to be included in a candidate’s documentation for promotion. Minimally, such guidelines must include expectations for the number of letters, internal versus external referees, and the acceptability of the nature of referees’ relationships with the candidate (e.g., collaborators, co-authors, former mentors).

37. Conflict of interest should be specifically addressed in the promotion and tenure committee review process. The Committee asks that the Provost’s Office obtain information on any such policies that may be in use at the campus or college level, which could be adapted for use system-wide.

38. The following addition (underlined) should amend Section III (in the paragraph that addresses voting) of the Provost’s annual promotion and tenure memorandum “All eligible members participating in promotion committee deliberations are required to vote on all candidates unless a conflict of interest with a particular candidate has been identified, in which instance the member should also exclude himself/herself from all discussion and deliberation of a candidate’s case.”

39. The current policy about granting tenure to new faculty appointments in which tenure is effective with the start-date of the contract, as described in Section III of the annual promotion and tenure memorandum from the Provost should be changed to “Primary and Area Promotion Committee” because of the importance of the individual’s relationship with faculty members that make up the department and its Primary Committee.

40. The following addition (underlined) should amend Section III (regarding the right to receive a copy the promotion document) of the Provost’s annual promotion and tenure memorandum. “A candidate should be given the opportunity to help create and review his/her promotion documentation and may receive a copy of any
document (with confidential materials, including but not limited to letters; department head/chair statements; and Dean’s statements, omitted) that will be submitted to the primary, area, and/or University committee(s).”

**Tenure Timeline**

41. All assistant professors should be reviewed annually for progress toward tenure and promotion and be given written feedback.

42. All associate professors should be reviewed and provided with written feedback on their progress toward promotion at intervals not to exceed two years.

43. The guidelines for extension of the tenure clock should be incorporated as an integral part of the revised tenure and promotion policies.

44. The following addition (underlined) should amend Item #1 of the current guidelines for extension of the tenure clock in the January 2007 Tenure-Clock Extension Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines document. “…provided a Request for Tenure-Clock Extension form is submitted within one year of the occurrence and prior to July 1 of the penultimate year…”

45. The following addition (underlined) should amend the Principles and Policies for Academic Freedom, Responsibilities, and Tenure, and Procedures for Termination for Cause, No. B-48, to simplify the process that defines specific years. “II.C.2. Also eligible for tenure are professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who hold part-time appointments of not less than 50% of full-time and whose duties include the normal responsibilities of full-time faculty members, including teaching, research, and service. The procedures for obtaining tenure are the same as those for full-time faculty members as described in a. above. However, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period by following the tenure clock extension policy.”
Concept of Tenure

46. The following additions should be made to the Tenure Policies section of the Principles and Policies for Academic Freedom, Responsibilities, and Tenure, and Procedures for Termination for Cause, No. B-48.

II. Tenure Policies

B. Purdue University is committed to excellence with an emphasis on equity within the process. Tenure ensures academic freedom and should promote creative, innovative pursuits. Tenure at Purdue University is a matter of policy and not a legal obligation binding on the University. Tenure policies are subject to change by the Board of Trustees, and it follows that all appointments to the faculty are subject to such changes. It is the policy of the University to renew appointments of faculty members who have attained tenured status, subject always to the availability of funds, the continuance of activities in the area of employment, and the absence of circumstances which would otherwise entitle the University to terminate the appointment for cause. Tenure is effective only at the particular campus of the University where it was acquired.

47. The following addition should be made under item D of the Procedures in Cases for Termination for Cause section (III.D.1.) of the Principles and Policies for Academic Freedom, Responsibilities, and Tenure, and Procedures for Termination for Cause, No. B-48.

III. Procedures in Cases for Termination for Cause

D. Formal Procedures

1. Adequate cause for termination of the employment of a faculty member from a tenured position or before the expiration of the term of appointment of a non-tenured faculty member will include
proven incompetence, gross neglect of duty, moral turpitude, or improper conduct injurious to the welfare of the University, or a record of sustained unsatisfactory performance as determined by Provost-approved [or Chancellor-approved], college-specific procedures. Other actions inconsistent with the responsibilities of a member of the academic community may provide adequate cause for removal, but the principles set forth in I. above shall not be violated. Improper conduct injurious to the welfare of the University either by individuals or by groups shall include (but not by way of limitation) obstruction or disruption of the teaching, research, administration, disciplinary procedures, or other University activities, or of other authorized activities on University premises, or inciting others to conduct having such effects.

Post-Tenure Review

48. Each unit will be asked to identify a constructive PTR process appropriate to the mission of the unit subject to Provost [or Chancellor] approval.

49. The process developed should build on processes already in place such as annual review.

50. The process is intended to be initiated at the College, School, or Campus level on the assumption that one process will not fit all Purdue University academic units.
Appendices
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Additional References and Cases

Additional References


Cases


Mayberry v. Dees, 663 F.2d. 502 (1981)

McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green, 411 U.S. 792 (1973)


27 Collegiality Indicators (arranged by Organizational Citizenship Behavior Category)

Altruism

1. Assists co-workers with job related problems
2. Assists co-workers with personal problems when needed
3. Shares materials when needed
4. Consults with others on work related problems when needed

Conscientiousness

5. Puts forth extra effort on the job
6. Serves on university wide committees
7. Volunteers for appropriate share of extra jobs or assignments
8. Agrees to teach an appropriate share of undesirable courses
9. Displays a generally positive attitude
10. Has positive contact with co-workers within own department
11. Has positive contact with co-workers outside of own department
12. Encourages faculty
13. Supports faculty

Sportsmanship

14. Avoids excessive complaining
15. Avoids petty grievances
16. Is not disruptive in meetings
17. Negotiates respectfully with co-workers
18. Praises achievements or awards of co-workers

Courtesy

19. Does not “gossip” negatively about co-workers
20. Challenges perceived injustices in a respectful manner
21. Demonstrates respect towards co-workers
22. Touches base with relevant persons

Civic Virtue

23. Regularly attends meetings important to departmental functioning
24. Promptly keeps appointments with co-workers
25. Completes committee responsibilities and assignments on time
26. Suggests improvements to the department or college
27. Contributes to joint efforts
Note: In addition to the 27 indicators, the Collegiality Committee believes it is important to recognize the value of expressing opposing opinions during discussion. Constructive debate should be encouraged. Consequently, the Committee added at 28th indicator to the list:

28. Expresses dissenting opinions and objections politely
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2008 Purdue University Report of the Interdisciplinary Initiatives Committee

REPORT OF THE INTERDISCIPLINARY INITIATIVES COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 9, 2008

Interdisciplinary Initiatives Committee

Committee Members: Alan Beck (Chair), Susan Curtis, Robert Geahlen, Klod Kokini, George McCabe, Robert Plante, Elizabeth Taparowsky, Val Watts, and David Williams (ex officio)

“Customary practices regarding tenure decisions that have existed for decades have become entitlements. The rigid departmental structure has become outmoded. Many of the best opportunities for significant scholarship lie in multidisciplinary areas. Yet a comment in the Kellogg Commission letter is to the effect that society has problems; universities have departments.”

