

Chapter 3.7 (4th paragraph): Requiring that the 3rd year review be performed before the completion of 3 full years in service causes problems for some faculty and change the name of the 3rd year review. □

Current Language:	Proposed Revision:
“Each department shall conduct a third year review of all its probationary faculty members. This shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member's third year.”	“Each department shall conduct a review of all its probationary faculty members. This shall take place no later than Spring semester of the 4 th probationary year.”

Chapter 3.9 (1st paragraph): States that tenure is the “more exacting” process—why, then, can a candidate receive tenure but not promotion? □

Current Language:	Proposed Revision:
“Decisions on tenure are different in kind from those on promotion. Tenure, in fact, is more exacting.”	“Decisions on tenure are different in kind from those on promotion. Tenure, in fact, is more exacting and, therefore, tenure is not possible if promotion to associate professor is not awarded.” □

Chapter 3.9 Collegiality: There is a need for clear definition of Collegiality.□

Current Language	Proposed definition:
<p>“In appraising a candidate's collegiality, department members should keep in mind that the successful candidate for tenure will assume what may be an appointment of 30 years or more in the department. Collegiality should not be confused with sociability or likability. Collegiality is a professional, not personal, criterion relating to the performance of a faculty member's duties within a department. The requirement that a candidate demonstrate collegiality does not license tenured faculty to expect conformity to their views. Concerns relevant to collegiality include the following: Are the candidate's professional abilities and relationships with colleagues compatible with the departmental mission and with its long-term goals? Has the candidate exhibited an ability and willingness to engage in shared academic and administrative tasks that a departmental group must often perform and to participate with some measure of reason and knowledge in discussions germane to departmental policies and programs? Does the candidate maintain high standards of professional integrity?</p> <p>Collegiality can best be evaluated at the departmental level. Concerns respecting collegiality should be shared with the candidate as soon as they arise; they should certainly be addressed in the yearly review and the third year review. Faculty members should recognize that their judgment of a candidate's collegiality will carry weight with the Promotion and Tenure Committee.</p>	<p>“In appraising a candidate's collegiality, department members should keep in mind that the successful candidate for tenure will assume what may be an appointment of 30 years or more in the department. Collegiality can be defined as the ability for an individual to work productively with faculty, students, colleagues, staff members and constituents in all environments impacted by the university. Collegiality encompasses the basics of the professional ethics of the academic world: Respect for persons, integrity of intellectual inquiry, concern for the needs and rights of students and clientele, and awareness of workplace safety.</p> <p>Collegiality should not be confused with sociability or likability, but rather as the professional criterion relating to the individual's performance of his or her duties within an academic unit that are compatible and consistent with the unit's mission and long-term goals. Collegiality is a basic expectation of all employees and is essential in maintaining or improving the academic quality of an institution. Each faculty member must interact with colleagues with civility and professional respect. All should exhibit an ability and willingness, when appropriate, to engage in shared academic and administrative tasks that a department group must often perform, and participate with some measure of reason and knowledge in discussions germane to department policies and programs.</p> <p>Concerns respecting collegiality should be shared with the candidate as soon as they arise; they should certainly be addressed in the yearly review and the probationary review. Faculty members should recognize that their judgment of a candidate's collegiality will carry weight with the Promotion and Tenure Committee.”</p>

Chapter 3.10 (2nd paragraph): Remove language that suggests that candidates “normally” are

considered for tenure in their 5th year. □

Current Language:	Proposed Revision:
"If a faculty member has had no prior service at another institution of higher education, he or she normally should be considered for tenure during his or her fifth year of full-time service. A faculty member may request that tenure consideration be deferred from the fifth to the sixth year without prejudice. Consideration cannot be deferred beyond the sixth year however; a candidate must be considered for tenure during his or her sixth year if he or she has not been considered earlier and has not waived consideration."	"A candidate must be considered for tenure during his or her sixth year if he or she has not been considered earlier and has not waived consideration. There is no fixed requirement for years of service at a given rank before a faculty member can be promoted or tenured. Therefore, if a faculty member has had no prior service at another institution of higher education, he or she may be considered for tenure during his or her fifth year of full-time service."

□ **Chapter 3.10 (3rd paragraph):** Counting partial years towards a candidate's probationary period is unfair.

Current Language:	Proposed Revision:
"A candidate whose employment began in the period between December 1st and March 15th (roughly between the call for nominations for tenure and final action by the President) may be considered during his or her fourth year of full-time employment. This allows the candidate reconsideration during his or her fifth year without requiring the University to grant de facto tenure if the candidate is denied in the fifth year."	"If a faculty member begins employment between January 1 and May 15, the partial academic or calendar year shall not count as part of the probationary period."

