Provost's Task Force on Promotion & Tenure

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Provost formed an Advisory Committee from three highly regarded academics from top universities in the US to review the current policies and processes related to Promotion and Tenure (P&T) at AUC. Following receiving the Advisory Committee report (Report), the Provost assigned a Task Force (TF) the mandate of analyzing the Report and formulating an action plan pertaining to the Report's recommendations. Accordingly, the Task Force met regularly during the Fall of 2018 to develop the action plan. This report is the outcome of the deliberations of the TF.

There was a consensus among members of the TF to adopt the Advisory Committee's view that the P&T review is one phase in a continuous process that is connected to other phases in the faculty's career. Hence, a reform of this review should include not only the review phase that takes place at the sixth or seventh year, but also all the phases prior to this review. Consequently, the TF adopted a methodology by which it looked at all the phases in a faculty member's journey at AUC. Such a journey starts with the initial step of identifying the need for faculty lines, followed by recruitment and hiring, mentoring, first year review, third year review, annual performance review and up to and including the last of phase of promotion and tenure review.

First, the Report's clearly suggested that the *"lack of clarity and agreement on the strategic direction of the university with respect to the balance of teaching and research"* is the reason for lack of consistency across the University in implementing the P&T process. The TF believes that the *"lack of clarity and agreement"* can not be resolved through a communication strategy. It must be generated organically through a deliberative process. Accordingly, the TF recommends that the University should capitalize on the institutional investment already made for the implementation of the centennial strategic plan, in particular the pillar of institutional effectiveness. Also, it recommends that the Provost initiates a process to reform how the AUC conducts its strategic planning. This process should include the Board of Trustees (BoT), President, Senate, deans and chairs starting Spring 2019.

Second, a clear and rational identification of the departments needs will guide the hiring process and will help departments set specific performance benchmarks that should be eventually taken into consideration in later stages. In the current practice at AUC there is no process applied consistently and transparently across schools to help departments in identifying institutionally rational needs and in convincing deans and Provost that such needs justify the opening of a faculty position. The TF recommends to the Provost establishing a task force that would formalize a needs identification process during Spring 2019 such that this process would be applied to all new faculty search.

Third, more institutionalized processes for hiring and recruitment will likely yield hiring decisions that are more rational from an institutional perspective. The TF suggests a creation of a post in the Provost's Office for supporting faculty recruitment that would help market AUC as a destination for international faculty, and support departments in actively recruiting faculty for the approved needs/positions. It also recommends developing guidelines for fair and lawful interview, screening and evaluating candidates. The TF also calls for the departments' chairs as well as the deans to become active players (together with the Provost) in contract negotiations. The involvement of chairs is

particularly useful to convey to the Provost useful information and feedback informed by the specific needs and preferences of the departments.

Fourth, a mentoring process needs to be established, with new faculty members paired up with senior colleagues within the department such that mentoring of new faculty member cannot be the sole responsibility of the Department's Chair whose role is to oversee the implementation of this process. The TF recommends the development of a university wide mentoring program in Fall 2019 such that it is implemented in the following year.

Fifth, the AUC Faculty Handbook says very little about the purpose and process of the first year review. Current practice of departments across schools is very inconsistent. Accordingly, the TF recommends the formalizing the process of the first year review along with changing its timing in order for it to become an opportunity for structured mentoring.

Sixth, the TF believes that, even though, the broad outline of the third year review as described in the Faculty Handbook seem sound, some specific changes are necessary to implement the Report's recommendations. These include adding an external member to the composition of the third review committee and developing consistent guidelines for preparing the faculty member's dossier.

Seventh, the TF concurs with the Committee's assessment that the University have in place policies for annual performance review of faculty. However, these policies suffer from the lack of implementation and inconsistent implementation. The TF believes that one important reason for the weak implementation of these policies and processes has to do with the generalized belief that the review process is inconsequential. Accordingly, the TF would like to emphasize that a key initiative to re-activate and re-invigorate a credible annual review process must start with ensuring that the review is connected clearly and transparently to financial and non-financial incentives (annual salary increases, adjustment for extraordinary performances and letters of recognition). This report suggests a scheme that links annual performance to a structure of financial incentives.

Lastly, the TF force proposes three sets of recommendations related to the P&T review. The first set includes a request from the Provost to all schools to develop criteria that contains clear benchmarks against which a faculty member's teaching, research and service are assessed for the purpose of the decisions of P&T. The second set of the recommendations include modifications in the P&T review process at the Department and School levels related primarily to the selection of external reviewers and modes of communications to them. Additionally, the TF suggests modifying the voting system at the departmental level from a binary vote of "yes" or "no" to a voting scale of 1 to 5. At Provost's level, the TF recommends that the 60% practice of tenured and tenure-track faculty is clarified and well communicated to the faculty body. Also, an important improvement is to enhance the communications to the candidate at the various stages of the process. At the BoT level, the TF recommends that the charter of the academic affairs committee of the board is amended so that it states clearly that the review at the BoT level should be formal and not substantive, and articulates the very exceptional circumstances, if any, under-which the Board may consider rejecting a tenure recommendation vetted through the P&T process. The third set of recommendations aims at ensuring some sort of accountability in the process. This includes ensuring that governance documents of

departments include the roles and responsibilities of departments chairs. Along the same lines, departments chairs should sign a separate contract whereby the additional compensation and course release are conditional on the discharge of their responsibilities. It also includes a recommendation on the formation and duration of membership of the committees at the School and Provost levels.

I.Introduction

In Spring 2018, the Provost constituted an advisory committee for review of AUC's tenure policies and processes composed of three highly regarded academics from Princeton University, Rice University and Santa Clara University. The charge of this Provost's Advisory Committee for Review for Tenure Process ("Committee") was *"to help AUC ensure that the tenure and promotion process is based on a clear, consistent, benchmarked procedure so that AUC maintains a rigorous and competitive tenure system that meets the university's strategic objectives and positions it for long-term success"* (Report, p. 1).

