

October 2, 2015

Paul C. Johnson, Ph.D.
President

TO: Tom Boyd, Associate Provost and Graduate Dean
Wendy Harrison, Professor, Geology and Geological Engineering Department
David Matlock, University Emeritus Professor, Metallurgical and Materials Engineering
Paul Martin, Professor, Applied Math and Statistics
John McCray, Professor and Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering

CC: The Academic Faculty

FROM: Paul Johnson, President
Terry Parker, Provost
Kenneth Osgood, Faculty Senate President



RE: Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

When Mines developed its latest strategic plan calling for CSM to be a premier, student-centered, research university, it articulated aspirations that have shaped our academic community for years. As we work together toward those goals, we need to help faculty by providing the most clear, predictable, and consistent promotion and tenure guidelines possible. The tenure process especially is one of the most important things we do; it reflects a mutual commitment between the institution and its faculty for long-term collaboration to fulfill the mission, vision, and values of the school. Our current promotion and tenure guidance may be too general, leaving wide latitude for interpretation that undermines the confidence of faculty in the process. Moreover, as we continue to evolve as an institution, we need a shared understanding of faculty excellence that is broadly accepted and practiced, as this is the strongest driver for CSM's growth and reputation.

Accordingly, we ask that you work as a committee together with the President's Office, Academic Affairs, and the Faculty Senate to update CSM's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines in a way that reflects Mines' core values and aspirations. This effort should focus on providing clarity, transparency, and predictability to our process by carefully articulating the institution's expectations for promotion and tenure. Deliverables from this effort include: (1) a set of draft principles for campus-wide discussion and (2) formal language articulating CSM's expectations for promotion and tenure, to be included in the Faculty Handbook and the Academic Affairs Procedure Manual as appropriate. The committee should endeavor to complete this work by January, according to the timeline below.

In carrying out this charge, the committee should consider the following principles:

- (1) We will set faculty up for success, by clearly and carefully articulating CSM's expectations for promotion and tenure and by making explicit that which may have been implicit;
- (2) We will promote excellence in a way that aligns our P&T process with our institutional aspirations and with established academic norms in our fields, drawing from comparisons to other institutions to inform our thinking;

(3) We will cultivate a shared understanding among reviewers and review committees that promotes consistency at every step of the review process;

(4) We will respect and actively consider disciplinary diversity, interdisciplinarity, and varying distributions of effort;

(5) We will actively solicit and consider input from all key stakeholders¹ while working with the campus to develop recommendations that reflect our community's consensus.

Considerations for the committee should include accepted definitions of excellence as applied to tenure and promotion that provide baseline requirements tied to teaching, scholarship, and service. It should also include examples of excellence that are common expectations of the faculty. The final document should include minimum requirements that are common to all faculty in all departments and it should provide examples of criteria that should (and possibly must) be considered (in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service) as indications of excellence.

The proposed effort is focused primarily on the tenure-track and tenured faculty, as the Faculty Senate led a similar review that resulted in changes to the 2015 Handbook. Nevertheless, committee members should be mindful of the ways this effort focused on the tenure-line faculty may impact those on the teaching-track. In addition, this committee should focus on *expectations* for promotion and tenure, rather than the *process* through which those expectations are assessed. The Senate is leading a separate inquiry into the process itself.

Coordination of effort:

The committee is responsible for developing draft principles and draft language. It will be assisted by an oversight group consisting of the Provost, Faculty Senate President, and two faculty senators (Davis, Singha) who are responsible for developing the charge, monitoring the timeline, providing committee support as required, relaying comments from stakeholders, and managing communications and events. The oversight group will support organization of forums, facilitate campus communication, and convene (or coordinate) faculty vote on the final document.

¹ As a part of considering our existing promotion and tenure process changes, the committee will consult with the Mines General Counsel, Deans, Department Heads, the Faculty Senate, and the faculty as key stakeholders in the process.

