

College of William & Mary

Memorandum

To: Faculty of Arts and Sciences

From: Advisory Committee on Retention, Promotion, and Tenure
Robert Archibald (elected in October to replace David Aday, on leave
1998-99)

During September, Will Hausman served for David Aday, by
appointment

Lawrence Becker, Chair
Clay Clemens (on leave, fall 1998; replaced by John M. Charles during
that term)

Rex Kincaid
Katherine Kulick
Mark Sher

Subject: Annual Report

Date: September 1, 1999

During the fall semester, the Committee considered 23 candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In one case the committee vote was negative, and in another case it was evenly divided. In all other cases, the committee vote was positive, though in three cases it was less than unanimous and in two further cases the positive vote was contingent upon the resolution of some issues raised by the departmental personnel committee reports.

During the spring semester, the Committee considered a range of internal promotions, hiring and retention decisions. There were five internal candidates for promotion to full professor and one for professor emerita, an internal candidate for promotion to associate professor without tenure, an external candidate for an associate professorship with tenure, and an external candidate for a full professorship with tenure. In all of these cases the committee vote was positive. At the Dean's request, the Committee also gave advice on one mid-probationary review in which the candidate had received conflicting information about departmental standards for scholarship.

There were several issues of policy or procedure that the Committee referred to the Dean. Two of them are sufficiently general to be noted in this report. One concerns making clear the responsibility of departmental personnel committees in constructing lists of external referees. It is our understanding that names of potential referees should always be solicited from the candidates, but that the personnel committees themselves independently make the ultimate decision about the list of referees -- usually by including some names from the candidates' lists and some names from lists of their own.. In some cases we considered this year, it appeared that all of the external reviewers had been drawn from the candidates' lists.

The other issue concerns peer review of teaching. In some cases, although the RPT Committee had a great deal of raw data about teaching, including syllabi, examinations, hand out materials and the like, there was no helpful assessment of that material in the report from the departmental personnel committee. It is our understanding that the Dean has pursued these matters with the appropriate policy-making bodies.