Chapter 3.10 (4th paragraph): Should it be clarified that if the faculty member waives the right to consideration they do it forever? □

Current Language:	Proposed Revision:
"A faculty member who feels that he or she has not met the requirements for tenure by the sixth year can waive consideration by stating, in writing, that he or she does not wish to be considered by the department. In such a case, the department head must send the faculty member a letter of noncontinuation."	"A faculty member who feels that he or she has not met the requirements for tenure by the sixth year can forever waive consideration by stating, in writing, that he or she does not wish to be considered by the department. In such a case, the unit head must send the faculty member a letter of noncontinuation stating that they will not be continued past the 7 th year."

Chapter 3.10 De facto Tenure: The local AAUP has suggested a revision for De Facto Tenure policy.□

Current Language:	Proposed Revision:
<p>“A faculty member who provided more than seven years of full-time service in faculty rank on a temporary or probationary appointment must be awarded tenure by the President. A faculty member who contends that he or she has served in an academic rank for more than seven years may appeal through the normal administrative chain for consideration of the claim. However, tenure gained this way must be forfeited if it is established that the faculty member's not being recommended for tenure consideration was a deliberate attempt on the part of the faculty member and/or the department head to avoid the formal tenure process in order to acquire de facto tenure.”</p>	<p>“A faculty member who provided more than seven years of full-time service in faculty rank on a temporary or probationary appointment must be awarded tenure by the President, except in those cases described in the section on Prior Service of this Handbook in which a written agreement, approved by the Provost at the time of the new appointment, excludes some or all years of prior service at Auburn toward tenure eligibility. Any such exclusion would also apply to the awarding of de facto tenure.”</p>

Chapter 3.11.3.D.1: Add the requirement for external letters to the promotion from assistant to associate (currently only required for promotion to full professor) and require a summary of each evaluator’s credentials in the dossier. □

Current Wording:	Proposed Revision:
<p>“The department head (or the dean) shall solicit information from outside referees in the case of candidates nominated for full professor or librarian IV or archivist IV; he or she may do so in other cases. In consultation with the candidate and the faculty voting on the candidate the head (or dean) shall compile a list of potential evaluators. He or she shall then seek responses from at least three of the potential evaluators. These evaluators shall be people outside of Auburn University who are nationally acknowledged experts in the candidate's field and can comment on the quality and reputation of the candidate's work. If the evaluator is from an academic institution, he or she shall be of higher academic rank than the candidate. Letters from the candidate's major professor for a graduate degree, from former graduate students, and from ongoing research partners are unacceptable. Evaluators may be associated with industry, government agencies, foundations, etc. If these letters arrive in time, they shall be made available to the voting faculty; otherwise, they shall be sent on to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.”</p>	<p>“The unit head(s) shall solicit information from outside referees in the case of candidates nominated for promotion and/or tenure; he or she may do so in other cases. In consultation with the candidate and the faculty voting on the candidate the unit head (s) shall compile a list of potential evaluators. He or she shall then seek responses from at least three of the potential evaluators. These evaluators shall be people outside of Auburn University who are nationally acknowledged experts in the candidate's field and can comment on the quality and reputation of the candidate's work. If the evaluator is from an academic institution, he or she shall be of equal or higher academic rank than the candidate. Letters from the candidate's major professor for a graduate degree, from former graduate students are unacceptable. Evaluators may be associated with industry, government agencies, foundations, etc. All letters shall be made available to the voting faculty. A summary of each evaluator’s credentials will be included with the letters in the dossier.”</p>

Chapter 3.11.E (2nd full paragraph): All faculty should be limited to one vote and that vote should be at the lowest (usually department level). In other words, faculty who serve on college/school or University P&T committees should not be able to vote twice (at different levels) for candidates from their home units.

Current Wording:	Proposed Revision:
<p>“If of appropriate academic rank and status, the department head shall vote by secret ballot with the faculty. Any other faculty member serving as an administrator who has an official vote on the candidate at a higher administrative level shall excuse himself or herself at the departmental level. Faculty members who serve in an advisory capacity at the school, college, or University level may vote at the department level but at higher levels shall excuse themselves from decisions on candidates from their departments.”</p>	<p>“The department head should not vote with the faculty because he/she provides a written evaluation of the candidate and a recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. Any other faculty member who has an official vote on the candidate at a higher level shall vote no more than once (i. e. departmental or University P&T Committee level).”</p>

□ **Chapter 3.11.E (2nd full paragraph):** Immediate family members must excuse themselves from

discussion of their family members as well as the vote. ☐

Current Wording:	Proposed Revision:
“Immediate family members shall excuse themselves from voting.”	“Immediate family members shall excuse themselves from discussion and voting.”

