This year the Advisory Committee consisted of the following five regular members:

- Claire Curtis, Professor, Political Science
- Genevieve Hay, Associate Professor, Teacher Education
- Mark Landis, Professor, Theater and Dance
- Elizabeth Jurisich, Professor, Mathematics
- Vijay Vulava, Associate Professor, Geology and Environmental Geosciences

There were three returning members from the previous year, Genevieve Hay, Vijay Vulava, and Claire Curtis.

Our panel began reviewing candidates for tenure and promotion on January 10, 2017 and completed all deliberations on February 23, 2017. At our bi-weekly meetings, we usually discussed 3-4 candidates. Most of our meetings lasted 2-3 hours, with some of the more challenging cases requiring additional time. In total, we reviewed 31 cases:

- 1 Third-Year Review
- 2 Senior Instructor
- 2 Promotion to Librarian Tenure
- 4 Promotion to Librarian III
- 1 Promotion to Librarian IV
- 13 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
- 8 Promotion to Full Professor

Seven of these cases necessitated the inclusion of four of the five alternate members of the Committee:

- Bonnie Devet – English
- Elizabeth Martinez-Gibson – Hispanic Studies
- Amanda Ruth-McSwain (I) – Communication
- “Henry” Yu Xie (I) - Department of Management & Marketing

The chair of the Advisory Committee made a decision not to invite Dr. Clifton Peacock, Associate Professor in Studio Art, due to the overrepresentation of SOTA on the panel.

Finally, this is the third consecutive year that no representative of Academic Affairs was present at the Committee’s deliberations. Provost Brian McGee conducted his own independent review of the candidates. On April 27, 2017, the Advisory Committee met with the Provost for debriefing session and to discuss suggestions for future improvement of the process.

This was the second year of entirely online submission of packets for tenure and promotion. The transition to online packets through SharePoint has facilitated the Advisory Committee’s access to the candidates’ files. Furthermore, remote (off-campus) access to SharePoint has facilitated the timely review of the packets. The Advisory Committee is grateful for the technical assistance
provided by the Office of Academic Affairs, in particular its Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Deanna Caveny-Noecker and Beth Murphy, Assistant to the Provost for Budget and Personnel. Included below are a few general observations the Committee would like to share with the campus community.

1. **Formatting of online packets:** The detailed formatting instructions in the [2016 Joint Memo](#) and subsequent formatting workshops contributed to consistency and uniformity in the preparation of candidates’ packets. Only a few files revealed problems (such as improper organization or filing of evidence, excessive length of files, and use of formats other than PDF) that we hope to be avoided in the future. The Advisory Committee submitted specific feedback to Academic Affairs at the April 27, 2017 meeting with the Provost.

2. **Recent graduate surveys:** In 2015, a new policy was adopted to urge Chairs of Department Evaluation Panels to solicit at least twenty recent graduate survey responses. Since that time, the Advisory Committee has been pleased with the number of returns of the surveys. As the Committee recommended last year, we encourage the adoption of a uniform institutional approach to processing and presenting the raw data of returned surveys. Our Committee recommends that the compiled reports include summaries of comments and rankings (not student demographics and instructions) rather than the inclusion of individual survey responses. By presenting the data in this way, recent graduate surveys will include relevant data and preserve student confidentiality and anonymity.

3. **Course instructor evaluation reports:** For each course taught during the evaluation period, course evaluation reports should include and be organized in the following order:
   a. Official Summary tables (with comparisons to departmental averages) produced by Institutional Research, Planning, and Information Management (which includes the number of students and section summary sheets).
   b. Blue-generated summary sheets for each section taught during the evaluation period.
   c. Numerical summary tables for Course-Instructor Evaluations for each section taught by the candidate during the period of evaluation. (Reports containing written student comments, when appropriate, may be included in the Supplementary Materials.)

4. **Departmental expectations:** Finally, we urge departments with additional expectations, practices and policies referred to in colleague letters or annual evaluations to have them approved by Academic Affairs. These expectations may be about service, research or teaching.

The Advisory Committee concluded its formal duties by co-organizing with Academic Affairs an Informational Session on April 25 for faculty, department chairs and deans regarding the next year’s tenure and promotion process. The PowerPoint from that meeting will be made available on the Academic Affairs’s website.