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Membership:

The Committee of 2012-13 was composed of the following faculty:

- Professor Jeffrey Berry, Political Science
- Professor Mark Cronin-Golomb, Biomedical Engineering
- Professor Vida Johnson, German, Russian and Asian Languages and Literatures
- Associate Professor Kevin Dunn, English
- Professor Sara Lewis, Biology
- Professor Beatrice F. Manz, History

Beatrice Manz chaired the committee. This was a substantially new committee. The only person to continue from 2011-12 was Sara Lewis, elected to a second one-year term. Beatrice Manz returned to the committee after a leave in 2011-12. Mark Cronin-Golomb and Jeffrey Berry joined the committee on one-year terms, while Kevin Dunn and Vida Johnson began three-year terms.

In 2013-14 Kent Portney returns to the committee and will serve as chair. Vida Johnson and Kevin Dunn will continue on the committee. They are joined by Professor Lenore Cowen, Computer Science, Professor William Oliver, Physics and Astronomy, and Professor Christoph Borgers, all elected for one-year terms. Beatrice Manz, Jeffrey Berry, Sara Lewis and Mark Cronin-Golomb are leaving the committee, though Mark Cronin-Golomb has agreed to a three-year term and will return in 2014-15 to fulfill the 2 additional years of his term. Mark Kachanov has resigned and will not return.

Summary of Cases:

From May 1, 2012 to April 30, 2013 twenty-two cases came before the committee. The breakdown was as follows:

- Lateral hire with promotion voted on during the summer by an ad-hoc committee: 1
- Expedited lateral hire voted on in summer by an ad-hoc committee: 1
- Expedited lateral hires voted during the academic year: 4
- Promotion-only cases: 8
- Mandatory tenure cases: 6
Changes in procedures:

The committee undertook some revisions to Statement 11, including some reorganization which we hope will make the text easier to follow. The most significant changes concern compiling and approving the lists of external evaluators. After consultation with the AS&E administration and with department chairs in both schools, we reduced the recommended number of letters from 10 to 8 in tenure and promotion cases, and from 6 to 5 in promotion-only cases. We also added specific language to define relationships which are considered unacceptably close for external referees. The language now reads as follows (new language in bold):

The majority 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. There must be no perception of a connection that might compromise the objectivity of the letter. Evaluators may not be people who have a personal stake in the candidate’s career, such as close mentors, dissertation advisors or colleagues who within the last seven years have taught in the same department as the candidate, collaborated on a grant, or co-authored publications.

Other changes were in the language concerning the department meeting and statement on the case. Here our concern was to ensure that only faculty present would vote, and that all present at the meeting have an equal voice in the deliberations. In addition to some changes in the Statement 11 language on the meeting, we created a partial template for the Department Statement with instructions:

The Department Statement on tenure and promotion cases should be prepared according to the description in Statement 11:

The department prepares a statement reflecting the full range of its tenured members’ opinions as expressed in the departmental discussion, to be signed by all members of the department who took part in the discussion and vote. This statement must preserve the confidentiality of all letter writers and all participants in the discussion. The content of this statement plays a major role in subsequent deliberations. Therefore, under the circumstance that the department cannot agree on one statement that adequately reflects its discussions, it should submit two statements signed by all voting members. For tenure cases, the statement(s) must be submitted to T&P along with the complete case at least two weeks before a scheduled subcommittee meeting. For promotion-only cases, the signed statement(s) must be submitted to T&P along with the complete case.
before or on the second week of October. (Part 1, Section 9; for expedited lateral hires see Part 3, Section 9)

The Tenure and Promotion Committee would like to amplify this description and emphasize certain points in it, based on current practice as we have observed it. Departments should keep the following in mind:

1) The statement should state which faculty members were present at the meeting and record the department vote numerically (e.g., 12 in favor, 2 against, 0 abstaining).
2) This recorded tally may include only those votes from faculty members present for the department discussion. Opinions of absent faculty members may be read at the discussion, but those faculty members may not vote and must not sign the department statement.
3) The statement should be drafted only after the department discussion and should reflect only what was said at the meeting.
4) The statement should reflect any substantial disagreements expressed during the meeting and not just the opinion of the majority.
5) Great care should be taken in the writing of the statement not to reveal the identity either of the individual discussants or of the external letter-writers, who should never be referred to by name or be identifiable from any other information.
6) The departmental discussion (and the departmental statement) should be organized under the three headings of research, teaching (including advising and mentoring) and service.

Additional activities:

Bylaws: Like several earlier committees the 2012-13 committee was concerned about the balance of departments represented on the committee. Previously the only requirement has been that the committee must contain at least one member from Arts and Sciences and one from Engineering. We also felt the need to ensure the confidentiality of committee proceedings. We therefore proposed changing the bylaws of the T&P committee on both of these matters. The motion on the composition of the committee proposed the following language (added language in bold):

\[
\text{Proposed language: (c) A Committee on Tenure and Promotion, consisting of six tenured members of this faculty elected by the entire voting faculty, and the provost, without vote. At all times, the committee membership shall include at least one member of the Faculty of the School of Engineering and three members from the Faculty of the School of Arts and Sciences. At least one member shall represent each of the following areas in School of Arts and Sciences: the humanities and arts; the social sciences; the natural sciences and mathematics.}
\]
The motion was passed at the faculty meeting of April 24.

