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The Advisory Committee consisted of the following five regular members:

- Roxane DeLaurell, Professor, Department of Accounting and Legal Studies (incumbent)
- Hector Qirko, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology & Anthropology
- Laura Brock, Associate Professor, Department of Teacher Education
- Joe Kelly, Professor, Department of English
- Christopher Korey, Professor, Department of Biology

The Advisory Committee began reviewing candidates for tenure and promotion on January 7, 2019 and completed all deliberations on February 23, 2019. During the committee’s bi-weekly meetings, 3-4 candidate packets were evaluated. Most meetings lasted 2-3 hours, with some of the more challenging cases requiring additional time. In total, the Advisory Committee reviewed 38 cases:

- Promotion to Senior Instructor: 1 case
- Renewal as Senior Instructor: 5 cases
- Tenure for Librarian II: 3 cases
- Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor: 17 cases
- Promotion to Full Professor: 12 cases

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

- C. Vincent Spicer, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology: 5 cases
- Doug Walker, Professor, Department of Economics: 4 cases
- Marcello Forconi, Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry: 2 cases
- Raul Carrillo-Arciniega, Associate Professor, Department of Hispanic Studies: 2 case

As in the previous three years, no representative of Academic Affairs was present during the Advisory Committee’s deliberations. Provost Brian McGee conducted his own independent review of the candidates. The Advisory Committee is grateful for the technical assistance provided by the Office of Academic Affairs, including support from Deanna Caveny-Noecker (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs), Beth Murphy (Assistant to the Provost for Budget and Personnel), and Cathy Peebles (Office Manager).

Below are a few general observations the Advisory Committee would like to share with the campus community:

- Most candidates diligently put together their packets to make the best case for themselves. Ultimately, FAM emphasizes that it is the candidate’s responsibility to make the most effective case in their own support.
- A summary sheet preceding each publication included in the packet, describing the candidate’s contribution (in multi-authored publications) to each publication as well as clear evidence of peer-review (from journal masthead or from editors) was helpful.
• An increasing number of candidates’ packets include external reviews of research in T&P and Promotion cases. These are optional, but most of the candidates coming up for tenure and promotion to associate and promotion to full included them.

• Some programs and departments used Qualtrics (campus-provided) very effectively for collecting graduate surveys. They provided summary statistics and analytical data that were very useful in evaluation of the candidates. However, other programs and departments provided PDFs of Qualtrics raw data that were difficult to review.

• DEP letters that specifically evaluated, polled, and rated candidates in each evaluative category were especially helpful.

• The committee’s job was made more difficult by the abundance of varying criteria used by departments and deans in their annual evaluations and their panel letters - from Excellent to High Professional Competence. The committee would like all levels of review to use the FAM standards.

• Colleague letters that evaluated the candidates in each evaluative category were more helpful than a broad letter of support.

• A better process for summarizing the Course-Instructor Evaluations for the committee should be explored. Documents of 300+ pages are unwieldy and are difficult to evaluate. There should be a shorter standardized version that is uniform across all departments. In addition, the committee would like to see all student comments on individual student evaluations. Some provide them, some do not.

• For those who teach primarily general education courses, the committee would like to see Course-Instructor Evaluation averages that compare the instructors data with all of those teaching the same course instead of a comparison to all courses taught by faculty in the Department.

On March 27, 2019, the Advisory Committee met with the Provost for a debriefing session as well as to discuss suggestions for improvement of the review process. The Advisory Committee concluded its formal duties by attending the spring informational session for faculty, department chairs and deans regarding next year’s tenure and promotion process. The PowerPoint from that meeting will be made available on the Academic Affairs’ website.