Editorial: "Evolution of Higher Education" by Philip H. Abelson
Science; 277 (5327): 747, 8 August 1997

PREAMBLE:

Purdue University's Strategic Plan "New Synergies" emphasizes interdisciplinary activity; "Purdue University will set the pace for new interdisciplinary synergies that serve citizens world-wide with profound scientific, technological, social, and humanitarian impact on advancing societal prosperity and quality of life.”

In response the University Senate Steering Committee requested that the Faculty Affairs Committee charge a subcommittee to propose guidelines for the consideration of Interdisciplinary activity in promotion cases—the Interdisciplinary Initiatives Committee (IIC). The committee also considered related issues that could be used to promote and encourage interdisciplinary activities.

Interdisciplinary efforts are needed to solve many of the most important problems faced by our society. These activities provide opportunities for faculty to move into new academic fields. Such activities can provide rich rewards because the scientific and curricular activities of faculty are not limited by a set of disciplinary boundaries (e.g., colleges, schools, departments). Among the richest of these rewards is the opportunity to learn new things while simultaneously contributing to new applications.
In addition to meeting the intellectual and educational needs of a university, facilitating interdisciplinary activities also enhances the university’s ability to compete for external research funding. This is especially true when federal funding priorities include initiatives that promote interdisciplinary activity.

As important as interdisciplinary activities are, the organizational structure of universities, and thereby colleges, schools and departments, often run counter to the facilitation of interdisciplinary activities in general. Universities are traditionally organized by discipline. Hence, any truly interdisciplinary activity is generally neither commensurate with the goals of a discipline-focused organization nor to the incentive/reward/promotion systems that support it.

How does one embed a culture supportive of interdisciplinary activities within a discipline-focused structure? Revising the structure or at least the incentive systems that support it seems prudent. Acceptance among the faculty is critical, and we must be cognizant of the “discipline-focused” environment within which we currently operate. With the current career risk posed to junior faculty, it is incumbent upon the senior faculty to assume leadership in increasing desired interdisciplinary activity. It is also incumbent upon each department, school, or college to support and encourage senior faculty to do so. To that end, we make the following recommendations:

**Recommendation 1:**

University promotion and tenure policy should explicitly recognize interdisciplinary activities. The university promotion policy should contain guidelines for considering interdisciplinary activities in promotion cases. These guidelines should provide mechanisms by which the importance of interdisciplinary activities could be highlighted during the promotion decision process. The development of these guidelines should assist in initiating a dialogue that will eventually lead to the inclusion of interdisciplinary efforts as positive and serious components of a promotion case. To begin this process, the template for faculty promotion documents should include categories for “interdisciplinary discovery”, “interdisciplinary learning”, and “interdisciplinary engagement”.

**Recommendation 2:**

Candidates should also include a statement highlighting their interdisciplinary activities. This statement should include the candidate’s relative contribution to the projects that are listed. It should also describe how this work has led to new opportunities as well as how these efforts have influenced the candidate’s overall development as a faculty member.
Recommendation 3:

It is recognized that the primary committee may have difficulty evaluating the strengths and significance of the interdisciplinary efforts. Therefore, **departments/schools may wish to ask for additional input on the interdisciplinary accomplishments.** This could include review from both Purdue and non-Purdue faculty. It may also include a statement of work and responsibilities from collaborators named by the candidate.

Recommendation 4:

The annual faculty evaluation system (i.e., activity reports) should be revised to clearly highlight the positive impact realized from **interdisciplinary activities.** To align incentives/rewards consistent with the strategic plan, each department/school/college template for faculty annual activity reports should include categories for **interdisciplinary discovery, interdisciplinary learning, and interdisciplinary engagement.**

Recommendation 5:

In recognition of the current career risks of interdisciplinary activity, particularly for junior faculty, leadership should be provided for supporting interdisciplinary activity at the lowest possible cost/risk to the faculty member. In our opinion, the best way to do this is to develop a structure for recognizing and rewarding **interdisciplinary learning.** One potential benefit of such interdisciplinary teaching, especially via the interdisciplinary teaching of graduate seminars, is the initiation of **interdisciplinary research/discovery** opportunities.

Recommendation 6:

The advancement of interdisciplinary activities will only occur through the leadership of our senior faculty. Broad-based senior faculty acceptance of the importance of interdisciplinary activity and their leadership in such activities is vital to the realization and sustainability of successful interdisciplinary activities. To this end, senior faculty should provide mentorship and advise junior colleagues about interdisciplinary activity.

Recommendation 7:

Consistent with Purdue University’s strategic plan (and those subsequently developed by departments, schools and colleges), it may be useful to **annually track the number of interdisciplinary efforts that**
faculty are pursuing. Over time, this would help to assess whether actions taken to increase/improve interdisciplinary activities have proved useful or more needs to be done.
Appendix 3:

Confidential Primary Committee Feedback Form

Name: ____________________ Rank: ____________________
Start Date: ____________ Mentor: ____________________
Tenure Clock Start: ____________ Penultimate Year: _________

Based on current level of accomplishments and impact, ___________ progress towards promotion:
☐ Exceeds expectations
☐ Meets expectations
☐ Needs improvement in (specify areas of concern for you)

Based on the information you have now, do you think he/she will be ready for promotion next year?
☐ Yes
☐ No, unlikely that a positive vote would be cast even if more detailed information was presented
☐ Not sure, but warrants preparation of a full document, so that a more informed decision can be made.

Further Comments:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Adopted from Mechanical Engineering Primary Committee Form
Appendix 4:
Purdue University West Lafayette Campus
Promotion and Tenure Policy
(Provost’s Annual Memorandum)

To: Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Clinical/Professional Faculty
Re: West Lafayette Campus Promotion and Tenure Policy

The following statements have been prepared for the purpose of informing the members of the tenured, tenure-track, and clinical/professional faculty of Purdue University of the policies and procedures that are followed in recommending them for promotion to higher academic rank.

SECTION I
GENERAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

The tasks of University faculty members are to acquire, discover, appraise and disseminate knowledge. They should communicate this knowledge and the manner of its acquisition or discovery to their immediate community of students and scholars, to their profession, and to society at large. Service to the institution, the community, the state, the nation and the world constitutes an important mission of University faculty members. As an institution of higher education with a commitment to excellence and a diversity of missions, Purdue University values creative endeavor, research, and scholarship; teaching and learning in its many forms; and engagement in its many forms, including extension and outreach for example. To be considered for promotion, a faculty member should have demonstrated excellence and scholarly productivity in at least one of these areas: discovery, learning and engagement. Ordinarily, strength should be manifest in more than one of these areas.

RECOGNITION OF VARIETY IN ACHIEVEMENT

The diversity of the academic enterprise in a land-grant institution such as Purdue University is to be taken into account when promotions are considered. For example, artists’ portfolios and performances that may simultaneously represent unique discoveries and their
communication are equivalent to the more traditional publications and research products. The same is true of innovation in clinical instruction, diagnostic activities, engagement, extension and outreach roles, and the like. Administrative functions, committee service, special program management, contributions to staff development, leadership in community affairs, participation in scholarly and professional societies, membership on review panels, consultation to government agencies, and the like are additional examples of professorial roles worthy of appropriate recognition. Faculty also may contribute in ways such as assisting in the production of scholarly publications, devising curricula, developing courseware, counseling students, organizing laboratories and libraries, officiating in professional societies, and so on. Many other equivalents exist and have to be recognized by members of the successive committees on promotions.