The language proposed on confidentiality is as follows:

*Proposed language:* The internal deliberations of the committee shall be considered strictly confidential and shall not be discussed with anyone except the voting members of the Committee. The Committee as a whole however, may meet with other concerned parties to discuss cases as prescribed in Statement 11.

This motion was discussed at the March 27 and April 24 meetings and will come to a vote at the final meeting of the year on May 15.

*Criteria for tenure and promotion:* The criteria applied to tenure and promotion cases have evolved over the years since Statement 12 was last revised, in 2005. We have therefore drafted a revised Statement 12 on the criteria for tenure and for promotion-only cases, separating the two types of case for greater clarity. The revised Statement 12 is appended as Attachment #1. This revised Statement 12 will accompany documents that are distributed to candidates who will come up for tenure and/or promotion in 2014-15.

*Tenure and promotion process for interdisciplinary faculty:* There have been increasing numbers of interdisciplinary hires in both Engineering and Arts and Sciences, and this trend is expected to increase, due in part to the introduction of cluster hires in A&S. At the request of the administration, and in consultation with the Provost and deans, the committee designed procedures for faculty with appointments involving secondary programs or committees. We produced an executive summary of procedures, which is being presented for comments to the department chairs of both Engineering and A&S. We expect that next year’s committee will turn this into a new section of Statement 11 governing the tenure and promotion procedures for interdisciplinary faculty. The text of the executive summary is appended as Attachment #2.

We want to express our thanks to Jillian Dubman, Secretary of the Faculty, who has been consistently patient and available, and extraordinarily efficient in managing schedule and materials. We have benefited also from her excellent suggestions on procedure and language, particularly in the revision of Statement 11.

Submitted on behalf of the Committee,

Beatrice F. Manz, Chair, 2012-13 Tenure and Promotion Committee
The general criteria for the award of tenure and promotion at Tufts University have remained essentially unchanged since they were first articulated in Statement 1 (1970, revised 1986 and 1989). Nevertheless the Tenure & Promotion Committee has periodically found it useful to clarify these criteria, first by publishing Statement 12 in 2005 and subsequently revising it in 2013.

The Committee reiterates that recommendations for tenure and for promotion are based on a comprehensive evaluation of each candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and service. We emphasize that there is no universally applicable standard of scholarly productivity that entitles a candidate to a positive recommendation. Because expectations regarding forms of scholarly output (e.g., books, journal articles, translations, artistic works) vary among the disciplines, the departmental statement should clarify such expectations. In addition to scholarship, serious consideration is also given to teaching and service. To evaluate teaching, the Committee examines course evaluations and letters from mentees. Comparisons of the candidate’s course evaluation scores with averages from other faculty teaching the same or similar courses are important. The Committee also welcomes additional evidence of enthusiasm for and innovation in teaching. In evaluating service, the Committee considers participation in the academic community at the departmental, university and professional levels.

**Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor**

In evaluating scholarship for tenure cases, the Committee looks for evidence of significant scholarly accomplishments coupled with the clear promise of continued productivity. The general criteria used to evaluate tenure cases are as follows:

- **Scholarly productivity.** The totality of the candidate’s scholarly works in relation to time will be considered. Periods during which the tenure clock has been stopped will not be included.

- **Evidence of scholarly contributions distinct from those of mentors and collaborators.** In many fields collaboration is necessary and highly valued, and the ability to establish fruitful collaborations with excellent colleagues is viewed positively. Nonetheless it is essential that the candidate’s individual contributions be clearly explained and demonstrated.

- **Significant contributions to the candidate’s field of study.** The letters written by outside experts provide an indispensable measure of the candidate’s scholarly impact. It is therefore of the greatest importance that these letters be obtained from distinguished colleagues with an arms-length relationship to the candidate who can objectively evaluate the significance of the candidate’s scholarly contributions.

- **Teaching:** The Committee looks for evidence of excellence in teaching and mentorship.

- **Service:** Candidates are expected to have demonstrated a willingness to contribute to the greater academic community at the departmental, university or professional levels.
Promotion to Full Professor

The typical interval before candidates would put themselves forward for promotion to full professor is six years post-tenure. In the belief that the strength of a university is based on the intellectual achievements of its faculty, promotion will be based primarily on evidence of scholarly contributions and stature within the candidate’s field. However, recommendations for promotion are based on a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and service, and the Committee expects demonstrable contributions in all three areas. The general criteria used to evaluate promotion cases are as follows:

- **Scholarly productivity.** The Committee expects candidates for promotion to show a level of scholarly accomplishment since tenure that equals or exceeds whatever was required to earn tenure.

- **Significant contributions to the candidate’s field of study.** Candidates for promotion should have well-established reputations in their fields; this includes international recognition in fields where it is appropriate.