Between May 24th and 26th, 2018 (both days included) the Committee met in Cairo with various AUC constituencies (Board of Trustees, President, Provost, Senate Chair, representatives of the Senate Executive Committee, Academic Affairs Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate, Deans, Associate Provosts and selected AUC faculty and administrators). They also reviewed material that the Provost provided in advance of the visit as well as material provided on-site in response to their requests for additional information.

On June 29th, 2018, the Committee submitted its report (hereinafter Report), that was circulated to President, members of the AUC Board of Trustees (BoT), and the Chair of the AUC Senate on or around July 29th, 2018.

On August 26th, 2018, the Chair of the AUC Senate communicated to the Provost the Senate's feedback after circulating the Report to the Senate's Executive, Faculty Affairs, and Academic Affairs committees.

On September 3rd, 2018, the Provost formed a Promotion and Tenure Task Force (hereinafter, "Task Force") from different schools to turn the recommendations of the advisory committee into a plan of action. The Task Force's mandate is to analyze the Report and recommend a clear plan of action with corresponding timeline for implementation of its recommendations.

The Task Force was composed of the following faculty in the alphabetical order of their last names:
- Dr. Zeinab Amin, Professor of Mathematics and Actuarial Science and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies of the School of Sciences and Engineering
- Dr. Samer Atallah, Associate Professor of Economics
- Dr. Salima Ikram, Professor of Egyptology and Unit Head at the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, Egyptology
- Dr. Adham Ramadan, Professor of Chemistry and Dean of Graduate Studies
- Dr. Hani Sayed, Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Law

On September 5th, 2018, the Task Force met for the first time with the Provost. The members of the Task Force decided by consensus to elect Dr. Samer Atallah as its Chair.

Between September and December 2018, members of this Task Force met regularly almost every Thursday. The following report is the outcome of its deliberations.

II. Methodology

The Report took a holistic view on the promotion and tenure (P&T) process in the AUC and made recommendations that address a wide range of issues at different governance levels in the university. One helpful way to look at the recommendations of the report, is to imagine them grouped in concentric circles, with the inner circle containing those recommendations that connects directly to the P&T criteria and process, and the outer circles containing those determinants of the P&T process that are 1) systemic and affect wide range of issues including the P&T; or 2) relate to levels of governance that are higher than the Provost.

At the core of the Report's recommendations there are several cross-cutting fundamental questions that have important implications on how to design and implement a credible, fair, balanced and transparent tenure process. These questions and the choices they impose can be helpful guides to any reform initiative. The members of this Task Force would like to emphasize that some of these questions have not been expressly articulated in the Report. However, we do believe that the exercise of stepping back to extrapolate these underlying fundamental questions would be helpful to clarify the choices we have to make collectively as an academic community. Some of these fundamental questions are elaborated in an appendix to this report.

The Report contrasted between two very different conceptions of the P&T review process. The difference between these two conceptions determines the scope of any reform initiative, and consequently the scope of our mandate.

There is on the one hand a conception of the promotion and tenure review process as a self-contained process that take place at one point in the professional career of the faculty. On the other hand, there is the conception of the tenure review process as a phase in a long process that starts at the moment of hiring and continues all through the career of the individual faculty.

The Report's recommendations clearly assumed that the tenure review process is a phase in a continuing process that is intimately connected with other phases in the careers of faculty. In the language of the Report:

> *"The integrity of the tenure process is not limited only to the period in which the intensive tenure review takes place. It begins, the moment a new faculty member is hired—when the conditions of the appointment are articulated formally in the offer letter and expectations are communicated both formally and informally-- and continues throughout the entire pre-tenure probationary period of a faculty member's working life in the institution. The review which results in a definitive recommendation about tenure and promotion is simply the final phase of a 5- or 6- year cumulative process"* (Report, p. 3).

The main implication of this recommendation is that a reform of the tenure review process should include not only the review process that takes place at the sixth or seventh year, but also the process of hiring new faculty, mentoring newly hired faculty, and the first and third reviews.

The Report further emphasized that in the conception of the tenure review as a phase, the most effective site for reform is at the level of the department. This the Report has emphasized when insisting on the importance raising the expectations from chairs particularly with regard to creating the objective conditions that would allow for an on-going structured mentoring for faculty.

At the same time, the Report made several recommendations that touched on broader governance issues, as well as on the tenure review process itself. All these recommendations are consistent with and supportive of the re-orientation of the tenure process to emphasize its interconnectedness with other stages of the faculty's career in the university.

The members of this Task Force are in agreement with this approach. The question that we are specifically trying to answer in the following sections would be what changes are necessary to achieve an institutional re-orientation of the tenure process to emphasize its character as *"final phase out a 5 -6 years cumulative process"*. More specifically, what specific changes the University must implement consistently in the way we identify departmental needs, recruit new faculty, interview candidates, decide on hiring, conduct ongoing mentoring and periodic reviews that would be consistent with making the review process merely a final phase in a cumulative process.

III. Action Plan

A. Strategic Planning

The Report was very adamant in pointing out what the Advisory Committee had described as a *"lack of clarity and agreement on the strategic direction of the university with respect to the balance of teaching and research."* (Report, p. 2)

The Task Force notes that the report has specified that what was problematic are two very distinct issues; namely i) *clarity* about strategic direction with regard to the balance of teaching and research; and ii) *agreement* among different stakeholders about it.