Length of service in rank is one of the criteria for promotion, but by itself should not insure promotion or cause denial of promotion.

THE FACULTY REVIEW SYSTEM

The promotion requirements are intended to guide all academic units of the University. Throughout the entire promotion process, primary, area and university promotion committee members respond to each tenure or promotion nomination as individuals, interpreting achievements described in the nominating documents in the light of standards appropriate for the nominee’s discipline and the University’s criteria for promotion. In the course of these evaluations, the give-and-take of full and confidential discussion is a critical element to informing each committee member of the candidate’s accomplishments. To this end, and with the unanimous support of the University Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, only those promotion committee members present for the entire discussion of a candidate’s record shall be extended the privilege of voting (Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes, March 2, 1998). Additional information about Purdue’s promotion process is included in Section III of this document.

To optimize faculty growth and productivity, it is important that department and/or school heads who chair primary committees and have an active role on area committees attempt to convey, annually and as accurately as possible, to each colleague who is not a full professor, what levels of performance and achievement are viewed favorably by those two committees. Deans of colleges/schools who chair area committees and have an active role on the University Promotions Committee have corresponding obligations to the members of their area committees.

SECTION II
PROMOTION TO DIFFERENT RANKS

Tenure-track Faculty

Promotion to Assistant Professor
A tenure-track instructor may be promoted to assistant professor upon attaining the level of professional accomplishment which would have justified appointment to an assistant professorship.

Promotion to Associate Professor
Academic tenure is acquired on promotion to this rank. A successful candidate should have a significant record of accomplishment as a faculty member and show promise of continued professional growth and recognition.
Promotion to Professor
Successful candidates should be recognized as authorities in their fields of specialization by external colleagues -- national and/or international as may be appropriate in their academic disciplines -- and be valued for their intramural contributions as faculty members.

Clinical/Professional Faculty

Promotion to Clinical/Professional Assistant Professor
Required degrees, qualifications, specialty certifications, and experience shall be determined by the appointing department. Successful candidates for promotion must exhibit expertise in clinical/professional practice and be qualified to participate in the education program of the department. They also must have a primary commitment to assist the college/school in meeting its programmatic need for clinical/professional services and instruction.

Promotion to Clinical/Professional Associate Professor
Required degrees, qualifications (e.g., certification), or experience shall be determined by the appointing department. Successful candidates for promotion must demonstrate evidence of excellence in teaching and clinical/professional practice and have a primary commitment to assist the college/school in meeting its programmatic needs for clinical/professional services and instruction. They also are expected to have accomplishments or potential for national prominence in their fields.

Promotion to Clinical/Professional Professor
Successful candidates must demonstrate an extremely high level of professional accomplishment in teaching, service, and clinical/professional practice and must be recognized by their peers at the national level.

SECTION III
GENERAL PROCEDURE

Before or during the first semester of each academic year, the head of each school, division, or department shall convene the primary committee, which is to consist of all tenured full professors and all tenured associate professors in the respective administrative unit. Tenured associate professors discuss and vote upon promotion up to and including the associate professor level. The department head shall act as chair of the primary committee.

At least five tenured full professors are necessary for voting on cases of promotion to full and associate professors. When this minimum number is not available in the candidate’s department, additional tenured full professors shall be appointed by the chair of the area committee (usually the dean) to which the primary committee reports, following consultation with the appropriate department head. Clinical/professional faculty at the professor level will vote on all clinical/professional faculty being considered for promotion. Clinical/professional associate professors discuss and vote upon promotion up to and including the clinical/professional associate professor level.

Faculty members who are in their penultimate probationary year shall be automatically nominated for promotion and voted on by the primary committee unless they specifically request otherwise in writing at any step in the process. Faculty who have been in rank less than six years also may be nominated for promotion by any member of the primary committee. Those whose nominations are seconded shall be voted on by the committee. Faculty with tenure who are not nominated by a member of the primary committee but,
nevertheless, consider themselves ready for promotion may nominate themselves and have their cases for promotion considered by the primary committee, if they have not been considered for promotion during the last three years. Review of candidates in the final year of their probationary period requires prior approval by the Provost.

A Nomination for Promotion form – President’s Office Form 36 (hereafter referred to as Form 36) -- must be submitted for **ALL** faculty members in their penultimate year, regardless of the vote at the Primary and/or Area Committee levels. A Form 36 also should be submitted for penultimate year faculty members who choose not to be reviewed. A Form 36 also should be submitted for all faculty members who are nominated for tenure and receive a majority affirmative Primary Committee vote regardless of their year in rank. A Form 36 also should be submitted for all faculty who are nominated for promotion to full professor and receive a majority affirmative Area Committee vote.

Supporting documents are not required with Form 36 if the penultimate year faculty member chooses not to be considered for promotion. Supporting documents also are not required for faculty members who fail to receive a positive majority vote for promotion to Full Professor, but Form 36 should be submitted in both of these cases.

The department head shall not cast a vote in the primary committee; rather, his/her recommendation will appear separate from the primary committee’s recommendation on the promotion document. This constraint will not apply if the number (including the chair) of tenured full professors on the primary committee is less than seven. Tenured associate professors are included in this count for review of candidates for promotion up to associate professor. The Provost, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the other members of the University Promotions Committee (see below) who are deans of academic colleges/schools will not vote in any primary committee.

The Form 36 shall contain at least the following items: name and PUID of the nominee, proposed rank and title, present rank and title, previous Purdue University rank and title, penultimate year (if applicable) and academic record. For faculty who remain in consideration for promotion beyond the Primary Committee level, additional documentation should contain: basis of nomination, prior experience, teaching assignments and evaluations of performance, research responsibilities and achievements, extension and engagement assignments and evaluation of performance, scholarly work in progress, publications, administrative and committee responsibilities, other pertinent activities (membership and positions held in professional societies, consultation, committee and public service, etc.), prospects for future development, comments and recommendations by the department head, reference letters, and the vote of the primary committee and area committee where applicable.

Please note that a faculty member may have received an extension of the tenure clock by virtue of University policy. Under these circumstances, the criteria for promotion and tenure are the same. When applicable, this language shall be included in a request for an external review letter.

Additionally it should be noted to external reviewers, under Purdue University policies, that their reply will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. The following statement should be included in all external review letter requests:

> Candidates may request a summary of all evaluations in their file, however sources remain confidential. We cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or government agency will not require the disclosure of the source of confidential
evaluations. Purdue University will endeavor to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluations to the fullest extent allowable under law.

