



Tuesday, December 06, 2005

To: College of Engineering Faculty

From: Steve M. Collins
Chair, Engineering Faculty Council

Subject: Motion to Revise College of Engineering P&T Policy

Last year, the University revised the *Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Decision Making*. These revised procedures were to be used in the promotion and tenure reviews conducted this semester. The revised policy is available at <http://www.uiowa.edu/%7Eprovost/docs/pandt97.htm>.

The revisions to University policy created a small number of out-and-out conflicts with the procedures in the College of Engineering *Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Promotions*. These conflicts made it impossible to conduct a promotion or tenure review in a manner consistent with both University and College of Engineering policy. Accordingly, the Engineering Faculty Council acted ad interim in the name of and on behalf of the College of Engineering faculty to revise the *Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Promotions* document. These revisions made no changes to College policy beyond those necessary to remove out-and-out conflicts with University policy and to meet the new requirement of University policy to define the criterion for a positive recommendation. The revised document is at <http://www.engineering.uiowa.edu/faculty-staff/P&TCriteriaDocument.pdf>. At the December 14, 2005 College of Engineering faculty meeting, the Engineering Faculty Council will present the motion below asking the College faculty to affirm the revisions. Underlined text represents new language. The footnotes provide short rationales for the specific changes.

Motion

Move to revise the College of Engineering *Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Promotions* as follows:

1. Revise paragraph IV.E.2.c to read: To obtain external reviews of the candidate's scholarship. Using the procedure defined in University policy, the Department Executive Officer shall strive to obtain eight to ten external reviews. In selecting potential reviewers to ask for letters, the Department Executive Officer shall consult the AFG via the AFG chairperson. The Department Executive Officer shall take particular care to keep the identity of reviewers confidential ~~unless the reviewer indicated that confidentiality is not necessary.~~¹ The portion of the candidate's work that each reviewer is to evaluate shall be determined by the Department Executive Officer in consultation with the AFG with the aim of obtaining a comprehensive assessment of the quality and scope of the candidate's research contributions.

¹ University of Iowa policy no longer provides for the possibility that a reviewer may waive confidentiality.

Likewise, the wording of the letter soliciting comments from external reviewers, while substantially conforming to the sample letter provided in University policy, shall be determined with the same aim in mind. The process of selecting external reviewers will commence on or before September 1.

2. Revise paragraph IV.E.4 to read: “A closed ballot vote of the AFG members attending the group meeting shall be taken, with the votes counted at the meeting. A simple majority voting in favor of promotion and/or tenure will represent a positive recommendation by the AFG.² A written report of the AFG's activities and evaluation shall be drafted by the group chairperson, modified as necessary and approved by the group, and submitted by the group chairperson to the Department Executive Officer and candidate.³ The report provided to the candidate shall be redacted as necessary to protect the confidentiality of all individuals who directly or indirectly contributed to the report. Minority reports, if applicable, shall be appended to and submitted as part of the written report.”
3. Revise the first sentence in paragraph IV.E.8 to read: “At the same time that the promotion file is submitted to the Dean, the Department Executive Officer will provide the candidate with a copy of the ~~AFG’s report and the Department Executive~~⁴ Officer’s recommendation.”
4. Revise paragraph IV.F.7 to read: The Dean’s Advisory Promotion and Tenure Committee shall meet to discuss the qualifications of each candidate for promotion or tenure and to vote by closed ballot to advise for or against the granting of promotion and/or tenure. A simple majority advising promotion and/or tenure represents a positive recommendation.⁵ The results of the balloting will be announced at the same meeting. The Chairperson or the Chairperson’s designee shall supervise the drafting of a report recording and explaining the committee’s vote. The report need not be lengthy, but should explain the rationale for the vote. After securing committee approval of the report, the Chairperson or the Chairperson’s designee shall communicate it to the Dean.
5. Insert new paragraph IV.F.8: If either the AFG’s or Department Executive Officer’s recommendation is positive and the Dean’s Advisory Promotion and Tenure Committee advises against promotion or tenure, the Committee’s report will be provided to the candidate. Pursuant to University policy, the candidate will have five working days to access the promotion file and another five working days to submit a letter of response.⁶
6. Renumber the remaining paragraph in section IV.F.

² University policy now requires the criterion for a positive vote to be defined in College policy.

³ University policy requires the AFG’s report to be provided to the candidate at an earlier time than does current College of Engineering policy.

⁴ University policy now requires the AFG’s report to be provided to the candidate earlier in the process.

⁵ University policy now requires the criterion for a positive vote to be defined in College policy.

⁶ University policy requires (under the stated conditions) that the Advisory Committee’s report be provided to the candidate at an earlier time than does current College of Engineering policy