The Report specifically addresses the implications of this lack of clarity and agreement on reforming the P&T process when discussing the desirability of setting benchmarks for promotion and tenure (Report, p. 10). More specifically, the Report seems to suggest that the strategic direction of the university with regard to the balance in the University's mission between teaching and research could be an important determinant of the relative weight that the promotion and tenure review would give to teaching and research respectively.

The Task Force notes that the 2015/2016 AUC Faculty Handbook does not allocate any weight to teaching, research and service. It merely specifies the substantive criteria that the tenure review will use to measure demonstrated excellence in the faculty member's discipline, and her contribution to the AUC in teaching, research and service. The definition of benchmarks and relative weight are left to the department and school levels.

The final paragraph of the Report hypothesized that the lack of consistency in implementing the system of the P&T in the University can be explained by the *"lack of shared understanding of the university's strategic direction and what it means to achieve it"* (Report, p. 13).

The insistence of the Report on bringing-up the lack of clarity and agreement with regard to the strategic direction of the University strongly indicates that perhaps we are grossly overestimating how much our current practices for formulating a strategic plan are inclusive and reflect a common understanding of shared governance. A strategic plan is an institutionally effective tool only in as much as those who have the responsibility of implementing it (faculty and staff) feel that they own it. This sense of ownership cannot be spun through a communication strategy. It must be generated organically through a deliberative process.

In implementing the Report's recommendation, the Task Force proposes the following:

- Capitalize on the institutional investments already made for the implementation of centennial strategic plan, in particular the pillar of institutional effectiveness, to reform how the AUC formulates its strategic plan. The goal of this reform would be to ensure that the planning process including articulation of objectives, intermediate goals, implementation strategies and the performance indicators are the outcome of genuine

deliberation in and between different levels of governance. A strategic plan cannot be effective, without a shared ownership of the process for its formulation. The Provost seems to be ideally situated to initiate such a reform initiative.

- Until the process of strategic planning is reformed, the relative weight of teaching and service should be decided by departments and reviewed by schools and Provost for consistency.

- Provost to initiate a process to reform how the AUC conducts its strategic planning. This process should include BoT, President, Senate, deans and chairs: *Spring 2019 to July 1, 2022.*

B. Needs Identification

The long process to shepherd newly hired faculty towards P&T review should ideally start even before hiring when a department identifies the need for a position whether new, or to fill-in positions that have been vacated. A clear and rational identification of the Department's needs will guide the hiring process and will help the Department set specific performance benchmarks that should be eventually taken into consideration to assess performance in the first, and third year reviews, and when the time comes, to recommend promotion and tenure.

In the current practice at AUC there is no process applied consistently and transparently across schools to help departments in identifying institutionally rational needs and in convincing deans and Provost that such needs justify the opening of a faculty position.

Accordingly, this Task Force recommends that the Provost creates a task force with the mandate to put in place a rational and transparent process for departments to identify needs for faculty lines with clear timeline and a structure for decision making at the schools' and Provost's levels. More specifically the proposed 'needs' task force has a mandate to generate publicly available guidelines that specify from perspective of the Provost: i) what counts as 'need' for the purposes of opening a faculty position; ii) what are the relevant financial and other data for departments and schools that will be used to determine whether there is a need for a faculty position; iii) the criteria that will be used to balance on a university level the needs for faculty positions from different schools; and iv) transparent process that departments, and schools can follow every year to assess and argue for their needs for faculty positions.

Furthermore, this Task Force recommends that departments' identification of needs should always strive to strike a balance between present needs and strategic goals as articulated in the Department's approved strategic plan. The link to the strategic plan has to be concrete to the point that it can be plausibly linked to specific departmental KPIs.

- Provost establishes a task force to rationalize and formalize needs identification: *Beginning of Spring 2019*
- Task force recommends to Provost a needs identification process: *Spring 2019*
- Task force proposal is presented to Provost's Council: *End of Spring 2019*, if approved then,
- A formal needs identification process is applicable to all new faculty search

C. Recruitment and Hiring

This Task Force believes that reforming the ways the AUC recruits, hires, and inducts newly hired faculty is instrumental for achieving many of the Report's recommendations. More institutionalized processes for hiring and recruitment will likely yield hiring decisions that are more rational from an institutional perspective. A more rational hiring decision is one that brings on board recruits who i) are globally competitive; ii) fit intellectually in their departments, iii) are qualified to satisfy department's present needs and to play an active role in realizing its strategic vision. This Task Force believes that achieving consistently more rational hiring decisions will, in turn, liberate institutional resources to focus on helping newly hired faculty in building their academic careers in the AUC through continuous structured mentoring. Accordingly, this task force recommends that the university explores the following changes:

1. Recruitment

A process of recruitment for approved needs must be institutionalized with the creation of a position in the Provost's Office for supporting faculty recruitment that would help market AUC as a destination for international faculty, and support departments in actively recruiting faculty for the approved needs/positions.

The creation of such position would aim at i) assisting and supporting departmental search committees in identifying and recruiting high caliber applicants; ii) assisting and supporting departmental search committees in collecting needed information about the state of the job market in the relevant discipline and field; iii) coordinating with the departmental search committee to arrange for campus visits, job talks and lectures for short listed applicants.

ACTION PLAN

- Provost allocates budget available in FY 20 to support the activities of the proposed faculty recruitment position including the resources sufficient to invite shortlisted applicants for campus visits: *no later than July 1, 2019*;

2. Hiring
   a) Interview and Evaluation Guidelines

Departmental search committees have currently very little guidance during interviews and evaluations for applicants for faculty position. Although the AUC faculty handbook provides certain background

parameters (Handbook, p. 26), but these are in no way sufficient to ensure that standards for fair interviews and rational evaluations are applied consistently in faculty hires across departments.