A candidate should be given the opportunity to help create and review his/her promotion documentation and may receive a copy of any document (with confidential statements omitted) that will be submitted to the primary, area, and/or University committee(s). It is the right of the candidate to have included in his/her departmental file whatever the candidate chooses to add, including the candidate’s own brief (one page) comments about teaching, research/creative activities, service or engagement. Candidates may choose to attach their comments to the promotion document.

To permit candidates and potential candidates to exercise their rights in a convenient fashion, it is expected that each chair of a primary committee should, during the first month of each fall semester, publish a timetable setting forth the dates of the primary committee meetings and suitable deadlines for faculty members to update their files and to receive and react to the appropriate parts of a nomination for promotion.

The area committee shall consist of the dean, serving as chair, department and/or school heads, plus tenured full professors elected by the voting faculty of the college/school according to procedures established by that faculty. If specified by college/school by-laws, area committees may include associate deans. At least one-third of the membership of each area committee shall consist of tenured faculty members without administrative responsibilities. In no case will the number of faculty members without administrative responsibilities be fewer than two. Clinical/professional faculty at the rank of full professor selected in accordance with college/school procedures will be voting members for all clinical/professional faculty being considered for promotion.

Each nomination shall be considered and discussed individually by the area committee, after which time a secret ballot will be held. The result of the ballot shall be recorded on the nomination form.

The dean shall not cast a vote in the area committee. Rather, the dean’s recommendation will appear separately from the area committee’s recommendation on the promotion document.

A separate, secret ballot shall be cast for each candidate in the primary and area committees. In addition to providing for a “yes” or “no” vote, the ballot should provide an opportunity to show reasons for the vote cast, with space allocated for comments, explanations, etc. The primary purpose of the ballot, other than to obtain a numerical vote count, is to contribute to a summary for “feed-forward” and “feed-back” use. The reasons for a negative vote are especially important.

The Dean of the College/School determines the attendance policy for the primary and area committee meetings. All eligible members participating in promotion committee deliberation are required to vote on all candidates unless a conflict of interest with a particular candidate has been identified. Submission of a blank ballot, recusals, or failure to cast a ballot are not regarded as votes.

Candidates who receive at least a simple majority vote of the area committee and support of their dean will be considered by the University Promotions Committee. In addition, the University Promotions Committee will consider candidates who receive either a simple majority vote of the area committee or the support of their respective college/school dean. Panel A will consider promotions within tenured and tenure-track ranks and Panel X will
consider promotions within clinical/professional ranks. These panels, following a secret ballot on each nomination, shall record the result of their ballot on Form 36 that also shows the results of the balloting by the primary and area committees. These forms are then to be transmitted to the President of the University who, in turn, makes his/her recommendations to the Board of Trustees for final action.

Candidates receiving a two-thirds affirmative vote by the University Promotions committee will be recommended by the Provost for promotion. In those cases where a recommendation supported by at least two-thirds of an area committee has been rejected by the University Promotions Committee, the dean may request written explanations for the vote.

Panel A of the University Promotions Committee for the West Lafayette campus shall consist of the Provost (chair); the Dean of the Graduate School; the Dean of Libraries; the academic deans; seven tenured faculty members nominated by the University Senate Nominating Committee and appointed by the President for three-year terms. Members of the University Promotions Committee must attend in person in order to cast a ballot. The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs is invited to attend Panel A sessions as a non-voting advisor to the Provost.

Panel X shall consist of the Provost as chair, three academic deans from schools/colleges employing clinical/professional faculty, and six faculty members. The Provost shall nominate three of these faculty from Panel A of the University Promotions Committee. The remaining three faculty, either tenure-track or clinical/professional professors, shall be nominated by the University Senate Nominating Committee and appointed by the President for three-year terms.

It is in the best interest of the University and faculty that full and frank discussion occur during the deliberations of promotion committees. The confidentiality of remarks made at such meetings should, therefore, be carefully preserved. Recommendations against promotion may be discussed with the faculty member affected, in a discreet manner and without undue delay, by the appropriate department head or dean. Faculty will be advised of their promotion progress by their department head after the Primary Committee and by their dean or his /her designee after the Area Committee and University Promotions Committee meetings. Official notice will be sent to promoted faculty members after the President and the Board of Trustees approve the promotions.

For tenure track faculty, where tenure is requested and approved outside of the normal promotion process, the tenure will be effective with the beginning of the semester following approval. Therefore, tenure approvals in the Fall semester will be effective in the following Spring semester. Spring semester approvals will be effective with the start of the next academic year for academic year faculty and the start of the next fiscal year for fiscal year faculty. Approvals in the summer will be effective at the beginning of the next academic year for both academic year and fiscal year faculty. In accordance with current practice, tenure without promotion requires an endorsement by both the Primary and Area Promotion Committees, a recommendation by the Dean, and approval by the Provost.
Note that new faculty appointments that include the awarding of tenure with the offers are not covered by the above process. In these cases, tenure is effective with the start date of the contract. For immediate tenure, current practice requires a request be submitted to the Provost for approval that includes an endorsement by the Primary (or Area) Promotion Committee and a recommendation by the Dean.

Questions regarding interpretation of these procedures shall be referred to the Provost or Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs for final determination.

Sincerely,

Tim Sands
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

POLICY-11-12
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Principles and Policies for Academic Freedom, Responsibilities and Tenure, and Procedures for Termination of Faculty Appointments for Cause (B-48)

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
EXECUTIVE MEMORANDUM No. B-48

(Supersedes Executive Memorandum No. B-38)

July 1, 1977

To: Chancellors, Deans, Directors, and Heads of Schools, Divisions, Departments, and Offices

Re: Principles and Policies for Academic Freedom, Responsibilities and Tenure, and Procedures for Termination of Faculty Appointments for Cause

Application: This Memorandum applies to all members of the Purdue University faculty

I. Principles
   A. A faculty member shall have full freedom as a researcher, scholar, or artist. He/she shall be assured freedom to communicate his/her work, to advocate solutions to human problems, and to criticize existing institutions. This freedom is subject only to adequate performance of his/her academic duties and to obligations he/she may have voluntarily assumed in accepting such support for his/her research. It should be recognized that research activities
are also subject to University policies on patents, copyrights, and inventions set forth in Executive Memorandum No. B-10 or succeeding memoranda and, where applicable, to duly established regulations designed to protect the rights and welfare of human subjects.

B. A faculty member shall have freedom in the classroom in discussing his/her subject, but he/she should avoid infringing upon his/her students' right to learn by introducing irrelevant subject matter.

C. A faculty member is a member of society; when he or she speaks or writes in that capacity freedom from University censorship or discipline shall prevail. The special position in the community enjoyed by a faculty member, however, imposes special obligations. As a scholar and a member of the University faculty, it should be remembered that the public may judge one's profession and the University by public utterances. A faculty member should make every effort to indicate that he/she is not a spokesperson for the University. A faculty member who assumes a governmental or political position or responsibility with the full consent and knowledge of the University shall be protected in his/her tenure rights in the event of controversy arising from the performance of his/her duties.

D. By accepting appointment to the faculty, the faculty member assumes the responsibilities of teaching, administration, or research as assigned by the proper University authorities. It is expected that these duties will be carried out in accordance with the spirit and terms of USD 66-14, Standards of Academic Ethics Within the University.

