

BELOW PLEASE FIND A REVISED DRAFT of the document discussed at our last meeting.

The Senate Personnel Committee reviewed issues and suggestions submitted by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. After reviewing and discussing those items, the Personnel Committee has reached the following conclusions.

1. A number of the items do not seem to call for action by the Senate. Rather, they are details that can be addressed by Dr. Huff-Corzine, who has a copy of the material from the P&T committee.
2. The following items might be addressed by the Steering Committee or be brought to the full Senate for discussion.

a. Should there be a University-wide policy regarding outside reference letters? Are letters from dissertation advisors appropriate? P&T members also noted that some other categories constituted “problem reference letters” (in categories not listed within the P&T document). Should there be campus-wide guidance regarding categories of letters deemed inadvisable for inclusion?

Committee Recommendation—

A University-wide policy should indicate that at least **four** outside reference letters should be obtained, with no more than 50% of these coming from a list submitted by the applicant. Moreover, outside referees should not include the applicant’s dissertation advisor or person’s who have been the applicant’s co-authors during the immediately preceding four years.

b. The P&T Committee also expressed concern about split votes when nothing in the file provided any grounds for interpreting possible causes. The Personnel Committee could reach no conclusion about what might/should be done to address this issue.

Committee Recommendation—

None; the Personnel Committee could reach no conclusion about what might/should be done to address this issue.

c. Providing only the categories of “+” and “-” to characterize outside letters seemed insufficient for P&T Committee members, who wanted discretion to conclude that these letters were “mixed” in some cases.

Committee Recommendation—

The P&T Committee should not have to designate the set of letters as a whole with a single + or -; rather discretion should allow for clarifying commentary (e.g., “The letters were mixed, with most positive but two very negative”).

d. P&T members expressed a concern about cases in which “only student evaluations” were included as “proof of student learning.”

Committee Recommendation—

The Personnel Committee concluded that such matters should be addressed in a broader context than teaching alone. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the faculty within each unit of a college prepare a document that sets forth guidelines by which research, service, and evidence of student learning should be evaluated as part of the tenure/promotion process. Moreover, that document should always be included in the material transmitted for evaluation during the tenure/promotion process. Those guidelines would be consistent with the recent directive from the Provost’s Office requiring that each unit within a college provide evaluative guidelines for the annual evaluation assessment.

e. P&T members thought that the service and the scholarship categories reflected considerable variation across campus. Variability in the scholarship section of packets included such matters as the grounds for inclusion within that category (e.g., statements that a faculty member was the subject of a “press piece”). The P&T Committee also felt uncomfortable about how to evaluate the category of service, given “wild discrepancies...across campus”—“Some units clearly expect no UCF service at all. Some expect no service beyond the department—and this minimal. Other units are allowing excessive service.”

Committee Recommendation—

As is the case with teaching (see “d” above), the Committee recommends that the faculty within each unit of a college prepare a document that sets forth the relevant guidelines of the unit—and again, that document should always be included in the material transmitted for evaluation during the tenure/promotion process.