Accordingly, this Task Force recommends that the AUC General Counsel in cooperation with the Provost's office and the deans of the different schools with feedback from departments' chairs as needed develop guidelines and instructions on fair, and lawful interview and screening. Furthermore, this Task Force recommends that the Provost's office, in cooperation with Deans and with feedback from departments' Chairs as needed, should develop guidelines for evaluating applicants that take into consideration differences between disciplines while maintaining consistency across the university. Each department's Chair is responsible for ensuring these guidelines are followed and must attest to this while sharing the shortlist with the school's Dean.

ACTION PLAN

- AUC General Counsel, Provost's Office, deans with feedback from departments' chairs as needed develop guidelines for fair and lawful interview and screening, *no later than July 1, 2019.*
- Provost's Office, deans with feedback from departments' chairs as needed develop guidelines for evaluating applicants: *no later than July 1, 2019.*
- Both guidelines are shared with departments' chairs for implementation in FY 20 searches: *no later than September 1, 2019.*

b) *Involvement of the Chair*

This Task Force notes that the AUC Faculty Handbook clearly states that all offers for faculty positions are made by the Provost with consultation with deans (Handbook, p. 27). Departments' chairs and search committees are strictly proscribed from discussing the specifics of compensation and benefits with candidates. We are not sure whether current practices are accurately reflected in the Handbook. Within the parameters set by the Handbook (i.e., without reducing the Provost's residual power to make offers), we recommend that departments' chairs as well as the deans must become active players (together with the Provost) in contract negotiations. The involvement of chairs is particularly useful to convey to the Provost useful information and feedback informed by the specific needs and preferences of the departments.

This Task Force recommends specifically that the Provost, in consultation with deans and with feedback from departments' chairs, develop standard operating procedures that specify, without reducing the scope of the Provost's residual power to make offers, what this "active player" role implies; and, that describe the division of labor between Provost, deans, and chairs during contract negotiations. These standard operating procedures must be communicated clearly to deans and chairs.

The relationship between Provost, deans and chairs during contract negotiations could be structured as follows: When a candidate is selected, and an offer is prepared by the Provost, this is to be shared with the Department's Chair and the School's Dean for information prior to sending it to the candidate. In case the candidate starts a negotiation process about the suggested terms of the contract, the Provost Office is to keep the Department's Chair and School's Dean informed, with the possibility of them providing feedback on the updated contract term suggested by the candidate.

- Provost, in consultation with deans and feedback from chairs as needed, develop standard operating procedures for division of labor between them during contract negotiations: *no later than July 1, 2019*
- Standard operating procedures are communicated to deans and chairs for implementation for all FY 20 searches: *no later than September 1, 2019.*

c) Induction

The Task Force has identified the induction of newly hired faculty as an important milestone in faculty member's working life in the institution. The way induction of newly hired faculty is done has significant impact on shaping the newly hired faculty experience during the first years including, in some instances, her ability to meet performance benchmarks.

The Faculty Handbook provides certain guidelines about how induction is managed and about the responsibilities of the different levels of governance. We have no information about whether the current language of the Handbook reflects actual practices. Based on anecdotal information, we believe however that it is under-utilized and inconsistent across departments. Accordingly, this Task Force is recommending the following to be added to existing processes for induction of newly hired faculty:

Once contract negotiations are concluded, the Department's Chair must communicate to the newly hired faculty formally, through appropriate channels, Department-specific expectations during the first year. These would complement general expectations from faculty as spelled out in the Faculty Handbook. They would be the basis of the 1st and 3rd year reviews, as well as P&T assessment if applicable. This formal communication could be included in a letter from the Chair sent with the final offer letter from the Provost. Such a letter should ideally specify the name of one faculty in the department who could act as a mentor to the newly hired faculty. Generally, and unless another faculty was selected, the responsibility to provide mentorship for newly hired faculty rests on the Department's Chair. The Department's Chair is responsible for drafting the letter, but the letter must be reviewed for consistency with School's and University's policies by deans and the Provost respectively.

ACTION PLAN

- Departments' chairs to develop in consultation with deans and the Provost department-specific expectations for newly-hired faculty: *no later than April 20th, 2019.*
- Provost to approve Chair's draft letter to new-hired faculty including department specific expectation: *no later than May 16th, 2019;*
- Department specific expectations communicated to newly hired faculty: *no later than July 1, 2019.*

D. Mentoring

Mentoring of new faculty member cannot be the sole responsibility of the Department's Chair. A mentoring process needs to be established, with new faculty members paired up with senior colleagues within the department. The mentoring process needs to include clear objectives for the process and procedural guidelines, expectations from mentors and mentees as well as an assessment process, with feedback collected from new faculty. It is suggested that this mentoring process would last two years following the hiring of a new faculty member, and feedback on the process obtained from the new faculty member at the end of this first year and that of the second year. The role of the Department's Chair is to oversee the implementation of this process (the Department's Chair being a senior member him/herself can be part of the process).

Continuing faculty members who would act as mentors need to undergo capacity development on the mentoring process, and in this respect, a university-wide faculty mentoring program needs to be developed. This would be a standing program with training "workshops" with multiple sessions offered once a semester. Attendance by mentors and mentees (preferably as a mentor-mentee unit) would be required. [1]

ACTION PLAN
- The new university-wide faculty mentoring program developed in Fall 2019.
- Delivery (training workshops to existing faculty members) starts in Spring 2020.
- Implementation of mentoring starts in Fall 2020 for new faculty hires then.

Attending the university-side mentoring program workshops, as well as efforts of continuing faculty members as mentors must be recognized in the annual performance reporting (AFRs) and assessment of faculty members and should also form part of the promotion and tenure review as a departmental activity.

ACTION PLAN
- Inclusion of the attendance of faculty mentoring workshops in AFRs of 2020, and P&T files prepared in summer 2020 for processing in Fall 2020.