II. Tenure Policies

A. Appointments to the faculty are made by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the President of the University. The terms and conditions of the appointment constitute and are set forth in a written contract of employment.

B. Tenure at Purdue University is a matter of policy and not a legal obligation binding on the University. Tenure policies are subject to change by the Board of Trustees, and it follows that all appointments to the faculty are subject to such changes. It is the policy of the University to renew appointments of faculty members who have attained tenured status, subject always to the availability of funds, the continuance of activities in the area of employment, and the absence of circumstances which would otherwise entitle the University to terminate the appointment for cause. Tenure is effective only at the particular campus of the University where it was acquired.

C. It is the intent of the University that tenure be acquired only as a result of positive action and never by default. The current policies concerning acquisition of tenured status are listed below. (These policies for acquisition of tenure are not intended to remove from the President of the University or his designees the power to terminate non-tenured or probationary faculty members after appropriate consultation.)

1. Full-time members of the faculty who hold the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor are eligible for
Tenure. The procedures for obtaining tenure are as follows:

a. Tenure will be automatically granted upon promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor.

b. The tenure of all other members of the faculty eligible for tenure will be determined during a probationary period not exceeding
   i. three years for professors
   ii. four years for associate professors
   iii. seven years for assistant professors and instructors

c. Sometime not later than during the penultimate year of the probationary period, the department head will convene the department primary committee to consider tenure. The same procedures and documents used in considerations of promotion will be followed. A positive vote of the primary committee will be documented and forwarded by the department with his/her own recommendation to the area committee. If the vote of the primary committee is negative, the department head may either forward the documentation to the area committee with his/her own positive recommendation or else inform the faculty member by letter that his/her employment will be terminated at the end of the probationary period. The area committee of each school will be convened annually to consider all recommendations for tenure forwarded to it. The same procedures and documentations used in considerations of promotion will be used. The dean of each school will forward his/her recommendation and that of the area committee for final decision to:
   i. The executive vice president and provost for tenure recommendations at the West Lafayette Campus, and
   ii. The chancellors for tenure recommendations at their respective regional campuses in accordance with the procedures approved for the respective campuses.

2. Also eligible for tenure are professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who hold part-time appointments of not less than 50% of full-time and whose duties include the normal responsibilities of full-time faculty members, including teaching, research, and service. The procedures for obtaining tenure are the same as those for full-time faculty members as described in a. above. However, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period by one, two, or three years. This request shall be made by a letter to the dean, with a copy to the department head, prior to the meeting of the primary committee during the penultimate year of the probationary period for full-time faculty as defined in a. above. In the event of an adjustment to full-time status during the
probationary period, the request for an extension of probationary time will be restricted as follows:

If the adjustment to full-time status occurs during the

a. first or second year, there will be no extension of probationary time
b. third year, there will be a maximum extension of one year
c. fourth year, there will be a maximum extension two years
d. fifth or sixth year, there will be a maximum extension of three years.

A member of the faculty whose initial appointment is on a full-time basis and whose appointment is adjusted to a part-time basis during the first three years of service to the University may request an extension equivalent to the probationary time for those who begin with a part-time appointment. If the adjustment to part-time status occurs during the fourth or subsequent year of initial appointment, the probationary period will be the same as that of a full-time faculty member as stated in a. above.

3. Members of the faculty who hold appointments other than those listed in a. and b. above (e.g., lecturer, adjunct instructor or professor, associate staff, affiliate staff, etc.) are not eligible for tenure.

4. The accumulation of time toward tenure is expected to be on an uninterrupted basis as a full-time faculty member or a part-time faculty member as defined in b. above at one campus of Purdue University, but justifiable conditions or interruptions may be considered as a basis for deviation from this policy. Official leave without salary will not be considered an interruption of continuity of service but will not count toward the limits of probationary time. Different provisions concerning the length of the probationary period for faculty members coming to any one Purdue campus with professional experience at another institution or at a different Purdue campus may be made in individual cases if set forth in the written contract of employment.

5. Administrative officers serve at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees and there shall be no tenure in an administrative office. Further, there shall be no tenure associated with administrative titles carrying the phrase "with the rank of."

III. Procedures in Cases of Termination for Cause:

A. General. In all cases in which the University proposes to terminate for cause the appointment of a faculty member who has previously acquired tenure, or to terminate for cause the appointment of a non-tenured faculty member prior to the expiration of the term of appointment, the following procedures
set forth in this Memorandum shall apply and in all such cases the faculty member shall be entitled to a hearing before a committee of the faculty as provided herein. The procedures set forth herein do not apply to cases in which the appointment of a non-tenured faculty member has expired or will expire by its terms and the University does not grant such person a new appointment or does not renew or extend the term of his/her appointment.

B. Committees on the faculty. On the West Lafayette Campus the committee of the faculty shall be the Faculty Committee on Censure and Dismissal Proceedings, as constituted under the provisions of Senate Document 68-8, with such amendments as may be approved by the University Senate and the Board of Trustees. On the Regional Campuses such hearings shall be held before comparable faculty committees.

C. Informal Procedures. Actual or potential controversies concerning the termination for cause of a faculty member should be resolved informally if possible. The President of the University or his designee (e.g., Executive Vice President and Provost or Regional Campus Chancellor) may discuss the matter with the faculty member in a personal conference. If this does not result in a solution of the problem by mutual consent, or if the President of the University or his designee should desire faculty advice before opening discussion with the faculty member, the matter may be referred to the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Senate (or comparable faculty committee at a regional campus). The role of this committee will be to inquire informally into the situation, using whatever procedures seem appropriate, and to advise the President of the University or his designee and the faculty member with particular attention to the desirability of effecting a resolution of the problem to the satisfaction of all concerned. If informal resolution is not possible, and if either the President of the University or his designee or the faculty member requests a formal hearing, formal proceedings may be instituted in accordance with the provisions of this document.

D. Formal Procedures.
   1. Adequate cause for termination of the employment of a faculty member from a tenured position or before the expiration of the term of appointment of a non-tenured faculty member will include proven incompetence, gross neglect of duty, moral turpitude, or improper conduct injurious to the welfare of the University. Other actions inconsistent with the responsibilities of a member of the academic community may provide adequate cause for removal, but the principles set forth in I. above shall not be violated. Improper conduct injurious to the welfare of the University either by individuals or by groups shall include (but not by way of limitation) obstruction or disruption of the teaching, research, administration, disciplinary procedures, or other University activities, or of other authorized activities on University premises, or inciting others to conduct having such effects.
   2. In all cases in which the University proposes to terminate an
appointment for cause before the end of the term of the appointment (whether or not the faculty member has acquired tenure), and if the matter has not been informally resolved, the President of the University, or his authorized representative, shall initiate formal proceedings by giving the faculty member a written statement containing the precise charges upon which the proposed termination for cause is based. This communication shall inform the faculty member, by inclusion of a copy of this Memorandum, of the procedural rights that will be accorded him/her. The President or his authorized representative shall request the Faculty Committee on Censure and Dismissal Proceedings (or appropriate Regional Campus committee) to set a time and place for the formal hearing of the case. The Hearing Committee shall be constituted as described in Senate Document 68?8 or parallel Regional Campus documents. The faculty member shall, not less than one week before the date set for the hearing, submit to the President and to the Hearing Committee his/her written answer to the charges, or state that no hearing is desired. If the faculty member fails to answer the charges or states that he/she desires no hearing be held, the President may proceed with the termination or may request that the hearing be held.