- **Teaching:** Candidates for promotion are expected to demonstrate a continuing commitment to excellence in teaching and mentorship.

- **Service:** The Committee looks for evidence of active participation in departmental, university and professional life.
ATTACHMENT #2
Proposed Changes to Statement 11
to Accommodate Interdisciplinary Tenure Reviews

Executive Summary

Note: a new set of guidelines to govern the process described below will be inserted in Statement 11 as Part 2, "Tenure and Promotion Procedures for Faculty with Interdisciplinary Appointments." The current Part 2, "Promotion within an Interdisciplinary Program," will become the new Part 3. What follows is a summary of the procedures we propose.

Hiring and tenure require that interdisciplinary faculty should have one home department which makes a recommendation to the administration (and in tenure cases, to T&P). Programs and secondary departments will have input through recommendations to the department, but not the decisive voice, and they will make no recommendations directly to the administration or T&P. In cases of hires across schools, tenure will be reviewed by the committee of the school to which the home department belongs unless university-wide tenure processes are developed that would govern such faculty hires.

This new tenure process will apply to any faculty member hired under a memorandum of understanding or who has, by the end of the year of the 4th year review, negotiated such an understanding with his or her department and dean. In promotion cases, the procedures will apply to those faculty members who have arranged with their departments and deans a memorandum of understanding between two or more departments or programs at least 2 years before putting themselves up for promotion. If a faculty member wishes to be considered for promotion only within an interdisciplinary program, the process is governed by the new Part 3, "Promotion within an Interdisciplinary Program."

The following are the major revisions that will need to be made to the standard tenure review process in drafting the new Part 2:

1) The preparator of the case will make contact with the chair or director of the secondary department or program as part of Step 1, in order to ensure communication throughout the process. When the candidate and preparator have completed the application (Step 2), the secondary department or program should be shown the document and asked for feedback.

2) As part of Step 3, the secondary department or program, when it offers its own courses, should also provide evaluations and a teaching summary, and it should in its turn be provided with a copy of the TCU report. The secondary department or program should follow the guidelines in Step 4. When necessary, the secondary department or program will assist the home department in finding the addresses of mentees (Step 5).
3) In developing its list of external evaluators (Step 6), the home department will solicit help from the secondary department or program and, if necessary, seek outside help in producing a list which will include names from the various fields within which the candidate works. The list should be designed to assure a minimum of 10 letters, two more than required in a standard case. The home department should consult the secondary department or program in its choice of outside expert to the end of finding a scholar who has interdisciplinary expertise as close as possible to the candidate’s. The final decision on the outside expert will belong to the home department.

4) The solicitation letter sent out to potential referees (Step 7) will state that the candidate has an interdisciplinary appointment or position. Suggested language will be added as an option in the template for the solicitation letter.

5) The chair, director or designee of the secondary department or program will write a statement about the candidate’s contributions and submit it to the home department before the home department’s meeting on the candidate, and the statement of the secondary department or program will be included in the case going forward. In the case of a program this statement will likely concern teaching, advising/mentoring and service primarily. In the case of a secondary department, scholarship should also be discussed. If so stipulated by a memo of understanding, the chair of the secondary department shall appoint a committee of at least three faculty members in relevant fields, who will have full access to the dossier and who will review the candidate’s research and draft the research section of the secondary department’s statement. The candidate will be given a copy of the secondary department or program’s statement together with the statement of the home department and be allowed to respond to both in writing (Step 10).

6) In tenure cases, the external subcommittee should include one person from the secondary department or program, who will be given access to the whole of the dossier given to department members. The home department will appoint two members to the subcommittee as prescribed in Statement 11, Step 8. The chair of T&P informs both the chair of the home department and the chair or director of the secondary department or program which T&P members will serve on the subcommittee (Step 11).

7) The tenure dossier will contain the following additional materials: i) correspondence between the candidate and the secondary department or program; ii) correspondence between the home department and the secondary department or program; iii) evaluations and a teaching statement from the secondary department or program; iv) the statement on the candidate from the secondary department or program together with the candidate’s response; v) the original memorandum of understanding (whether composed at hire or at the 4th year review) and any revisions made to it (Step 12).

8) Faculty in secondary departments or programs will not be required to write a confidential letter, in part because they will not have access to the full dossier (Step 13). However, such faculty will receive a written invitation from the Secretary of the Faculty to submit a letter directly to the Secretary of the Faculty. Unlike Additional Letters in
standard tenure cases, these letters will be accepted into the case without the notification of the candidate.

9) If the Committee splits evenly or rejects a case that had a positive vote from the home department, the chair or director of the secondary department or program is notified along with the home department, and he or she (or a designate) will attend the meeting required by Step 17. The chair of the Committee will also inform the chair or director of the secondary department or program in writing of the Committee's vote (Step 18). Such notification will also take place in the instance that a case is tabled (Step 20). The final disposition of the case is reported to the chair or director of the secondary department or program in writing at the same time as the candidate (that is, after the candidate will have heard by phone) (Step 23).