

QUALIFICATIONS FOR ACADEMIC RANKS

FOR THE FACULTY COUNCIL

1. Attached to this note are two "documents." One, the criteria for academic rank which currently appear in the Operations Manual, and which clearly do not distinguish satisfactorily between the Professor and Associate Professor ranks. A majority of the Senate officers prefers a policy on the order of the Wiley-Menninger draft, also attached. A minority of the officers prefers no change, except for moving the sentence about long service from the Associate Professor to the Professor level. The Council and the Senate will be the final arbiter in this matter. PLEASE READ THESE DOCUMENTS CAREFULLY AND COME TO THE MEETING PREPARED TO SETTLE ON FINAL WORDING FOR THESE PROMOTION CRITERIA. If you have suggested language changes, please have them available in written form. Thanks.

2. There is another problem with the Ops Manual. At Par III-10.2, it states that candidates for promotion will be evaluated under relevant, clearly defined standards of the faculty member's department that were in effect at the time of the faculty member's most recent appointment, promotion, or reappointment. The problem is what constitutes "most recent appointment," and in particular whether the three-year review of probationary faculty constitutes an "appointment." The prevailing sentiment seems to be that what is intended is the initial appointment to the current rank, except that some maximum time should be specified to prevent faculty from being evaluated under very old criteria. How about this?

A candidate for promotion shall be evaluated under relevant, clearly defined standards that were in effect at the time of the faculty member's appointment or promotion to the rank currently held, except that these standards will not be older than the time specified as normal time at rank. For assistant professors, this is six years and for associate professors, seven years (Ops. Manual III-10.5).

It is likely that this matter may have to be considered by others, but ultimately it will probably come to the Council, so that as long as we are dealing with related matters, it seems efficient to determine also how the Council feels about this item at this time.

(Current version in O.M.)

QUALIFICATIONS FOR ACDEMIC RANKS
(Operations Manual, Sec. III-10.4)

Associate Professor

Acknowledged record of teaching success, including a record of successful direction of the work of doctoral students, where applicable.

Established record of productive scholarship supported by substantial publication or the equivalent. Original or creative work of a professional nature may be considered an equivalent of this qualification.

Capacity for attainment of full professor. Not a reward for long or acceptable service.

Professor

Acknowledged record of teaching success, including a record of successful direction of the work of doctoral students, where applicable.

Established record of productive scholarship supported by substantial publication or the equivalent. Original or creative work of a professional nature may be considered an equivalent of this qualification.

Unmistakable evidence of recognition by peers.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR ACADEMIC RANKS

(Wiley-Menninger suggestions)

These criteria will be applicable in most academic units. If the pattern and practice in some units deviates markedly from these norms, such units may seek approval of the provost for alternate criteria.

Associate Professor

Convincing evidence that the candidate is an effective teacher of, as appropriate, undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. ^{postdoctoral}

clearly demonstration of scholarly or artistic works

~~Demonstration that the candidate has identified an appropriate area in which to display scholarly or artistic creativity.~~ Accomplishment will be documented by ^{publications} several research papers of high quality, significant books, or equivalent artistic creations or performances. *of high quality*

Departmental, collegiate, and/or University service and, if appropriate, professional service will be expected at an appropriate level.

The quality and quantity of teaching, scholarly/artistic accomplishment and service should give unmistakable promise of promotion to full professor.

Professor

Consistent record of high-quality teaching at all appropriate instructional levels, including successful guidance of doctoral graduate students to the completion of their degree programs, where applicable.

^{mistakable} Unequivocal evidence that the candidate is a nationally ^{internationally} recognized scholar or creative artist in the chosen field.

The candidate should have a record of significant and effective service to the department, college, and/or the University, and, if appropriate, to the profession.

Comment - Earlier drafts included short descriptions of validation methods for each criterion. Wiley agrees with Carlson that the methods to validate these criteria are specified in some detail in the ops manual section on promotion and tenure process adopted last year; therefore, it is redundant to include validation methods here, and they have been deleted. Otherwise, only minor editorial changes to the Menninger draft, as well as the alternate criteria provision, have been suggested.