3. The faculty member may be suspended during the proceedings involving him/her only if, in the judgement of the President, his/her continuance should threaten immediate harm to the faculty member, to others, or to the University. Before suspending a faculty member, the administration will, if feasible, consult with the Faculty Affairs Committee. Unless legal considerations forbid, any such suspension shall be with full pay.

4. The function of the Hearing Committee shall be to determine whether or not the faculty member is guilty of the charges set out in the written statement of charges. The Hearing Committee will conduct its hearings in private. The President of the University may attend the hearings, as may his representatives chosen to present the point of view of the administration. The faculty member may be accompanied by an advisor of his/her own choosing who may act as his/her counsel. The Hearing Committee will receive oral and written statements of witnesses and other evidence concerning matters set forth in the letter of the President of the University as desired by the President of the University or his designee, the faculty member, and the Committee. The Hearing Committee will conduct the questioning of the witnesses and should secure the presentation of all evidence deemed important to the case. The faculty member and his/her counsel and the President of the University and his representatives will have the right to question all witnesses who testify orally, within reasonable limits.

The faculty member will have the opportunity to be confronted by all
witnesses adverse to him/her, except under the most unusual and urgent circumstances or if the witness cannot appear. In any case, the identity of the witness, as well as his/her statement, must be disclosed to the faculty member. In the case of charges of incompetence, the testimony on this point should include that of qualified scholars.

The Hearing Committee shall give opportunity to the faculty member and his/her counsel and to the President of the University and his designated representatives, to argue orally before it. The Hearing Committee may, if it desires, request written statements.

Within a reasonable time after the conclusion of the hearing and the receipt of the transcript of the hearing, the Hearing Committee (by a majority vote of the entire Committee) shall determine whether the faculty member is guilty of each of the charges set forth in the written statement of charges. This determination shall be based solely on the evidence introduced at the hearing. The Committee shall prepare a written report setting forth its determination of guilt or innocence and shall also state its specific findings of fact supporting its determinations as to each charge. Copies of the report shall be furnished to the faculty member and to the President, and each of them or their representatives shall have access to the record of the hearing. The President shall take appropriate action in view of the report.

IV. Review Procedures

Either the faculty member or the President may, within 30 days after receiving the record of the hearing and the Committee report, request a review by the Board of Trustees. The Board's review shall be based on the record made during the hearing before the Hearing Committee, accompanied by full opportunity for either written briefs or oral argument, or both. If the Board affirms the determinations of the Hearing Committee, the matter shall be deemed closed and the President may proceed to terminate the faculty member if he/she has been found guilty of any of the charges. If the Board finds that the Hearing Committee's determinations and findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence, or are otherwise improper, the Board shall return the matter to the Hearing Committee with a written statement of its reasons. The Hearing Committee shall reconsider the matter, receiving new evidence as deemed necessary. It shall then report its new determinations and findings of fact to the Board, with copies to the faculty member and the President. After considering the report, the Board shall make its final decision in the case, and the matter shall be deemed closed.

Arthur G. Hansen
President
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Terms and Conditions of Employment of Faculty Members (B-50)

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
EXECUTIVE MEMORANDUM No. B-50

(Supersedes Executive Memorandum No. B-50, Dated 28 July 1977)

March 16, 1979

To: Deans, Directors, and Heads of Schools, Divisions, Departments, and Offices, Regional Campus Chancellors, and Faculty Members

Re: Terms and Conditions of Employment of Faculty Members

I. DEFINITION OF TERMS
A. Faculty Members — Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Instructors, Veterinary Interns, and Post-Doctoral employees. Adjunct appointees, affiliate appointees, associate appointees, and Lecturers are not included within this definition, nor are they included within or covered by any of the provisions of this Memorandum.

B. Non-tenured Faculty — There are two types of non-tenured faculty:
   1. Members Eligible for Tenure — Faculty members with the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor appointments, who hold either full-time faculty appointments, or part-time faculty appointments of not less than 50% of full-time (as further defined in Executive Memorandum No. B-48, as revised or supplemented from time to time), and who, at any given time, remain in probationary status and have not been given notice of non-renewal of their employment;
   2. Members not Eligible for Tenure — Faculty members who do not meet the criteria for the above category B. 1.; also, those who have been given notice of non-renewal of their employment.

C. Effective Date — Date this Memorandum was the Board of Trustees (16 March 1979).
D. President or His Designee — The delegation outlined in Executive Memorandum No. B-31.
E. Form 19 — The appointment to the faculty form, used both for appointment of a new faculty employee and for extension of the employment of a continuing employee.
F. Form 19E — Official University notice of non-renewal of contract form.

II. GENERAL

This Memorandum sets forth the terms and conditions of employment of faculty members, as defined above, and applies to all existing and future appointments of faculty members, except temporary appointments for a summer session, which are governed by Executive Memorandum No. B-5. It does not apply to any persons other than faculty members as so defined.

III. NEW APPOINTMENTS

All new appointments to the faculty are governed by this Memorandum and are made by executing Form 19 even if immediate tenure is a condition of appointment. All initial appointments, whether tenured or non-tenured, shall be subject to approval of the Board of Trustees.

IV. TENURED FACULTY

Existing Appointments — The appointments of faculty members who have previously acquired tenure continue in effect without the execution of Form 19, subject to the provisions of Executive Memorandum No. B-48, as revised or supplemented from time to time, and the other provisions of this Memorandum.

V. NON TENURED

A. Existing Appointments — The existing appointment of each faculty member who has not acquired tenure as of the Effective Date of this Memorandum is or should be evidenced by an individually executed Form 19, the terms of which will not be affected by the adoption of this Memorandum. The existing appointment of any non-tenured faculty member who was given notice, prior to the Effective Date (pursuant to his or her Form 19 and to Executive Memorandum No. B-50 as previously in effect) that his or her appointment would terminate at a time on or after the Effective Date, will terminate in accordance with such notice and will not be renewed or extended.

B. Duration of Appointments —
   1. All non-tenured faculty appointments will be for a definite term, with a specific end date expressly stated in the Form 19. If faculty members are hired with immediate tenure, Form 19 will provide for an indefinite term (subject to the provisions of Executive Memorandum No. B-48 as revised or supplemented from time to time).
2. No non-tenured appointments will be automatically renewed or extended; except, that if a faculty member is granted tenure during the term of an originally non-tenured appointment, his or her appointment will be treated as having been extended for an indefinite term (subject to the provisions of Executive Memorandum No. B-48 as revised or supplemented from time to time). Notice of a decision not to renew a non-tenured appointment will be given as provided in section 5. C. below, except in cases governed by the following subsection (5. B. (3)).

