

**FACULTY HANDBOOK COMMITTEE  
MATERIALS TO PRESENT TO THE SENEATE**

**APRIL PRESENTATION- 1<sup>ST</sup> READ AND DISCUSSION  
MAY PRESENTATION- 2<sup>ND</sup> READ AND VOTE**

**Concern 1) P&T Discussion Participants**

3.6.5.C.3.E. (2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph): “The department head/chair, dean, and any other faculty member serving as an administrator who has an official vote on the candidate at a higher administrative level shall not vote at the departmental level. Faculty members who serve on committees at the college or university level may **only attend, participate, or vote at one level and shall fully recuse themselves at the other levels** ~~choose to vote at the department level or at higher levels, but they may vote only once on candidates from their departments.~~ Immediate family members shall excuse themselves from discussion and voting.”

**Committee Recommendation:**

1. The committee recommends that the Senate consider a change that will only allow faculty to attend, participate, or vote at one level.
2. This is a substantive change and should be voted on by the University Senate.

**Concern 2) P&T Process- Letters that Arrive after Departmental Consideration**

“E. Confidential Letters from Outside Reviewers The department head/chair (or the dean) shall solicit information from outside evaluators in the case of candidates nominated for associate or full professor. In consultation with the candidate and the faculty voting on the candidate, the head/chair (or dean) shall compile a list of potential evaluators. The head/chair shall then seek responses from at least three of the potential evaluators. These evaluators shall be people outside of Auburn University who are nationally or internationally acknowledged experts in the candidate’s field and can comment on the quality and reputation of the candidate’s work. In the case of a candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure, evaluators 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. **Only letters received in time for departmental consideration shall be made available to the departmental voting faculty and college and/or university committee. 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.** The letters from these outside evaluators shall remain confidential and shall not be made available to candidates at any time.”

**Committee Recommendation:**

1. Per the recommendation of the P&T committee, the committee recommends that the Senate consider striking this portion from the FHB and ending this practice.
2. This IS a substantive change and should be voted on by the University Senate.

### **Concern 3) P&T Comparison Statement Removal**

“Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of (1) teaching and/or outreach and (2) research/creative work. They are further expected to demonstrate over a sustained period distinctive achievement in one of these areas or achievement in both areas ~~comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years~~. In addition, they are expected to have contributed service to the University.”

#### **Committee Recommendation:**

1. The committee recommends that the Senate consider striking the comparison statement so that faculty will be reviewed on their own record and not in comparison to other faculty.
2. This is a substantive change and should be voted on by the University Senate.

### **Concern 4) P&T Consideration of Language to Ensure Clear and Consistent Approaches across Departments for Evaluating Faculty Who Have Taken a Tenure Clock Extension: Standard Biographical Data Sheet** (from ad hoc Senate committee recommendations)

3.6.5.C.2.a. “A Standard Biographical Data sheet ([PDF Form](#)). ~~Candidates may note their number of approved extensions in the biographical data sheet of the dossier under years in rank. Candidates who take an approved extension do not need to explain or justify their reasons for an extension.~~

#### **Committee Recommendation:**

1. The committee recommends that the Senate consider changing the standard biographical data sheet to:
  - a. Note the number of approved extensions
  - b. Without providing an explanation of why (for what purpose the extension was sought)
2. These are both substantive changes and should be voted on by the University Senate.

### **Concern 5) P&T Consideration of Language to Ensure Clear and Consistent Approaches across Departments for Evaluating Faculty Who Have Taken a Tenure Clock Extension: Impact of Extensions on Candidate Evaluation** (from ad hoc Senate committee recommendations)

3.6.5.d. “The candidate’s dossier (consisting of the departmental guidelines, weights for each performance area, information supplied by the candidate and the information supplied by the department head/chair), and supporting material shall be available for review exclusively by faculty eligible to vote on the candidate. ~~Any approved extension time will not count against the candidate in consideration of the candidate and their record for tenure and promotion (e.g., if a candidate has 6 years in rank including an approved extension of one year, the~~

candidate's record will be assessed as a whole and not excluding any research produced during the leave year(s) using the departmental standards as if it was completed in 5 years). The faculty has had time to review the dossier and supporting material, the department head/chair, as a nonvoting participant, shall convene a meeting of all eligible faculty to discuss nomination of the candidate."

**Committee Recommendation:**

1. The committee recommends that the Senate consider a change that will clarify that approved extension time will not count against the candidate in consideration of the candidate's record.
2. This is a substantive change and should be voted on by the University Senate.

**Concern 6) P&T Consideration of Language to Ensure Clear and Consistent Approaches across Departments for Evaluating Faculty Who Have Taken a Tenure Clock Extension: Outside Letter Request Language** (from ad hoc Senate committee recommendations)

3.6.5.c.5. The sample solicitation letter will be updated to include language about extensions as follows. "Please note that some candidates will have qualified for extensions to the probationary period. The candidate's work should be evaluated on its merits alone, independent of the length of time in rank."

**Committee Recommendation:**

1. The committee recommends that the Senate consider a clarification be added to the outside solicitation request letter to reflect the changes in this section.
2. This is a substantive change and should be voted on by the University Senate.