

MEMORANDUM

To: Deans of the colleges
From: Jeremy Haefner, provost and senior vice president for academic affairs
Subject: Revising processes to reflect changes to RIT policy E5.0
Date: August 2009

As you hopefully know by now, the campus has approved changes to RIT tenure policy E5.0. These changes include the use of external evaluation of scholarship, a third year comprehensive review, and a more robust use of statement of expectations for pre-tenure faculty. Throughout the summer, the deans and I have been discussing these changes and how we might be thoughtful in their implementation. The result of this discussion is this memorandum, which charges the faculty to develop policy, procedures and practices that adapt to these changes.

Charge 1: Develop guidelines, protocols, policies and procedures for the **third year comprehensive review** of pre-tenure TT faculty. This review will be required for new faculty who start at RIT on or after September 2009. The 3rd year review should be comprehensive and complete, meaning it should come all the way to the provost, include a minimum of 2 external evaluations of scholarship (see charge 2 below), and provide constructive, meaningful feedback to the candidate. This work should include how a college tenure committee will provide recommendations to the dean.

Charge 2: Develop guidelines, protocols, and procedures for soliciting **external letters**. External review of a candidate's scholarship will begin with tenure reviews held in 2010. Guidelines should include who solicits letters, how many (campus min is 4 for tenure review and 2 for 3rd year review), the 'charge' in the solicitation letter, other included documentation, etc. Please read the updated policy E5.0 for other details – in particular, the candidate can recommend the names of half of the solicited reviewers while the P & T committee (or dean/chair) will recommend the remaining reviewers. The purpose of these external letters is to provide a sense of how RIT scholarship compares against scholarship from respected national and international scholars. Such comparison should not be limited to RIT peer schools. Many leading schools insist that the external reviewers used for the tenure review are distinct from those used for the 3rd year review. Moreover, every effort should be made to include reviewers who are not co-authors or an advisor during the tenure review process. Finally, the candidate should be permitted to submit names of potential scholars that they do not want as reviewers.

Charge 3: Develop and/or review **college policy/guidelines/protocols concerning the tenure review process**. Specifically, the policy/process should include how the college tenure committee is formed, the role of the candidate, the role of the tenure committee, the role of the department or program chair, and the role of the dean. If no such documentation exists, one must be developed. Any documentation should be updated to reflect that promotion to associate professor is now automatic with the awarding of

tenure.

Charge 4: Review all **college and department specific tenure criteria**, as well as acceptable forms of evidence and documentation. If such college and/or department specific tenure criteria do not exist, they must be developed. Such criteria must be approved by the dean and the provost. This criteria should be included in an appropriate section of the college policy on tenure and will be a part of the statement of expectations for faculty.

Target due date: In order that colleges can implement these changes as early as academic year 2010-2011, I am requesting that the deans bring the recommendations to me no later than **April 10th, 2010**.