

College of Agriculture and Life Sciences

Operating Procedures for College Instructor Promotion Committee

The College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Instructor Promotion Committee functions according to the following procedures:

Election of CALS Instructor Promotion: All units that have instructors will send one representative to the college committee. It is recommended that the committee representatives be elected among advanced and senior instructors and associate or professors with primary or significant teaching responsibilities. In addition, the associate dean and director of academic programs, in consultation with the CALS Faculty Association, will appoint one faculty member to the committee. It is recommended that this faculty appointee have significant teaching responsibility. Committee members are elected to three-year terms and a third are replaced each year.

Constitution of Unit Review Committee

As most units in CALS do not have a separate review committee for instructors, each unit's promotion and tenure committee will be responsible for reviewing candidates for promotion to the rank of advanced and senior instructors. For the purpose of making decisions regarding instructor promotion, when possible, it is expected that at least one member of the committee should be at the advanced or senior instructor rank. The promotion and tenure committee will pass to the unit leader the results of its vote and a brief written explanation of its deliberation.

The evaluation process for instructors will be the same as that described in the unit's policies and procedures manual for tenure-track faculty, but reflecting the job expectations of the instructor's appointment. At the time when the promotion and tenure committee's meeting is being scheduled, faculty with an instructor's appointment will be invited to participate in an evaluation for potential promotion. If the invitation is accepted, the candidate will prepare and submit to the committee a professional dossier that follows the provost's guidelines for promotion of instructors. The candidate will meet with the committee to discuss his or her program. As necessary, the committee will make recommendations to the candidate about program enhancements to increase the likelihood of promotion in the future. If sufficient time in rank has passed, the committee may deliberate on the merits of the candidate and vote. The committee will meet the deadlines for submission of instructor promotion packages set forth by the university and college.

In the case of a mixed vote, a minority report may be written. The unit leader independently reviews the dossier, consults with persons with awareness of the candidate's teaching program, and prepares a letter explaining their recommendation. If either the unit leader or promotion and tenure committee recommend promotion, the application goes forward to the college review committee. These letters become part of the dossier reviewed at the college level. The candidate is given the opportunity to withdraw their dossier after unit review.

Constitution of the College-Level Review Committee

All units that have instructors will send one representative to the college committee. It is recommended that the committee representatives be elected among advanced and senior instructors and associate or professors with primary or significant teaching responsibilities. In addition, the associate dean and director of academic programs, in consultation with the

CALS faculty Association, will appoint one faculty member to the committee. It is recommended that this faculty appointee have significant teaching responsibility.

College Committee Organizational Meeting: The academic associate dean schedules an organizational meeting of the CALS instructor promotion committee generally sometime in late fall semester. At this meeting, the academic associate dean discusses college policies and procedures with the committee. Next, the members of the committee elect a chair and secretary. Traditionally, the secretary rotates into the role of chair. Since a third of the members rotate off the committee each year, the secretary is elected from one of the first-year committee members and the secretary from the previous year is appointed chair.

Responsibilities of the Chair: The chair of the CALS instructor promotion committee is responsible for setting the dates for meetings, presiding over all meetings, ensuring that all guidelines are met, providing the dean with the final vote for each candidate, and ensuring that all correspondence concerning each successful candidate is prepared and distributed. In particular, a recommendation letter for each successful candidate is prepared by the chair of the committee addressed to the dean and summarizing the candidate's dossier and giving reasons that promotion is recommended. The final vote for each successful candidate must be indicated in the chair's letter to the dean.

Responsibilities of the Secretary: The secretary of the CALS instructor promotion committee is responsible for randomly assigning a committee member as presenter and another committee member as recorder for each candidate for promotion. The secretary is also responsible for randomizing the order in which candidates are considered and for randomizing the order in which votes are taken. The secretary also serves as recorder for all voting. Finally, the secretary prepares a set of minutes for all committee meetings and submits the minutes to the dean to serve as a permanent record after all decisions are finalized.

Responsibilities of Presenters: In random order, the presenter for each candidate for promotion presents a 3-minute (approximate) overview of the candidate's dossier. The presenter should prepare a brief written narrative or bulleted summary in hard copy for use at the meeting. In making the oral presentations, the presenter is not expected to be an advocate for the candidate or a critic, but merely to summarize the facts and give the merits and demerits of the case. Finally, all presenters are to post an electronic copy of their summary on the committee electronic site.

Responsibilities of Recorder: The recorder for their assigned candidate is expected to take comprehensive notes during the discussion of their candidate(s). Using these notes and the presenter's summary, the recorder prepares a brief summary, which provides the substance of the discussion of the candidate's dossier. The summary, which contains the overall consensus of the committee, should be completed within two days (or as soon as possible thereafter) of the deliberation meeting and sent electronically to the chair and dean for use in preparing their recommendation letters, which will accompany the successful candidate's promotion package to the university provost. If a candidate is unsuccessful, the committee chair prepares a summary letter that contains the overall consensus of the committee. An electronic copy of this letter should be sent to the dean within two days after the deliberation meeting. Finally, the recorder prepares a written list of suggestions for purposes of improving the candidate's dossier regardless of voting outcome. This list, along with other handwritten notes and editorial changes from other committee members, is passed along to the candidate through the chair of the committee and the candidate's unit representative on the committee.