E. First Year Review

The AUC Faculty Handbook says very little about the purpose and process of the first year review. Current practice of departments across schools is very inconsistent. This lack of clarity and consistency has at least the following two negative consequences: i) it puts newly hired faculty at a significant

---

[1] Members of this Task Force had different opinions on how best to promote an environment of continuous and structured mentoring in the AUC. There were two approaches. The first, outlined above, emphasizes formal process, procedural guidelines, training workshops, etc. A minority opinion, while in agreement about the principle that mentoring of a new faculty cannot be the sole responsibility of the Chair and that it should be integrated in the academic routines of the Department, is skeptical about the effectiveness of a formalized process.

disadvantage because of lack of guarantees of due process; ii) it deprives departments and the University from a valuable opportunity to intervene meaningfully to ensure that new faculty are effectively mentored.

Accordingly, this Task Force recommends the following changes:

1. Timing:

We believe that the first year review should ideally be conducted on the basis of evaluating the performance of the new faculty for at least two full semesters. This means that review should ideally take place between not earlier than June of the newly hired faculty first year, and no later than sixth week of fall of the second year. We leave it to the Provost's office in consultation with the AUC General Counsel and the Senate's Faculty Affairs Committee to determine a contractual arrangement that is fair to the University and the reviewed faculty in the situation in which the first year review results in a recommendation of contract termination.

2. Formalization

The process of the first year review should ideally become more formal and applied consistently across departments and schools. This formalization has to be described clearly in the Faculty Handbook. Although this Task Force is conscious that the details for a formalized first year review including appropriate changes to the Faculty Handbook should be the outcome of consultation between Provost and the AUC Senate in particular Faculty Affairs Committee, we do believe that the process of first year review should ideally have the following elements:

- The first year review should be conducted by a committee composed of three members of tenured or otherwise dis-interested faculty. The Department's Chair cannot be a member of the committee.
- The scope of the review should include teaching, research and service in the period under review.
- The committee conducting the review should not rely only on self-reporting from the reviewed faculty. The review committee should be proactive in seeking additional information including classroom observations.
- The review report must include a recommendation of either interruption of the hiring contract, or its continuation with the strengths and development areas for the faculty member under review included.
- The reviewed faculty should have an opportunity to comment on the recommendations of the review committee.

3. Mentoring

The first year review should ideally become an opportunity for structured mentoring. The current practice of the AUC on first year review correlates with a hiring process that is not consistently rigorous. Infelicitous hiring decisions are, as result, more likely. In this context, the first year review has the important function of allowing departments to remedy such situations during the first year. But in line with this Task Force's recommendations for a more rigorous and institutionalized hiring process, we expect the first year review to slowly shift to become an opportunity for structured mentoring. A more formalized first review should ideally result in a report that outlines substantive

suggestions and specific expectations for teaching, research, and service and provide necessary guidance for meeting promotion and tenure standards. These suggestions will be eventually revisited during the third year review.

- Provost enters into consultations with the Senate's Faculty Affairs Committee to introduce changes to the first year review provisions of the handbook: *Spring 2019.*
- Amendments of handbook provisions regarding first year review are adopted by Senate and seconded by BoT: *no later than July 1st, 2019.*
- New process for first year review is operative for all faculty starting in September 2019.

F. Third Year Review

The broad outline of the third year review as described in the Faculty Handbook seem sound. The faculty member receives a comprehensive review that covers the entire period since the initial appointment. The review process takes into account the faculty member's proven teaching effectiveness, his/her research productivity and potential, professional service as well as service to the Department, School and University and student life. The Task Force believes that the following specific changes on the existing process are necessary to implement the Report's recommendations. The suggestions below are in line with the general guidelines for the third year review specifications in the Faculty Handbook.

1. Membership of Review Committee

The third year review committee should include a tenured faculty member from outside the Department.

2. Consistent Guidelines for Preparing the Dossier

The relevant section of the Handbook does provide some guidance to the reviewed faculty and to the Department on what to include in the dossier. We cannot ascertain whether the practice of the departments across schools is consistent or in-line with the handbook. This Task Force recommends that the Provost Council develops guidelines for third year review including on how to structure the dossier.

The faculty member submits a dossier containing a statement of accomplishments and future plans in teaching, research (creative work), and service, course materials, student evaluations of instruction, published articles (creative work), work in progress and any other relevant material. The assessment should not be solely based on the review material submitted by the faculty under review, but should extend to include classroom observations, course surveys and any other sources that can describe teaching effectiveness, research impact and quality of service provided by the faculty. The report must include the criteria of the Department upon which the evaluation is made. Evaluation criteria must be applied in an unambiguous and transparent way.

The Task Force further recommends consistent formalization of the communication with the reviewed faculty at the conclusion of the review process. For example, the Department's Chair should provide an executive summary of the assessment report to the faculty member, who has the right to respond within five working days of receiving the review report. Additionally, the Department's Chair writes a separate letter reporting his/her independent assessment and recommendation. The committee's report, the letter from the Chair and the faculty's response are transmitted to the School Dean to make a final recommendation to the Provost on renewal of the contract. The Provost makes the final decision on contract renewal.

ACTION PLAN
- Provost Council to develop guidelines for third year review during Spring 2019 in order to be implemented during Fall 2019.

G. Annual Performance Review

The Report (at p. 12) made general recommendations regarding the annual performance review in the context of the Provost's question on potential post-tenure review. The Report concluded that the AUC have in place the policies to address the legitimate concern of ensuring that tenured faculty continue performing as expected. The problem, the Report added, is that "*the policies have either not been implemented or been implemented inconsistently.*" Chief among those policies and processes are the ones that regulates annual performance reviews.

