

Faculty Council Lunch  
October 4, 2013

## DISCUSSION NOTES

### Review and Promotion of Non-tenure Track Faculty

#### Question 1

**Do faculty members get to see their student evaluations? How are student evaluations weighed when faculty members come up for annual reviews and promotion?**

#### Table 1

- Student evaluations are unclear whether or how they factor into promotions
- Recommendations:
  - Revive the faculty expectations document; changes in the Administration since then; Faculty Expectations documents should reflect those changes
  - Internal peer teaching evaluations for faculty
  - Need for greater transparency in promotion process – currently arbitrary and abstract
  - **Clear are not necessarily fair standards**
  - Standards need to be individually tailored for the ranks
  - Establish a point system for promotion including teaching, service, research; percentage attached; it would be different in each school/college
  - Demotion expectation should be spelled out – how a demotion should be stated

#### Table 2

- School of Social Work has a detailed and codified set of expectations that it uses
- Some schools has detailed requirements that are widely understood but not necessarily codified (CGS)
- SMG put together and codified a set of FE but never used it; recently has begun moving in right direction for Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Master Lecturers; doing annual review on that basis
- LAW for the full-time NTT faculty; a well understood set of requirements that people seem happy with

- CFA – some variety but it’s a difficult task to evaluate across the three disciplines
- Moving overall in the right direction, but it’s varied from school to school

#### Table 3

- A lot of variation across schools
- Course evaluations are seen by faculty; faculty think the evals important, used in review process but not always clear how the evals are used
- Some schools are better with codifying the modified and non-modified titles; not consistent; not clear that the codes are the best codes in the world

#### Table 4

- Inconsistency between schools
- Who has what sort of contract, how are you evaluated, how often, portfolio,
- Lack of clarity re: promotion
- More involved system in some schools and not another
- **Faculty were recruited under one set of expectations that were not codified and there is a new set of expectations that are also not codified**
- Number of doctoral people who have been recruited under a non-tenure track position, but they are productive and they would like to move into the tenure track and the system is not good at accommodating their needs; most of the faculty have been told they may not switch tracks
- We do not have to invent the wheel; there are other places that do this well and have clearly articulated career paths for non-tenure people, applied system-wide

#### Various tables

Why isn’t there a set of standards that faculty can plug into and take it to the chair; there are too many private deals, problem of fairness/lack of fairness.

Is there one set of rules published in the Faculty Handbook? Are there handbooks for each school?

#### Table 5

- Now that we are part of AAU, would it be possible to do a survey of AAU institutions to see what their policies are around student evaluations? Are students required to complete evaluations before getting their grades?
  - MED has a centralized system for graduate students to complete evaluations before they get their grades

Various tables:

SPH – students get to evaluate students on the day after they take their final exam

There was a University group that surveyed how student evaluations were done

Disconnect between the Medical Provost and the President, approving promotion for non-tenure track faculty

## **Question 2**

**Are faculty members in schools and colleges familiar with review and promotion processes for faculty with Lecturer/Instructor and Modified Professorial titles? Are those processes followed in regular, systematic ways?**

Various tables:

- MED has guidelines that are given to faculty when they first arrive, but whether they are followed up, unclear
- Department had guidelines but they are completely destroyed now
- What do we tell them in faculty recruitment? How do we recruit faculty if we cannot state the guidelines
  - Different levels of service (med campus, clinical sciences, basic sciences)
- There is varying standard for applying the Professor of the Practice
- On the whole, procedures are not clear

## **Question 3**

**Come up with 4 concrete steps to recruit URM faculty**

Started with Table 2, discussion extended to the various tables

- Relationship formation
  - Making contacts with sources of URM faculty (professional organization) have University Provost create a database that will identify for each school the organizations that support, nurture or have the attention of URM faculty in each profession
- Retention
  - Once we have recruited a faculty member:

- See what we are doing with mentoring faculty – is a special approach required here? Something more to do with mentoring or will existing mentoring system help?
  - When we lose URM faculty, we need to know if they are being attracted by a superior offer somewhere else, or is it a problem with our own promotion and tenure process
- Reception
  - Can we do more when URM faculty first arrive? Help them settle in, feel more welcome; perhaps through the first year, faculty should be invited to events
- Room for Representation
  - A good deal of time is consumed with URM students and clubs wanting their service; admissions also asks for help; at least let that qualify for University service
- Increase faculty networking
  - Colleges are not provided with funds to attend conferences, are discouraged
- First year housing pool; provide some housing for the new arrivals – promote Boston
- Send information directly to potential candidates – inform people you know of open lines
- Send direct solicitations to Ph.D. students
- Neighborhood strategies; have open houses to promote the community to engage with the institution
- Each college should designate one or two faculty members to devise recruitment strategies to improve URM presence
- “Growing our own” – graduating our own Ph.D. students and hiring them
- Search committee should be diverse to impact the outcome
- Recommendation from the E&I committee – Associate Provost for Diversity; need a centralized person with some authority and resources and money and power
- Website for the Associate Provost for Faculty Development – needs to be updated; improve the public face of BU
- Professional networking
- Self-liquidating committee – centralize a database; where are the organizations that draw professional people
- Flexible with rank – recruit aggressively if you find people who merit coming in at a higher rank
- Service and demand expectation; faculty should get credit for the students they advise; students of color seek out the faculty

- Engage someone on the Board of Trustees or the Board of Overseers to create a named post-doc program that would address our need to be involved in the URM faculty issue at many points around that issue; create opportunities for people to do post docs, cultivating people relationships with those people as they develop their careers; would help to address the image problem; hold this up as a challenge that BU needs to meet
- Build a greater dialogue between URM faculty who already are here and the central administration; E&I committee report recommendations
- Establish a sister relationship with other schools to cultivate faculty
- Steal the faculty from other institutions
- What is diversity – what does that mean? There are other ways in which the faculty might be diversified; recruiting from outside North America – South America and Africa
- What are the stats on the international character of the faculty at the University?

#### Question 4

**Have your school/college faculty members had opportunities in faculty and department meetings to discuss how to increase its numbers of underrepresented minority faculty? Have you seen evidence that suggestions made at those meetings have been implemented by deans and department chairs?**

Various tables

- On the whole, “no” to both questions
- Some schools have specifically not discussed this issue, stated they are not interested in diversity recruiting

#### **TABLE NOTES**

What follows is a transcription of the table notes people gave me at the end of the event. Some of it is jumbled.

Underrepresented Minorities

- Instruct quality candidates

- Exhaustive and representative as possible
- Stop searches
- 1. – Provost for Diversity
- 2. – What are professional orgs that POC... populated by minority groups
- 3. Internal and external
- 4. Self-liquidating committee
  - database of resources, contacts, task force to create and assess database then disband, updated on an annual basis
- 5. Changing lines from Assistant to Associate for recruiting URM faculty
- 6. Service – Demands on people of color... unofficial advisees... ? compensated + seen \_ ?

### Non-tenure track faculty

- Lack of clarity re: promotion
- Changing expectations w/changing administration
- Lack of transparency and lack of clarity
- Contracts and expectations are variable
- Some folks have clearly articulated goals, expectations but others do not
- Harvard and other systems do this better

### Issues for Non tenure track faculty

- Make review and promotion clear and realistic: Particular to hire, to service, to university to potential family situation within reason
- Connect upper level (presumable Administration?) to each school in University
- This was an issue not raised: for non-tenure track faculty who do go through promotion process to Associate Professor, what is really gained? There is a slightly longer contract, pay raise, but not real long-term security that promotes academic freedom.
- When criteria are not clear, the point system was great idea, allows for realistic criteria

### Recommendation Question #1

- Revive the faculty expectations document
- Internal peer review/teaching evaluation for faculty
- Need for greater transparency in promotion process for non-tenure faculty
- Nevertheless, clear standards are not necessarily fair standards

- These standards need to be individually tailored, especially in the areas of clinicians vs. researchers
- Demotion expectations – faculty are being demoted; how a person gets demoted must be clarified

The culture “has to change.”

Student evaluations

- Student evals – not clear what their impact on promotion
- Establish a point system for promotion, service, teaching, research (categories should be established by each college)

Question #2

- Increase faculty networking among minority professional groups (i.e. funding must be provided for travel)
- First year housing pool – provide subsidized housing for some period
- Assertive and direct efforts when openings arise – send info directly to potential candidates
  - E.g. send letters to Ph.D. programs with high % of minority students to announce faculty vacancies
- Expand creative recruiting efforts such as neighborhood strategies, even open house events
- Each college should designate one or two faculty members to devise strategies for improved minority presence
- Let’s grow our own – develop home-grown talent
- Improve promotion of Boston as a liveable environment
- Search committees should be diverse in order to have impact on the outcome