3. Persons ineligible for tenure may be appointed for a specific, limited time when there is no expectation of continuing the appointment beyond a certain date. In such cases, the Form 19 will indicate that the end date signifies termination date without further notice. In such instances the Form 19 serves as both the appointment form and the termination notice.

C. Non-Renewal of Appointment Notice —
   1. If the University does not intend to renew or extend the term of appointment of a non-tenured faculty member, who is eligible for tenure and is serving a probationary period, the University shall give him or her written notice on Form 19E within the following applicable time period: at least three months before the expiration date, if given during the first year of employment; at least six months before the expiration date, if given during the second year of employment; and at least 12 months before the expiration date, if given after the second year of employment. The University's notice of non-renewal of appointment Form 19E may be given by the President, or such person or persons as the President may designate.

   2. If the University does not intend to extend the term of appointment of a non-tenured faculty member who is ineligible for tenure, it shall give him or her written advance notice of such intention by processing the Form 19E one month prior to termination for each year of continuous service immediately prior to the end-date, with a maximum of 12 months' advance notice, except where the provisions of subsection 5. B. (3) apply.

D. Renewal or Extension of Appointments —
   1. All renewals or extensions of non-tenured faculty appointments shall be evidenced solely by execution of a new Form 19, which shall be subject to the same limitations as to duration, as set forth in section 5. B. above.

   2. Other than by execution of a new Form 19 by the President or his duly authorized designee, no officer or employee of the University is authorized to represent or agree, directly or indirectly, that the term of any non-tenured appointment to the faculty will or may be renewed or extended. The fact that the University may have entered into one or more extension agreements with any particular faculty member or with other faculty members (with or without an increase
in salary) does not in any way obligate or bind the University to enter into an extension agreement or any subsequent extension agreement with that particular faculty member or with any other faculty member. No faculty member has any claim to an extension as a matter of right, and none should assume that an extension will be offered by the University. The University may exercise its prerogative of not extending the term of an appointment without a statement of reason.

VI. RESIGNATIONS
A. A faculty member is expected not to resign a fiscal-year appointment after June 1 if he or she is tenured or serving the probationary period for tenure; or if holding an academic-year appointment, he or she is expected not to resign after July 1 for the subsequent year except under conditions established and approved by the President of the University. When a resignation letter is offered by the employee, the Form 19E is not required on the part of the University.

B. A faculty member who is ineligible for tenure is expected not to resign except after giving a one-month notice of intent to resign. Any shorter notice requires approval of and shall be subject to the conditions established by the President of the University. When a resignation letter is offered by the employee, the Form 19E is not required on the part of the University.

VII. TERMINATION DURING TERM OF APPOINTMENT

The University may terminate the employment of any tenured or non-tenured faculty member before the end of the term of appointment (or any extension thereof) for cause (as defined in Executive Memorandum No. B-48, as now or hereafter revised), because of discontinuance of the work or of the position assigned to the faculty member or of the department or school to which the faculty member is assigned, or because of unavailability of funds. If the University proposes to terminate the appointment of a tenured faculty member or the appointment of a non-tenured faculty member before the end of the term of his or her appointment, the procedures set forth in Executive Memorandum No. B-48, as now or hereafter revised, shall be followed. It should be noted that such procedures do not apply to cases which the appointment of a non-tenured faculty member has expired or will expire by its term and the University elects not to give such person a new appointment or to extend the term of his or her appointment.

VIII. TENURE

Tenure at Purdue University is a matter of policy and not a legal obligation binding on the University. Tenure policies are subject to change by the Board of Trustees, and all appointments are subject to any such changes. It is the current policy of the University to extend the appointments of faculty members who have attained tenure status, subject always to the availability of funds, the continuance of activities in the area of employment, and the University's right to terminate the appointment for cause. So long as that policy is in effect, the employment of
faculty holding tenure will be automatically continued from year to year without requiring annual execution of Form 19. Tenure is effective only at the particular campus of the University at which it was acquired. Reference is made to Executive Memorandum No. B-48, as now or hereafter revised, for a more comprehensive statement of the tenure policy of the University.

IX. ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

Persons who are appointed to the faculty may at the same time or at a later time be appointed to an administrative position; e.g., head of a department or dean of a school. Administrative appointments of tenured as well as non-tenured faculty members are made and continue in existence solely at the option of the University and may be terminated at any time without cause. The termination of an administrative appointment does not thereby terminate or otherwise affect the status of a faculty appointment.

X. SALARY PAYMENTS

A. Salaries for academic-year employees are paid in 10 equal installments: the middle of the months of September, October, November, and December; the first working day in January; and the last working day in January, February, March, and April; and the day preceding or following Spring Commencement which may vary from year to year.

B. Salaries for fiscal-year employees are paid in 12 equal installments the last working day of each month with the exception of December; payment for December will be made on the first working day in January.

C. If for any reason service ceases before the term of appointment is ended, payment shall be at the contracted rate for the time of actual service and no allowance shall be made for the uncompleted term of employment.

D. The rate of pay is subject to modification in the event that there is any legislative reduction in the State and Federal appropriation from which such compensation is paid. Salaries derived from other sources will be paid only to the extent of funds available.

XI. STAFF BENEFITS

A. All eligible appointees to the faculty of the University holding rank equivalent to Instructor or above are required to participate in the group insurance programs of the University and to make the stipulated payments thereunder as provided by the policies established by the Trustees.

B. All appointees to the faculty eligible for participation in one of the retirement annuity plans will enter into the regular contract arrangements for such retirement annuity with TIAA.

C. All eligible faculty are entitled to the staff benefit program described in Executive Memo Nos. B-11, B-17, B-19, B-22, and the Faculty and Staff Handbook, as now or hereafter revised.
XII. MISCELLANEOUS

A. All members of the faculty are under obligation to become familiar with the general administrative practices and requirements of the University as set forth in the University Code and in Executive memoranda. It is incumbent upon all members of the faculty engaged in teaching to be familiar with all regulations relating to students, not only those contained in the University Code as now published, but also those adopted from time to time by the faculty or the Trustees. University policies and regulations relative to political activities of the staff are prescribed in Executive Memorandum No. B-4, or succeeding documents, and the policies and regulations concerning patent rights and copyrights are prescribed in Executive Memorandum No. B-10, or succeeding documents. Should a faculty member desire to engage in Outside Activities, he or she must request approval by completing President's Office Form 32.

B. Waiver or Modification of the Memorandum: No officer or employee of Purdue University is authorized to waive any of the provisions of this memorandum or of Form 19. The provisions of this Memorandum and Form 19 may be modified from time to time by the Board of Trustees or by the President of the University. By accepting appointment to the faculty and executing Form 19, each faculty member agrees that all such modifications shall become a part of his or her employment agreement as of the date of such modification, provided that no modification shall reduce any salary except as stated in paragraph 10.D.

C. Conflicts with Other Regulations — This memorandum supersedes all existing policies, rules and regulations established or issued by or on behalf of the University which are in conflict herewith.