Responsibilities of Committee Members: Committee members should review the university instructor promotion guidelines prior to attending the initial committee meeting. In addition to the responsibilities listed above, all committee members are responsible for reading all dossiers prior to the initial deliberation meeting. Committee members should decide on an initial vote of "yes" to approve, or "no" to disapprove the forwarding of each candidate's dossier to the dean. Members will have opportunities to change their initial votes, but should make an initial decision on each case independent of hearing comments from other members; "neutral" votes are not allowed. Obviously, all deliberations are *confidential* and should be treated as such. During discussion, committee members should feel free to clearly articulate their impressions of a candidate's dossier; each member has the right to their independent judgment. By the nature of the promotion and deliberation process, unanimous votes are not necessarily expected for all cases. Each committee member should have an equal voice in the decisions taken, and an individual committee member should not attempt to persuade other members to vote one way or the other.

Role of Committee Members with Regard to Candidates in Their Units: In almost all cases, college committee members have also been members of their own respective unit committees. Thus, they should have a clearer and more comprehensive understanding of the programs and dossiers of candidates in their respective units. Therefore, they should be able to answer questions about candidates from their unit, and in fact should come to the meeting prepared to answer any questions that may require further clarification of a dossier from their unit. It is not the role, however, for a committee member to be an advocate for candidates from their unit. In fact, attempts by a member at defending a shortcoming in a candidate's dossier will likely reduce the credibility of comments made to answer questions about the candidate's program and performance.

Meeting Attendance: All elected committee members are expected to attend all meetings except in emergencies. The associate dean and director of academic programs attends all meetings as an observer, but does not vote. Knowledge of the details of the committee's deliberations is useful to understand the collective thoughts of the committee for presenting successful candidates to the provost.

Randomization of Candidates' Dossiers: The secretary randomizes the assignment of a presenter and recorder for each candidate. Care is taken to ensure that presenters and recorders are not assigned a candidate from their unit or a colleague with whom they work very closely. Members should notify the secretary if they have a conflict of interest in presenting or recording for a candidate assigned to them.

Randomization of Discussion of Each Candidate: At the beginning of the deliberation process, the order of discussion for each candidate is randomized. Once committee members have selected seats and the seating order in the deliberation room is established, the committee member to discuss the first candidate is selected randomly. Following in sequence thereafter, the order of discussion moves clockwise to the next committee member. Should the person selected as discussant happen to also be the presenter for that candidate, the person selected as discussant moves clockwise to the next person.

Randomization of Voting: In the same way as above, voting is randomized so that the committee member having the initial vote changes with each succeeding vote.

Deliberation Process: The order of deliberation begins with the list of advanced candidates followed by candidates for promotion in the rank of senior instructors. In random order, each candidate is considered. An initial vote is taken prior to the presentation of each candidate. Next, the randomly assigned presenter presents the candidate's case for promotion. Following the presentation, each committee member is given the time to discuss the merits of the candidate's case. The discussion of each case is also randomized as noted previously. Once each member has been given adequate time for discussion of a candidate, the chair opens the floor for any other discussion. While discussion time will vary, sufficient time will be taken for any candidate requiring extensive discussion. After discussion of the candidate's case has been completed, a second vote is taken. The secretary records all votes. Other candidates in this category are then considered in the same manner in the random sequential order established by the secretary. Once all candidates in this category have been considered, a second round of discussion takes place followed by a third vote. In the second and succeeding rounds of discussion, all candidates in the category are discussed and then the vote is taken on each candidate. Candidates are discussed in the original random order but voting is again randomized as before. Voting and discussion continues until the vote stabilizes for each candidate. The vote for a candidate is considered final when no committee member changes his/her vote. During this final sequence of voting, any committee member who changes his/her vote must explain reasons for their change. Upon completion of the deliberations for the candidates for advanced instructor candidates for the rank of senior instructor are considered.

Official Correspondence Following Deliberations: As stated previously, the chair prepares a letter of recommendation for each successful candidate using input from the recorder for that candidate. The dean notifies the unit leader of successful candidates. Following the dean's notification, the recorders for successful candidates also send constructive comments through the unit representatives to the successful candidates as stated previously. Finally, the secretary forwards a copy of the minutes to chair.

Unsuccessful Candidates: The dean notifies the unit leader of candidates who were unsuccessful. The committee member from the unit of the unsuccessful candidate advises the candidate and provides feedback as appropriate.

Timeline for College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Instructor Promotions

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| September-October | The College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALs) Instructor Promotion Committee is finalized with names of incoming members provided by the units to the dean's office. Timeline and procedures are sent to all new and returning members. |
| September-October | Units determine instructors who will be considered for promotion. Candidates assemble dossiers in format provided by the provost and with any supplementary material required by CALs. |
| November-December | Unit committees meet to consider candidates and make recommendations. Unit leaders subsequently and independently evaluate candidates and make their recommendations. |
| Before December 1 | Notify the Associate Dean for Academic Programs Office with names of instructors who will be considered for promotion by the unit. |
| Check College Calendar for Date | Promotion dossiers submitted electronically to Associate Dean for Academic Programs Office. All dossiers are to be submitted, regardless of outcome at the unit level. Associate dean's staff checks dossiers for accuracy and completeness. |
| Before December 20 | Promotion dossiers of those candidates advancing from the unit level are distributed to the CALs Instructor Promotion Committee. |
| January | CALs meeting to be scheduled during this block. One 2-hour meeting is typically sufficient unless there are a large number of candidates. |
| February | Recommendations of CALs Instructor Promotion Committee due to the dean. |
| February | Dean reviews dossiers and writes their recommendation for each candidate. |
| March | Dossiers receiving a positive recommendation at the college level are submitted to the provost. |