Chapter 3.11.E (5th and 6th full paragraphs): Individual letters from faculty members should be replaced by a consensus report of the faculty meeting written by a faculty member (not the head/chair) that covers the meeting discussion and is approved by all eligible faculty. □

Current Wording:	Proposed Revision:
<p>“The department head and the dean shall provide a written evaluation of the candidate and a recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. Faculty members too should be encouraged to write letters explaining why they do or do not favor promotion and/or tenure. Where there are fewer than three faculty members in a department who are eligible to write letters of evaluation, the head may ask for letters from faculty members in other departments who have knowledge of the candidate's professional performance. Letters should address the quality of research/creative work and the candidate's potential for continued work, teaching effectiveness, effectiveness in the area of extension, service contributions and, in tenure cases, the matter of collegiality. In the case of candidates for tenure-on-hire, letters from the candidate's current colleagues as well as from Auburn faculty members are strongly encouraged and should address these same issues.</p> <p>Faculty should bear in mind that letters to the Promotion and Tenure Committee are an important source of information for the Committee. Letters can help the Committee to make an informed judgment about the candidate's collegiality by addressing the candidate's performance of his or her duties within a department. Letters can also help the Committee, whose members may not come from the candidate's field, understand the significance of the candidate's work and make a fair appraisal of it.”</p>	<p>“The unit head(s) shall provide a written evaluation of the candidate and a recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. In addition, a consensus letter written by the faculty members is required. The consensus letter should explain why the faculty do or do not favor promotion and/or tenure. Letters should address the quality of research/creative work and the candidate's potential for continued work, teaching effectiveness, effectiveness in the area of extension, outreach, service contributions and, in tenure cases, the matter of collegiality. In addition, faculty members may elect, but are not required, to write individual letters addressing the same issues and have those letters appended to the census letter. In the case of candidates for tenure-on-hire, letters from the candidate's current colleagues as well as a consensus letter from Auburn faculty members are strongly encouraged and should address these same issues.</p> <p>Faculty should bear in mind that the consensus letters to the Promotion and Tenure Committee are an important source of information for the Committee. Letters can help the Committee to make an informed judgment about the candidate's collegiality by addressing the candidate's performance of his or her duties within a department. Letters can also help the Committee, whose members may not come from the candidate's field, understand the significance of the candidate's work and make a fair appraisal of it.”</p>

Chapter 3.11.E (last paragraph): Create a “closed” dossier by removing the ability to send evaluative letters straight to the dean/college committee and the P&T committee.

Current Wording:	Proposed Revision:
“Normally, evaluative letters should be addressed to the department head; however, such letters may be submitted directly to the dean/College Committee or to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Department heads and deans shall submit all letters of evaluation that are submitted to them.”	“Evaluative letters must be addressed to the department head. Department heads and deans shall submit all letters of evaluation that are submitted to them.”

Chapter 3.11.H (4th paragraph): This procedure is not practiced at AU as outlined. It is practiced as suggested in the revised wording. □

Current Wording:	Proposed Revision:
“The procedure for promotion shall differ from that outlined above in one case: when a faculty member is hired at the assistant professor level but has had to be appointed as an instructor because the terminal degree was still in progress, he or she may be promoted to assistant professor once the terminal degree is completed. Such a promotion requires the recommendation of the department head, the concurrence of the dean and the Provost, and the approval of the President. It shall be effective at the beginning of the semester following completion of the terminal degree.”	“The procedure for promotion shall differ from that outlined above in one case: when a faculty member is hired at the assistant professor level but has had to be appointed as an instructor because the terminal degree was still in progress, he or she (if continued) will be promoted to assistant professor at the beginning of the following Academic Year after the terminal degree is completed.”

Chapter 3.14 (6th paragraph): Explicitly allow the addition of new material to be added to the dossier for the appeals process when appropriate.

Current Wording:	Proposed Revision:
“A faculty member who contends unjust denial of promotion or tenure may choose to discuss the reasons for denial and the appeals process with the Provost. Appeals should be made in writing to the Provost through the department head and dean within 14 calendar days of the date of the faculty member's receipt of written notification of denial.”	“A faculty member who contends unjust denial of promotion or tenure may choose to discuss the reasons for denial and the appeals process with the Provost. Appeals should be made in writing to the Provost through the department head and dean within 14 calendar days of the date of the faculty member's receipt of written notification of denial. The written request should include any relevant new material (not included in the original dossier) for the appeals committee consideration.”