The Task Force concurs with the Committee's assessment. Indeed, this Task Force observes that annual performance review is not treated seriously by the faculty. It is also not taken seriously by chairs. The weak implementation of annual review policies and procedures has negative consequences. The Task Force believes that one important reason for the weak implementation of the policies and processes regulating annual review has to do with the generalized belief that the review process is inconsequential.

Accordingly, the Task Force would like to emphasize that a key initiative to re-activate and re-invigorate a credible annual review process must start with ensuring that the review is connected clearly and transparently to financial and non-financial incentives (annual salary increases, adjustment for extraordinary performances and letter of recognition). This requires certain actions on the part of the administration including:
- Announcing at the conclusion of the budget preparation process every year the funds that will be allocated to finance salary increases;
- Announcing what is the value of a step increase;
- Clarifying the generalized criteria that will be used to justify a one step and a two-steps increase.

We believe that an effective, fair, and transparent link between annual review and financial incentives is instrumental to ensuring that the policies and procedures that regulate annual performance review for faculty are adequately implemented. The recommended financial compensation scheme is as follows: (a) Below Expectations: no salary increase, but inflation adjustment; (b) Meeting

Expectations: salary increase equal to the percentage increase of university budget together with inflation adjustment; (c) Above Expectations: a salary increase of two and a half time the percentage increase of university budget together with inflation adjustment.

- Each department should set its own criteria for annual performance review. School Councils to adopt these criteria and ensure consistency across School. Provost Council to set the general elements that are to be included in the criteria. All of this should take place before the next faculty reporting cycle.
- The above suggested salary increases to be considered by the Provost in the following budget preparations.

H. Promotion and Tenure Review

The Advisory Committee Report identifies several recommendations pertaining to the process of Promotion and Tenure. These recommendations fall into three broad categories: recommendations related to the P&T criteria, recommendations related directly to the P&T process, and recommendations related indirectly to the P&T process.

For each of these categories, there are specific action items that relate to the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

1) Recommendations Directly Related to the P&T Criteria

There is a clear need to develop a set of criteria that contains clear benchmarks against which a faculty member's teaching, research and service are assessed for the purposes of the decisions of promotion and tenure. The development of such criteria must be conducted at the departments level through a transparent and consultative process. Benchmarks of different departments within each school should be discussed at the School Council level to ensure functional equivalency among the different disciplines. These criteria and the process to update them should be part of the departmental and school governing documents. The discussion at the School level should generate a generic set of criteria that is applicable to all departments within the School. The set of schools' criteria should be discussed at the Provost Council. This, in turn, will lead to the development of a general criteria for the whole university.

The frequency of updating the criteria should be minimal and justified. The justification of the update must be approved by the School's Council and the Provost's Council. The update of the criteria should not apply retroactively. The updated criteria should only be implemented for promotion and tenure review for faculty contracts dates post the formal adoption of the update. The update of the criteria should follow the same process entailed above. Ensuring that the ad hoc committee and the department have followed the criteria is the responsibility of the P&T School and Provost committees.

- Provost to formally request from deans of schools to develop such criteria during Spring 2019. Criteria to be implemented once approved on faculty hired post the approval.

2) Recommendations Directly Related to the P&T Process

Along with the need for well-developed criteria for P&T, there is an equally important need for a P&T process that is well harmonized across the University. This process needs to be clear, transparent, consistent and enables trust among the University's constituents. In particular, this Task Force recommends that the different levels of governance involved in the P&T process must have a shared understanding about the function of the review process at each level. Each level is best suited to control specific aspects of a tenure dossier. For example, departments are generally better at assessing aspects of the tenure dossier that are discipline-specific. Schools are generally better prepared to ensure that due process was followed in the department and that the review on the merit is rigorous.

In order to achieve these objectives, the actions below address improvements in the P&T process at the levels of the departments, schools, Provost Council and BoT.

Process at the Department's Level:

One area where there is a need for harmonization across the university is the process of selecting external reviewers. Given the important role that external reviewers have in the P&T review process in providing impartial and objective assessment of the candidate's file, departments should develop clear criteria for selection of external reviewers. The criteria should be approved by the School's council. The criteria should give the option to the applicant not only to propose names for external reviewers, but also to exclude names with a corresponding justification.

Additionally, given departments' decision to recommend the promotion and/or tenure is a complex decision that incorporates multiple and different parameters, it would be better to replace the binary vote by a vote by an anonymous score voting on a scale of 1 to 5. The average of all scores will be calculated and a passing score is at least 3.3 out of 5. The justification of such a move to a scale system in the vote is to give a quantitative assessment of the quality of the file which could facilitate the final decision on whether to promote and/or tenure the candidate. [2]

ACTION PLAN
- Provost to ask departments to develop clear criteria for the selection of external reviewers during Spring 2019. Such criteria should be adopted in the P&T cycle of 2019/20.

Process at the School Level

Along with the same lines, there is a need to communicate to the external reviewers the benchmark that are used to assess the faculty's tenure applications. This would help the external reviewers to provide institutionally useful feedback on the faculty's research record.

---

[2] It is important to note that this recommendation of the Advisory Committee was not unanimous. This Task Force was also not unanimous on this issue. It is also important to note that such recommended change would require a change in the Faculty Handbook.

- Provost to request that each dean must clearly communicate the performance expectations to external reviewers for the 2019/20 P&T. Deans to use the criteria developed by the departments once it is ready.
- Provost to request from schools and departments to develop two templates to be approved by the Provost Council:
  - Template for the initial invitation sent to the external reviewers
  - Template for the actual document sent to the external reviewers once they approve the invitation.

