A&S&E Faculty Committee on Tenure and Promotion
Annual Report 2010-2011

Membership
The committee in 2010-2011 was composed of the following faculty members.

- Professor Misha Kilmer, mathematics
- Professor Sheldon Krimsky, urban and environmental policy and planning
- Associate Professor Stephen Levine, civil and environmental engineering
- Professor Beatrice Manz, history
- Professor Kent Portney, political science
- Associate Professor Eric Rosenberg, art history

The two members new to the committee in the 2010–2011 academic year were Beatrice Manz and Kent Portney. Misha Kilmer chaired the committee during the 2010–2011 academic year.

Shelly Krimsky will chair the committee in 2011–2012 and Kent Portney will serve as vice chair. Shelly Krimsky and Kent Portney are the only members to return to the committee for 2011–2012. They will be joined by four new members: Professor Mark Kachanov, mechanical engineering (three-year term); Professor Sara Lewis, biology (one-year term); Professor Klaus Miczek, psychology (one-year term); Christiane Romero, German, Russian, and Asian languages and literatures (one-year term). Misha Kilmer, Stephen Levine, and Eric Rosenberg completed their three-year terms on April 30, 2011, while Beatrice Manz will rotate off during the 2011–2012 academic year due to a research leave and be reinstated for 2012–2013.

Summary of Cases Studied
From May 1, 2010 to April 30, 2011, the committee recorded and reported votes in eighteen tenure and/or promotion cases. One of the mandatory tenure cases completed during this period was an off-cycle case that began in the previous year.

The breakdown of cases is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory tenure cases</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmandatory tenure cases</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion cases</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral hire cases</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior, nonlateral hire (tenure)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes in Procedures
The committee spent time during the fall revising Statement 11 in response to complaints from individuals and departments about the committee’s vetting of the proposed lists of external evaluators. The argument was made that the committee’s interpretation of “arm’s length” had become so strict that some individuals best positioned in the field to comment objectively on the
candidates’ cases were being omitted. The unintended consequence, worried some, was that the individuals coming up for tenure and/or promotion would perceive this as meaning they should not affiliate with those who might be asked to write letters, and that in turn, the candidates’ visibility would suffer.

In response to these concerns, the language in Statement 11 pertaining to the composition of the list was updated. Specifically, step 5 in Statement 11, v. 14, which will govern the 2011–2012 process, now reads as follows:

The list should include names of reviewers who can articulate the quality of the candidate’s research while outlining the candidate’s individual contributions to the discipline. A substantial portion of the names on the list must be individuals with whom the candidate has had no more than an arm’s length relationship and who can provide an objective assessment of the candidate’s scholarly contributions.

This language allows next year’s committee more flexibility during the vetting process. Additionally, the language in Statement 11 now emphasizes the potential importance and mechanism for soliciting additional letters from individuals who are or have been recent close collaborators of the candidate in an attempt to delve into the candidate’s individual contribution(s) to specific joint projects.

Two other substantive changes are worthy of note. The first is the standardization of the list generating process. The committee found that practices for generating lists of external reviewers were not uniform across departments, and attempted to rectify this by mandating, for 2011–2012 cases, the individual creation of lists of external reviewers by the candidate and the department. The process is outlined in 5a of version 14. The final change is the additional wording on page 1 that informs departments that promotion case materials are due by the middle of October. The committee felt the need to insert this language in response to the unfortunate timing of events that unfolded during 2010–2011: departments were not delivering promotion case files until late October or mid-November. Since T&P external subcommittee meetings for tenure cases began in November and into early December, the result in fall 2010 was that committee members were very heavily burdened with committee work in the second half of the fall semester. The unintended consequence was that some tenure case votes were taken unusually late into the spring term, potentially at some emotional cost to the candidates and the respective preparators and departments.

The other changes to Statement 11 were less substantive and intended to standardize language and presentation.

**Additional Activities and Deliberations**

In addition to making changes to Statement 11 as outlined above, the committee spent some time discussing the need to preserve the information the committee sees on the teaching evaluations (specifically, individual evaluations and the corresponding remarks on those evaluates which are helpful in revealing the correlation between scores and class performance.) The suggestion was made that, if the university moves to computerized evaluations, someone should be tracking (for a fixed number of senior professors, in a fixed number of courses) the ratings before and after the switch to determine whether the switch fundamentally affects the raw scores on the evaluations, with an eye toward factoring this in when evaluating tenure and promotion cases. As it is now, scores on questions 8 and 15 below a 3.5 generally raise an eyebrow and warrant further investigation—in the future, though, there could be a shift of this benchmark. The committee considered meeting with the Committee on Educational Policy on this issue, but ran out of time.
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Additionally, the outgoing and incoming chair (and vice chair) hosted three training sessions: one for preparators, one for candidates coming up, and one (as a Part IV of new faculty orientation hosted by the deans), for Tufts’ newest junior faculty. In April 2011, the chair and vice chair organized two formal training sessions for the (unusually large number of) individuals new to the committee in 2011–2012.

Issues to Consider

Teaching evaluations. See previous section.

Makeup of the committee. There is a need to ensure that the committee is as diverse as possible. Currently, the only condition imposed upon elections to the committee is that one of the members be an engineer. Gender balance and balance of the departments represented on the committee continues to be a critical issue, and the Committee on Committees needs to address it in a systematic manner. This year’s committee made a number of recommendations to the Committee on Committees of potential candidates to stand for election, both in the one-year term elections and the three-year term elections. In academic years 2011–2012, there will be two female faculty members on the committee. However, in academic year 2012–2013, there will be no scientist on the committee.

Course release for chair. The number of cases along with the increased volume of case materials in recent years, in addition to the amount of preparation and summer cases, results in a significant extra burden for the faculty member chairing the committee. The university may do well to consider an additional course release (probably in the fall) to compensate the chair of this committee for this extra service.

Administrative matters. Secretary of the Faculty Jillian Dubman continued to serve admirably well as the committee’s administrative link with the provost’s office. Jillian continued to be extremely helpful with numerous improvements in the committee’s administrative process and the interface with the provost and the academic deans. The committee simply could not function as well as it does without her fair-minded, insightful, constant, and immediate attention to all committee matters.

Submitted on behalf of the committee,

Misha E. Kilmer, Chair
2010-2011 Committee on Tenure and Promotion for Arts, Sciences and Engineering
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