





**Summary: Promotion and Tenure and Pre and-Post Tenure Reviews AY 2008-2009**

Category:	Totals	Provost Peers	Campus Peers	Chancellor	Provost
Promotion to Professor	12yes, 2 no, 1 withdrawn		1		0
Promotion to Research Professor	1 no		0		0
Tenure, PTMY at Professor	No candidates		0		0
Tenure, Mandatory at Associate	No candidates		0		0
Tenure, PTMY at Associate	2 yes		0		0
Tenure and Promotion, Mandatory at Assistant	5 yes		1		1
Tenure and Promotion, PTMY at Assistant	13 yes		1		0
Promotion to Research/Clinical Associate Professor	5 yes		0		0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>41</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>1</b>

\*PTMY = prior to mandatory year

Cases of Provost disagreement with campus peers occurred in a few cases when recommendations were not consistent among the unit peers, dean(s) and campus peers.

	Totals	Provost Peers	Campus Peers	Comment
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Year Review</b>	13 satisfactory, 4 unsatisfactory		3	Campus peers evaluated candidates who were unsatisfactory in research as satisfactory overall; the Provost did not.
<b>Post Tenure Review</b>	12 satisfactory		0	

**Issues:**

Formal workload (especially on the summary form) does not correspond to major differences in teaching load.

Some units lack approved Unit Criteria. These are particularly important if research productivity does not meet the standard definition of peer-reviewed journal articles or books.

Lack of annual evaluations for research faculty.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness beyond IAS scores and occasional classroom observations is needed.

•

•



- 
- 
- 
- 
-

**CSW Luncheon**

**Brown Bag Lunches**

**Survey**

**Family Friendly Policie**