Process at the Provost Level

The Report has identified the 60% cap of tenured faculty as a practice that *"muddies the transparency of the P&T process"*. It clearly points to the effect of such practice on the faculty morale. It is, therefore, critical to the objectives of ensuring consistency and improving the clarity, transparency and trust in the P&T process that such practice is clarified and well communicated to the faculty body.

Another important improvement in the process at the University level is to enhance the communications to the candidate at the various stages of the process. This includes setting a time limit on when the candidate will receive a final decision letter.

Ideally the process, the standard of review and decision making at the Provost's P&T Committee should be put in writing and made public.

Also, the candidate should be communicated the responses and recommendations at the School and Provost levels. The candidate would acknowledge in writing receipt of the recommendation and may submit a response to the School feedback within two weeks to be included in the application file, should the faculty member wish to do so.

ACTION PLAN
- Provost should clearly and annually communicate to all faculty that are in the departments and schools that exceed the threshold of tenured faculty to total number of faculty. Along with this, there must be clear commitment from the Provost and the BoT that current faculty on tenure track would be evaluated exclusively on the merit of their performance, and not based on the threshold.

- Provost to include the following changes in the annually set deadlines for the process of P&T starting the 2019/20 P&T cycle:
  - A deadline by which the candidate will receive a formal letter that entails the decision on his application.
  - Timeline of the receipt the candidate of recommendations at the school and provost committee levels.

Process at the Board of Trustees Level

In order to address the Committee's recommendation that the review of the BoT should be formal not substantive, we recommend that the charter of the academic affairs committee of the board is amended so that it states clearly that the review at the BoT level should be formal and not substantive, and articulates the very exceptional circumstances, if any, under-which the Board may consider rejecting a tenure recommendation vetted through the P&T process.

ACTION PLAN
- Provost to communicate to the BOT the above recommendation during the BoT meeting of February 2019. It is useful if the BoT could take a decision before July 1st, 2019. Subsequently, the Provost would inform the faculty body of the BOT's response.

3) Recommendations Indirectly Related to P&T Process

Ensuring the success of the well functioning and transparent process for the P&T, there is an important complementary process of establishing checks and balances within hiring and P&T processes. This is critical to improve compliance to the procedures and requirements at the different levels, in an effort to enhance accountability.

Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs.
The Advisory Committee has pointed out in several occasions in its report to the critical role and responsibilities of department chairs. The Task Force, therefore, believes that the roles and responsibilities of department chairs should be further detailed beyond what is in the current version of the Faculty Handbook. School councils should review governance documents of different departments to ensure they detail the responsibilities of department chairs in line with the annexes of Faculty Handbook. These details should be in line with elements and principles set by the Provost Council. This is to ensure consistency across schools.

The Task Force recommends further, that department chairs (and perhaps any faculty with administrative responsibilities) should sign a separate contract with the university at the time of her appointment as chair, in which whatever additional compensation and course releases normally associated with the position are conditional on effective discharge of the responsibilities of the chair. This may require establishing an annual review of chairs incorporated in the existing annual faculty review through e-repertoire.

ACTION PLAN
- Provost to request from the Senate to update the roles and responsibilities of department chairs in the Faculty Handbook when necessary during academic year 2019/20.
- The Provost Council to determine the key elements and principles that must be included in any school governance during academic year 2019/20.

- Provost to request from University Counsel to develop a separate contract for faculty acting as department chairs and in administrative responsibilities.
- Provost to ask Schools to detail the roles and responsibilities of department chairs in the schools' governance documents.

Roles and responsibilities at schools and university levels.

Additionally, the following recommendations are aiming at enacting checks and balances at the different levels of the P&T process:

1. The P&T School committee(s) is formed by the School Council with approval of the Dean who has a veto power on the membership of a specific faculty. The term for members of this committee is a 2 year term. The change of the membership should be staggered (change 50% of the membership per year).

2. The P&T Provost committee is formed by the Provost's Council with approval of the Provost who has a veto power on the membership of a specific faculty. The term for members of this committee is a 2 year term. The change of the membership should be staggered (change 50% of the membership per year).

3. The Provost's P&T committee may seek additional information for justification, clarification, and/or confirmation of provided information for any case. This must be justifiable and kept on record.

4. The grievance procedure should ensure that when the Senate grievance committee reaches its recommendations and delivers them to the Provost, the Provost responds to each and every recommendation within a period of 4 weeks.

ACTION PLAN
- Provost to communicate the above recommendations for the concerned parties to take effect for next P&T cycles.
- Provost to propose adding item #4 above to the grievance procedure in the Faculty Handbook.

Appendix

As stated above in the Methodology section, at the core of the Advisory Committee's recommendations there are several cross-cutting fundamental questions that have important implications on how to design and implement a credible, fair, balanced and transparent tenure process. These questions and the choices they impose can be helpful guides to any reform initiative. The members of this Task Force would like to emphasize that some of these questions have not been expressly articulated in the Report. However, we do believe that the exercise of stepping back to extrapolate these underlying fundamental questions would be helpful to clarify the choices we have to make collectively as an academic community. The following is a brief outline of these issues:

1. Privilege vs. Right

Reforming the tenure process, involves asking a fundamental question about the nature of the decision to award tenure in US based universities. The processes for evaluating and deciding tenure applications in US based universities vary significantly but can be placed on a spectrum on the basis of the assumptions implicitly accepted by faculty and administrators about the nature of the decision to award tenure.

At one end of the spectrum, a faculty is thought to have an institutional *right* to be awarded tenure the moment she demonstrates that she meets certain minimum requirements. These minimum requirements are designed to give the university assurances about quality of teaching, research and service in addition to some indication about the likelihood that performance in that quality in teaching, research and service will continue over time. We will refer to this way of looking at tenure as the 'Tenure as a right' model.