Arthur G. Hansen
President
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Tenure-Clock Extension Policy, Procedures and Guidelines**

(Presented at Faculty Senate, January 2007)

Purdue University recognizes the importance of providing a workplace that enables faculty to do their very best work. The university also recognizes that faculty may encounter circumstances which impair or prevent progress toward professional and scholarly achievement. This is an especially critical issue for faculty working toward tenure within a limited and specified timeframe. This policy provides faculty the opportunity to seek an extension of the tenure clock when certain situations arise that slow or hinder achieving tenure.

Background: The University tenure policy (Executive Memorandum B-48, Section II) states that justifiable conditions or interruptions may be considered as a basis for deviations from the traditional probationary tenure clock. Furthermore, the policy grants the University discretion in determining what kinds of conditions shall be deemed justifiable. The President has delegated the authority to approve tenure-clock extensions for justifiable conditions to the Provost.

To ensure consistency and fairness in determining which conditions are sufficiently justifiable to warrant deviation from the tenure policy, the following guidelines are recommended:

1. A one-year automatic approval will be granted for birth of a child and adoption, provided a Request for Tenure-Clock Extension form is submitted within one year of the occurrence and prior to the penultimate year. This provision applies to either or both parents.

*University Senate Document 91-2, Approved 28 October 1991
**Supersedes N-50a - N-50b
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2. When conditions and personal circumstances arise which substantially interfere with progress toward achieving tenure, faculty may request that time be excluded from their probationary periods. Justifiable conditions for granting exclusions include, but are not necessarily restricted to, severe illness, disability, or caregiving of a family member.

   a. Ordinarily, requests for tenure-clock extensions are for one year.
   b. Requests for exclusions should be made within one year from the time the conditions occurred which precipitated the request.
   c. Exclusions will not be granted after the beginning of the penultimate year.
   d. Requests for exclusions will be reviewed by the Provost upon receipt.
   e. Decisions regarding the granting of exclusions shall be based upon:
      a) verification that the conditions leading to the request occurred or continue to exist.
      b) verification that the faculty member demonstrated progress prior to the conditions leading to the request.
   f. Deans and department heads have a responsibility to inform faculty of this policy, especially upon recognition that a qualified faculty member’s progress toward tenure may be impeded by circumstances cited within this policy. Furthermore, faculty members are encouraged to discuss this policy with their head when qualifying circumstances arise or are anticipated.

3. Procedures for initiating, reviewing, and approving requests to exclude time from the probationary period are as follows:

   a) Faculty should submit a Request for Tenure-Clock Extension form to the department head.
   b) The department head shall transmit the request to his/her dean. The department head and/or dean is responsible for ascertaining that the request is valid.
   c) If the dean approves the request, he/she will forward it to the Provost, who will act upon it.
   d) Revised President’s Office Form 19 should be processed to reflect the change in the end of the maximum probationary period.
   e) Any faculty member who feels it necessary to appeal a decision may utilize established grievance procedures.
Request for Tenure-Clock Extension

Name: _________________________________________________________________

Department: ___________________________________________________________________________________

College/School: __________________________________________________________________________________

Campus address: __________________________________________________________________________________

Phone/email: ___________________________________________________________________________________

Tenure-clock start date/penultimate year: ______________________________________________________________

Duration of request (e.g., 1 year): ___________________________________________________________________

“New” penultimate year requested: ________________________________

Rationale for request:
(If request is for childbirth or adoption, send this form directly to the Provost office.)

I understand the conditions associated with the granting of my request for an extension of the tenure clock and accept the extension as an arrangement which does not render an automatic granting of tenure. I also understand that I will not have a claim on tenure if no action is taken on my promotion/tenure status by the newly established penultimate year.

__________________________________________  __________________________
Signature                                      Date

Approvals:

____________________________  __________________________
Department Head                  Date                  Dean                  Date

Head/Dean comments (optional):

Approved:

____________________________
Provost                       Date

Notification of approval will be sent to the requester.
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_________________________ Extension/Change in Appointment
New Appointment

NAME ___________________________ Soc. Sec. # ____________ Total
Last First Middle

DEPARTMENT(S) ___________________________ TITLE ___________________________

PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT: BEGINNS ___________________________ ENDS ___________________________

(Month) (Day) (Year) (Month) (Day) (Year)

(Check One) _____ “Ends” Signifies Termination Date Without Further Notice
_____ “Ends” Signifies Review of Appointment Date

ANNUAL RATE OF PAY FOR THIS APPOINTMENT $ ____________ on an academic/fiscal year basis (“X” out word that does not apply)

Are there any other agreements affecting the terms and conditions not covered by this document YES; ____ NO.

If “Yes,” attach documentation of these agreements. On the following line(s), list the document(s) attached.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. ___________________________

2. ___________________________

3. ___________________________

FACULTY TENURE STATUS:

___ New Appointment

a) ___ Appointed with Tenure (Reference Date Tenured Below)
b) ___ Not eligible for Tenure
c) ___ Eligible for Tenure; Waiting (Reference below for Day Following End of Maximum Probationary Period)

___ Extension/Change in Tenure Status

a) ___ Tenured (Reference Date Tenured Below)
b) ___ Not eligible for Tenure
c) ___ Eligible for Tenure; Waiting (Reference below for Day Following End of Maximum Probationary Period)
d) ___ Change in Maximum Probationary Period (Reference below for Revised Period)
e) ___ Other: (Explain)

Date Tenured/Day Following End of Maximum Probationary Period

(Month) (Day) (Year)

Are there any Conditions Regarding Tenure YES; ____ NO. If “Yes,” attach documentation of these conditions.

The individual named above is hereby appointed to the faculty of Purdue University for the limited term stated above, and hereby accepts such appointment on the terms and conditions provided herein and in Executive Memorandum No. B-50 (Terms and Conditions of Employment of Faculty Members), or succeeding documents, which by this reference is made part of this Agreement. This Agreement will become effective when it is signed by the individual named above, signed by the President, or a duly authorized designee, and, in the case of the initial appointment, approved by the Board of Trustees.

The term of this appointment, as to a non-tenured faculty employee, may be extended only by the execution of a Form 19, except that if tenure is attained during or at the expiration of the term of this appointment, extension of this appointment will be governed by the provisions of Executive Memorandum No. B-50, subject to the provisions of Executive Memorandum No. B-48, as revised or supplemented from time to time. Except as noted above, this Agreement and Executive Memorandum No. B-50 contain all of the terms and conditions of employment. The undersigned appointee understands that it is his/her responsibility to become acquainted with those Executive Memoranda which are related to Purdue employment, including, but not limited to, B-4, B-10, B-48, and the Faculty and Staff Handbook, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged.

AGREED:

(Appointee) ___________________________ (Department Head) ___________________________

(Date) (Date)

RECOMMENDED:

(Dean/Vice Chancellor) ___________________________ (President or Designee) ___________________________

(Date) (Date)

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED APPROVED:

(Date) (Date)

1 Your Social Security number is requested on this form to facilitate record keeping and to minimize effort and errors in reference to other records which require use of your Social Security number. You have the right to refuse to provide your Social Security number on this form without penalty, or to request that it be removed at any time.