

**Minutes of the Tenure & Promotion Committee meeting  
Tuesday, October 31, 3:00-4:00 pm**

In Attendance: James Babanikos (chair), Sylvia Chan-Olmsted, Sandi Chance, Robyn Goodman, Linda Hon (phoned in), Moon Lee, Jon Morris, Ron Rodgers, Spiro Kiouisis (for the first part of the meeting)

The meeting started with Spiro giving the committee its “charge.” There are two candidates going up for tenure and promotion this year – both from the Department of Advertising – and Spiro emphasized that it’s very important to evaluate the two candidates individually, and not compare one to the other. He reminded us that the candidates need to show distinction in research and teaching, and a satisfactory record in service. It’s also important that the candidates show potential in building a national or international reputation. Finally, Spiro said that it would be helpful (but not required) for the committee to provide him with a written summary of each candidate.

Once Spiro left, the committee discussed two documents – the College’s “Faculty Standards and Criteria” for research and promotion, and the “Research Norms and Expectations Guidelines” that the Research Committee came up with last year.

One committee member said that it’s important to identify what the role of the “Research Norms and Expectations Guidelines” would be. Is it informational, or are we trying to develop some kind of policy that all faculty must adhere to? If the purpose of this document is to inform faculty about what’s expected of them to get tenured and/or promoted, maybe a better document could be developed that shows the achievements of those who did get tenured and/or promoted in the past three years or so – in terms of how many papers they published, what their student evaluations were like, and so forth.

Most committee members were concerned about the recommended 2-4 publications a year stipulated in the “Research Norms and Expectations Guidelines.” And the fact that 1-2 funded proposals were expected from untenured faculty – along with the 2-4 publications per year – was seen as a little much. Writing a grant takes a lot of time, and it would be very difficult for assistant professors to submit 1-2 grants a year, along with the 2-4 publications.

There was discussion that these expectations were possible for some faculty, but not all. Historical research, legal research, qualitative research, all take longer to do than quantitative or experimental research, and it’s unfair to have the same expectations/guidelines for everyone.

One committee member said that a professor’s research assignment also needs to be taken into consideration when evaluating their research output.

Another committee member stated that the length of an article also needs to be taken under consideration. A 30-40-page article takes much longer to complete than a 5-10 page article. Also, some legal monographs are 70 pages long.

Yet another said that it takes time to get a paper accepted at a top journal, and that the recommended two publications in top-tier / high impact journals is unrealistic.

We also questioned the requirement that there be publications in high impact factor journals. Some faculty are in more specialized or niche areas, meaning the top journals in their area may have impact factors below 1.0. It isn't fair to assume these journals are not impactful. For example, media and religion is a specialized area and the top journals in that area have lower impact factors despite being the premiere, go-to journals for that area of specialization.

One person also wondered whether conference presentations count. He said that often conference presentations are more effective than publications because they have more of an impact. Talking about your research to 30 or so colleagues from across the country and around the world is sometimes more effective than publishing in a journal that few people read.

This person also stipulated about how obscure and open-ended the College's "Faculty Standards and Criteria" document is, and he wondered whether it could be a little more concrete. He suggested that maybe the Chair of the College's T & P Committee can meet with the Chair of the University Personnel Board (the university-wide committee that reviews the tenure and promotion packets at the university level) to see what that committee looks for in making their decisions on whether to grant the candidate tenure and/or promotion. As the chair of the CJC T & P Committee, I said that I would follow up on this.

The main point from our discussion, though, centered on what the purpose of the "Research Norms and Expectations Guidelines" document would be. If it's to let people know what's expected of them to get tenure and/or promotion, then maybe the better thing to do is to come up with a document that showed what successful tenure and promotion packets in that past three years or so look like. If it's to make it a policy of what's expected from the College's faculty, that's a different story, and we need to take a closer look at it. At the very least, we can change the recommended "2-4 publications per year", to "at least two publications a year."

One committee member raised the question of whether the expectations were meant to (already) apply to all faculty because they were mentioned in her annual evaluation last year and she suggested the College clarify this.

So the purpose of the "Research Norms and Expectations Guidelines" document is what needs to be addressed at some length.

The meeting ended at 4:00 pm.

- submitted by James Babanikos