At the other end of the spectrum, the decision to award tenure to a faculty is a *privilege* of the awarding university. At this end of the spectrum a faculty meeting the minimum requirements is eligible to apply for tenure. But the university does not have an institutional duty to award this faculty tenure. In this model, the decision to award faculty tenure is ultimately determined by other factors and considerations including for example the strategic direction of the university, interpersonal relationships between faculty in the department and ability to work together in a productive teaching and research environment. We will refer to this way of looking at tenure as the 'Tenure as a privilege' model.

These two models (Tenure as a right for the faculty; and, Tenure as privilege for the institution) are, it must be emphasized, *ideal types*. There is no system for evaluating and deciding on promotion and tenure applications, including the AUC's that is (or can even be) purely the one or the other. All universities will be somewhere along a continuum between these two models. But it is useful to bring the contrast between the two models to the foreground because it has implications on how we understand the function of the tenure review process, the role and contribution to each level of decision-making.

In the 'Tenure as a right' model, a faculty hired on a tenure-track line has expectations of tenure provided that she meets the performance benchmarks set at the moment of hiring. The purpose of the tenure review in this model would be to compile and verify the record of the faculty to establish credibly and conclusively that she has met the criteria. The weight in making that verification would fall on the Department. The role of the review at the school's, Provost's level would be to verify that the collection of data was accurate. The role of the Board of Trustees in this model would be formal. The question that the tenure process is trying to answer in this model is whether the applicant meets the benchmarks. This is a question of facts. A key reform initiative in this model would be to ensure that the verification process is applied consistently and transparently in the same department and across departments in the same school, and across schools.

In the 'Tenure as a privilege' model, a faculty has no expectations of tenure if she meets the performance benchmarks set at the moment of hiring. Meeting the performance benchmarks according to this model signifies merely that this faculty member is eligible to apply for tenure. The purpose of the tenure review in this model is twofold: *First,* to establish credibly and conclusively that the faculty applying for tenure is indeed eligible. This involves verifying that s/he has met the performance benchmarks set at the moment of hiring. *Second*, to determine whether awarding tenure is in the best interest of the Department, the School and the University. In other words, the tenure process should answer two questions that are logically independent but related questions: Is the applicant eligible for tenure? Is awarding tenure desirable from the perspective of the institution? These two questions are related in the sense that a negative answer to the first question, renders the second question moot. These two questions are logically independent in the sense that an affirmative answer to the first does not logically imply an affirmative answer to the second.

In the 'Tenure as privilege' model, the relationship between the different levels of governance is more complex. The burden of establishing eligibility falls on the Department. The higher up the ladder, the question of desirability of awarding tenure will become more central. A key reform initiative in this model would focus on: *First,* ensuring that the process for verifying the eligibility for tenure is applied consistently and transparently. *Second,* minimizing arbitrariness and decision by fiat when determining whether awarding tenure is desirable.

It should be emphasized again that these two models are represented as *ideal types*. **The practice of all universities is of course messy and hybrid.** A cursory reading of the AUC faculty handbook reveals that the AUC system has elements of the two models intertwined. In this, to quote the language of the Report, the practice in the AUC is "aligned with the widely recognized good practices in US universities." (Report, p. 3).

The fact that our tenure process has elements of these two very different models is not *per se* problematic. In fact, it is very healthy. It reflects the fundamental fact in the lives of all universities that there is a conflict of interests between different constituencies and ranks of faculty (e.g., tenured vs. not tenured), and between the faculty as a group and the administration. In very simplified terms, a system for evaluating tenure that assumes the 'Tenure as a right' model, is more favorable to the interests of untenured faculty, and gives them more bargaining power in relationship to the university. Conversely, a system for evaluating tenure that assumes the 'Tenure as a privilege' model, is more

favorable to the interests of university administrations and tenured faculty and gives the institution more bargaining power in relationship to its faculty. The criteria and process for evaluating tenure included in the faculty handbook, or the governance documents for departments and schools, and the settled practices of the university constitute a record of bargain (whether explicit or implicit) between these conflicting interests.

A fundamental policy choice that we confront as a university is then where on the spectrum between these two models we want to be. We confront this question not only with regard to the system for evaluating the tenure system as a whole, but also with regard with how we modulate each one of the sub-rules that govern tenure.

This Task Force would like to emphasize in the strongest possible terms that this fundamental policy choice cannot and should not be considered as a technocratic one that can be made unilaterally by the Administration in a discretionary way. This is the type of questions that is best answered through a fair, transparent, and public conversation among equals between the Board of Trustees, the administration and the Faculty through existing institutional channels particularly the University Senate.

2. **Rules in the Books vs. Existing Routine Practices**

In more than one occasion the Report points at an observed gap between rules and mechanisms currently formally in force and actual practices followed in tenure review, and in relation to different facets of faculty life in their Departments. Many recommendations in the Report consist merely in ensuring that existing rules and mechanisms formally in the books are implemented.

The Task Force would like to point out that turning this type of recommendations into action items with a timeline is not a simple affair. In fact, it is possible that managing this gap between rules in books and actual practices will be the core challenge in any reform initiative dealing with the promotion and tenure review process.

It is very easy to fall into the fallacy that the solution to gap problems consists of putting in place rules and procedures that have the function of ensuring that other rules are being implemented. If the problem is that rules are not implemented, then adding more rules exacerbates it.

It is important to identify, for every observed gap noted in the Report, the objective conditions that explain the gap before making concrete proposals for action items. In some situations, gaps between rule and application could indicate that the rule is impractical. In others, a gap is tolerated and reproduced collaboratively because it satisfies a desideratum shared by the relevant stakeholders, such as flexibility or margin for discretion. The recommendation of this Task Force cannot as a result be the same in every case where there is a lack of implementation.