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- Literature regarding Associate Professors
  - National and local considerations
- Preparing for Promotion
  - Qualifications for professor
  - General recommendations
  - Post tenure review
- Understanding the Process
  - Procedures
  - Candidate’s responsibilities
  - Flow
- Question and answer
Qualifications for Promotion to Associate Professor

III.10.4b. Associate Professor

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

2. Demonstration of artistic or scholarly achievement supported by substantial publications or equivalent artistic creations or performances, of high quality, as appropriate to the discipline(s).

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

4. The quality and quantity of teaching, scholarship/artistic accomplishment, and service should give unmistakable promise of promotion to full professor.
LITERATURE ON ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

- Low morale among associate professors compared to other ranks
- Lack of institutional and departmental attention to associate professors relative to pre-tenure faculty
- Lack of mentoring and career planning for associate professors
- Lack of transparency and clarity regarding promotion criteria
LITERATURE ON ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

- Disproportionate service demands and administrative duties for associates that interfere with progress toward promotion, especially for minority faculty.

- Need for more flexible and inclusive “paths to professor” that recognize a broader range of contributions.
UI Associate Professor perspective

→ Survey of Associate Professors
  • Sent to approximately 200 UI associate professors in May 2017
  • 141 responses (70% response rate)

→ Focus Groups (in collaboration with Faculty Senate and HR)
  • Conducted three focus group sessions in Fall 2017
  • Approximately 70 participants across all colleges
I aspire to be promoted to full professor.

88% strongly agreed or agreed

I aspire to be promoted to full professor, and I have received formal feedback from a DEO or supervisor regarding my progress toward promotion.

48%

I aspire to be promoted to full professor, and I would value regular reviews regarding my progress toward promotion.

65%

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
I would prefer to spend a greater proportion of my time on research. My teaching obligations make it difficult to find time for research. My student mentoring activities make it difficult to find time for research. My service or administrative obligations make it difficult to find time for research.

- 77% strongly agreed or agreed
- 49% agreed
- 41% neither agree nor disagree
- 62% disagreed
- 1% strongly disagreed

Strongly Agree  Agree  Neither Agree nor Disagree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
My department has a culture in which associate professors are encouraged to work toward promotion to full professor.

I understand the expectations and what one needs to accomplish in order to be promoted to full professor.

My DEO/Associate Dean provides me with adequate support and guidance to advance my career goals.

51% strongly agreed or agreed

53%

49%
Considerations

→ Balancing institutional teaching and service needs with individual faculty needs to focus on research for promotion

→ Include progress toward promotion in annual review

→ Consider peer advisement on enhancing or modifying research program

→ Allow reasonable time for adjustment (retooling?) and monitor progress frequently

→ Conduct peer review three years after tenure to assess progress toward promotion?
Preparing for Promotion
Qualifications for Full Professor

III.10.4c

1. 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.
Qualifications for Full Professor

2. Continued artistic or scholarly achievement of high quality, accompanied by unmistakable evidence that the candidate is a nationally and, where applicable, internationally recognized scholar or creative artist in the chosen field.
3. 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.
General Recommendations

→ Know department/college standards
→ Maintain teaching excellence
→ Be a strong mentor and role model
→ Perform quality research/scholarship
→ Obtain funding (if appropriate)
→ Be open to feedback during annual review process
→ Cultivate contacts for letters
→ Be a good citizen and colleague
Post Tenure Review

Purpose is

• to assist in ongoing faculty development post tenure
• to support new approaches to scholarship
• to address issues of meeting/not meeting expectations in teaching, scholarship, and service
• to identify additional career support
Post Tenure Review

→ Annual Process should:
  • be evaluative
  • conform to process laid out by unit
  • provide an opportunity to identify progress
  • provide substantive feedback

→ Peer process should:
  • be formative
  • conform to process laid out by unit
  • encourage professional growth and development

→ In either case, faculty member has chance to respond
Understanding the process
III.10.5a (summarized)

No clock but should be considered no later than the seventh year after promotion to that rank.

Promotion may take place earlier assuming strong record

Individual faculty members may request review for promotion, tenure, or both, at any time, and shall be afforded such review by the applicable department or non-departmentalized college.
Evaluation Criteria

- Research/Professional Productivity
- Teaching
- Service
General Message - Tenure

Research/Scholarly Productivity

Teaching

Service
General Message - Promotion

- Research/Scholarly Productivity
- Teaching
- Service
Your Responsibilities

→ Preparation
  • Know what is expected
  • Ask previous candidates about best practices
  • Ensure that the promotion bid is welcomed

→ Execution
  • This should reflect what you have done since your last promotion – but your entire career is reviewed
  • This is a process – give it the thought and attention it deserves
Dossier Development

As a candidate you should:

• Ensure you have the teaching evaluations necessary for promotion
  • Check with your Department or College if there is a central repository

• Write your personal statement to explain to one and all WHY you should be promoted

• Identify individuals in your field who will provide an honest appraisal of your work

• Choose your best scholarly work
Teaching evaluations

- Review your evaluations and make sure you address any concerns
  - Do not make excuses!
- Ensure you have adequate peer evaluations of your teaching
- Choose your best teaching materials to submit
  - Change your PP slides into PDFs
**Personal Statement**

Your personal statement should:

- Be an “I” document (I did this; I did that) with appropriate attributions
- Point out the best of your work
- Defend some bumps along the way

Ask for feedback from:

- Trusted colleague
- Someone recently promoted
- Someone who sat on the promotions committee in the past
External letters

- You should provide names of people who can assess your work
  - Ensure appropriate degrees of separation
  - Provide at least 8-10 names

- The Department/College will add to that list
  - You can provide feedback on those names

- Do not solicit letters

- You will not know who writes the letters
PHASE I
Dossier developed

PHASE II
Dossier assessed

Sequential Development of Promotion Record through Decision-Makers:

1. Candidate and DEO compile dossier
2. Peer evaluation of teaching
3. Internal peer evaluation of scholarship
4. Peer evaluation of service
5. Candidate's opportunity to respond
6. External peer evaluation of scholarship
7. Departmental Consulting Group's vote and report
8. Candidate's opportunity to respond
9. DEO's letter to Dean
10. Candidate's opportunity to respond, if DEO's recommendation is negative
11. Collegiate Consulting Group's vote and summary report, if any
12. Candidate's opportunity to respond
13. Dean's letter to Provost
14. Candidate's opportunity to respond, if Dean's recommendation is negative
15. Provost's recommendation to the Board of Regents

*If recommendation is negative and contrary to DEO or DCG recommendation
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Approval Process

Department (DCG & DEO) → Dean → Provost → Board of Regents
Relative Impact on Promotion Decision

Department (DCG & DEO)

Dean

Provost

Board of Regents
Time to Promotion

Associate to Full
Average Time to Promotion
1999-2019

Female
6.77

All
6.53

Male
6.43
AVERAGE YEARS TO RANK BY COLLEGE AND GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy Graduate</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine &amp; Dentistry</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion...
Resources

→ Essay on how faculty members can chart a meaningful post-tenure career (K. Rockquemore, Inside Higher Ed 6/25/2012)

→ Midcareer melancholy (J Misra, J Lundquist, Inside Higher Ed 5/29/15)

→ You may not be ready for promotion (K. Weyland, Chronicle of Higher Ed June 10, 2015)

→ The Uncertain Path to Full Professor (A.W. June, Chronicle of Higher Ed, 2/14/2016)

→ Politics, Policies and Practices for Associate Professors Advancement (M. Bugeja, Inside Higher ED 12/18/2018)