

Report to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee

From: Daniel Cristol and George Greenia, Co-chairs of RPT 2013-2014

May 20, 2014

Committee Members 2013-2014: George Greenia, Daniel Cristol, Pamela Hunt, Simon Joyce, Michael Deschenes, Henry Krakauer

This report covers the activities of the Committee in 2013-2014.

The Advisory Committee on Retention, Promotion, and Tenure consists of six members elected by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and charged with reviewing recommendations made by Arts and Sciences departments and programs concerning the retention, promotion, and/or tenure of members of the home departments. The Committee's recommendations are forwarded to the Dean of the Faculty. Retention (interim or mid-probationary review) cases usually come to the Committee only when a department or program recommends against retention or the Dean disagrees with a department or program recommendation. When a member of the Committee had a conflict of interest in the case of a candidate (such as a member of the same department), the Committee member was replaced for that discussion and decision by a past member of the Committee, from the same Area if possible.

During the 2013-2014 academic year, the Committee reviewed fourteen departmental recommendations for tenure and appointment to Associate Professor. The Committee forwarded to the Dean positive recommendations for all fourteen. The Dean agreed with the Committee's recommendations in all cases. The Provost concurred with all of the Dean's recommendations.

The Committee also reviewed one department's recommendation for promotion to Professor and forwarded a positive recommendation. The Dean agreed with the Committee's recommendation and the Provost concurred.

The Committee also reviewed one case of a faculty member hired in Spring 2014 with the expectation of immediate tenure and promotion to Professor. The Committee recommended in favor of tenure and promotion, and the case is proceeding through as this report is filed.

The Committee found the electronic submissions of dossiers to be improving, with fewer cases of incomplete documentation than in the previous year. The Committee also notes an improvement in the selection of reviewers who were truly arm's length.