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Advisory Committee—Regular Members:

Anton Vander Zee (Chair), English
Susan Divine, Hispanic Studies
Marvin Gonzalez, Supply Chain and Information Management
Brian Lanahan, Education
Alem Teklu, Physics and Astronomy

Beginning near the end of the spring 2021 semester, the incoming Advisory Committee conferred over email to set a meeting time for Spring 2022 meetings. The incoming chair worked closely with Academic Affairs on revisions to both the FAM and the T&P Memo, and attended some of the T&P information sessions held over the summer and into the early fall of 2021.

The committee also conducted its first preparatory meeting via Zoom on Monday, November 1 at 5:00, with the following agenda:

1. Committee responsibilities
2. Deliberations--process and principles
3. Meeting schedule, potential conflicts, and modality preferences
4. Review resources inside the SharePoint site: link to Faculty/Administration Manual (sections VI.A-D), Joint Memo, and approved department guidelines
5. Accounting for Pandemic measures as articulated in the Joint Memo
6. Additional questions and concerns?

Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, was also present for this meeting, as were members of the alternate committee: Christy Kollath-Cattano, Allan Strand, Phyllis Jestice, and Jordan Ragusa

The committee began their review of cases on January 10 and concluded on February 18. Meetings were held on Monday and Wednesday via Zoom between 10:00 and 12:00. During the first two meetings, only two cases each were reviewed to give the committee time to settle into the work and calibrate. During subsequent meetings, three cases were reviewed each day.

Over the course of the Spring 2022 semester, the committee reviewed 33 cases:

- Senior Instructor Renewal: 2 cases
- Library Faculty Review for Tenure: 2 cases
- Library Faculty Promotion to Librarian III: 1 case
• Promotion to Associate Professor: 13 Cases
• Promotion to Professor: 12 Cases
• Additional Third-Year Review Cases referred to committee: 3 cases, 2 of which required additional interviews with the candidate

Each of the 4 alternate members were used for 3 cases each. The committee requested additional information in relation to 2 cases.

Some general observations on the T&P process follow:

• The committee would like to strongly support current proposals that would modify promotion criteria for instructional faculty. Requiring exemplary performance in any category for promotion and retention makes it more difficult for reviewing bodies to apply the 4-level rating system across different faculty types. There has been broad campus support for this change as it relates to instructional faculty, but the committee also feels a similar revision should be explored for library faculty as well.
• Candidates are encouraged to use the highlight feature on their word processing software to indicate all areas on their CV that are included in the current review period.
• The committee appreciated it when candidates included a table of contents for items in the packet that include numerous individual documents (e.g. syllabus, assignments, and graded student work for an individual course). Hyperlinking the TOC to help reviewers navigate the PDF was especially helpful.
• It is essential that DEP chairs offer a summary sheet for any data collected via graduate surveys. Including the raw data alone presents difficulties for the reviewer.
• DEP chairs are advised not to include entire CVs from those serving as external reviewers. This information is not necessary, it takes up a good deal of space, and a brief summary of qualifications would suffice. If included, the CV should be at the very end of the document so it doesn’t interfere with quick access to the letters themselves.
• DEP letters that specifically evaluated, polled, and rated candidates in each category of review were most helpful. Colleague letters should also discuss the candidate’s work in each category rather than offer broader support or critique.
• If there are areas where the DEP or individual colleague letters are more critical of a candidate’s work, the candidates should be given the opportunity to address those areas of criticism in the interview. When colleague letters raise concerns and those concerns are not a part of the broader record (DEP letter or interview), this leaves the committee with an incomplete picture.
• A summary sheet at the start of each publication describing the candidate’s contribution as well as clear evidence of peer review and journal quality was helpful.
• Candidates are encouraged to avoid listing items in the narrative, especially when those items are clearly listed on the CV. The goal of the narrative is not just to document an activity, but to describe it.
The Advisory Committee appreciated the expert support and advice offered by the Office of Academic Affairs. Associate Provost Deanna Caveny was an essential resource throughout the process—from early conversations about FAM and T&P Memo updates through the submission of final letters.

The current chair, Anton Vander Zee, facilitated the selection of the chair for the 2022-23 academic year, Susan Divine (Hispanic Studies).