Provost's RTP Ad Hoc Committee Final Report

Overview

The RTP Ad Hoc Committee met monthly for one hour from May through December 2022 – with follow up meetings to conclude the process in January of 2023. All charge items were discussed in committee meetings and/or over email. Other related topics that arose during discussions that were outside of the initial charges have been included at the end of this report for consideration and further discussion.

On many charges, the committee had unanimous or near unanimous consensus. On others a variety of views were presented. This report attempts to balance brevity with depth and breadth for these more complicated and less clear-cut discussions – presenting the most useful responses and opinions instead of decisive conclusions.

RTP Ad Hoc Committee

- Doug Russell, Arts and Sciences (Chair)
- Barbara Rasco, Agriculture and Natural Sciences
- Andrew Kniss, Agriculture and Natural Sciences
- Mark Clementz, Arts and Sciences
- Ronn Smith, Business
- Scott Thomas, Education
- Dave Bagley, Engineering and Physical Sciences
- John Koprowski, Haub School
- Tristan Wallhead, Health Sciences
- Klint Alexander, Law
- Cass Kvenild, Libraries
- Mike Borowczek, Faculty Senate representative
- Thomas Grant, Faculty Senate Representative

Executive Summary

- **External Reviewers – page 4**
    - The committee <u>recommends</u> that there should be a minimum, but no maximum, number of external reviewers and that the number be set at 4 to 6.
    - The committee <u>recommends</u> that guidelines should (and already do) exist for the proportion of external reviewers that are recommended by the candidate. This proportion should be set at 50/50 split between the candidate and unit head.
    - The committee <u>does not recommend</u> a requirement that external reviewers hold a professorial rank that is equivalent to or above the candidate.
    - The committee is <u>mixed</u> on whether multiple reviewers from a single institution should be allowed. Please see a detailed discussion below.
    - The committee is <u>mixed</u> on whether there should be an expectation regarding inclusion of reviewers from R1 universities. Please see a detailed discussion below.
    - The committee is <u>mixed</u> on whether there should there be guidelines on limiting the number of reviewers that come from non-U.S. institutions. Please see a detailed discussion below.

- **Conflict of Interest – page 7**
    - The committee <u>recommends</u> that there should be guidelines regarding disclosure of potential conflicts of interest between the candidate and external reviewers.

- **Level of Reviews – page 7**
    - The committee <u>recommends</u> that Year one reviews should be maintained only as Annual Performance Evaluations at the College/School Level for tenure-stream faculty and non-tenure-track faculty reappointments.
    - The committee <u>recommends</u> that Year Three Mid-Probationary Reviews should continue to rise to the level of the Provost, as they do now, with conflicted cases reviewed by the University RTP Committee**.**
    - The committee <u>recommends</u> that Year one, Year two, Year four, and Year five reviews should be maintained at the College/School Level for tenure-stream faculty.
    - The committee <u>recommends that it is not necessary</u> for the university RTP committee to review all tenure and promotion cases for tenure-stream faculty and provide a summary report/recommendation to the Provost.
    - The committee <u>recommends it is not necessary</u> for the university committee to review all FTRC and non-tenure track reviews.

- **Separate RTP Committees for Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty – page 9**
    - The committee is <u>mixed</u> in its response of whether should there be separate university committees for tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. Please see a detailed discussion below.

- **Rank of Voting Faculty – and Choice of Voting Faculty by Candidate – page 10**
    - The committee <u>recommends</u> that the candidate (tenure stream or FTRC) <u>not</u> be able to choose their voting pool as is currently the practice.
    - The committee is <u>mixed</u> in its response on whether voting on RTP cases should be limited to faculty who hold a higher rank (e.g., Associate and Full Professors vote on T&P for

assistant professors, Full Professors vote on promotion of Associate Professors). Please see a detailed discussion below.

- **Timeline of Reviews – possible to complete by end of fall semester** – **page 11**
    - o The Committee is <u>mixed</u> whether the review process should be completed by the end of the fall semester. Please see a detailed discussion below.

- **Six Year Review Schedule for Tenure Stream Faculty – page 12**
    - o The committee in general <u>recommends</u> a six year schedule (as described below) for type and level of reviews for tenure stream faculty.

- **Review Schedule for Non-Tenure Stream Faculty** – page 14
    - o The committee in general <u>recommends</u> a schedule (as described below) for type and level of reviews for non-tenure stream faculty. The model below shows the first three years of a new fixed term rolling contract (FTRC) type position.

External Reviewers

The committee <u>recommends</u> that there should be a minimum, but no maximum, number of external reviewers and that the number be set at 4 to 6.

No maximum is recommended - unless clear guidelines exist or are created on a process for removing extras letters received. If a minimum is set above four, the Provost should consider the challenging nature of requesting and receiving external evaluations. Four is very reasonable when often fifteen to twenty requests are needed to just achieve that final completed and total number of four.

The committee <u>recommends</u> that guidelines should (and already do) exist for the proportion of external reviewers that are recommended by the candidate. This proportion should be set at 50/50 split between the candidate and unit head.

To receive a minimum number of four letters, the number of external reviewers recommended by the candidate/head each at the start of the process should be from 6 to 8 each (for a total reviewer pool of 12 to 16). If the minimum total required letters is greater than four, the initial pool of recommended external reviewers should be increased proportionally, e.g. the candidate/head should recommend 7 to 10 each if the minimum required number of letters is five. Additionally, the candidate and/or unit head can also recommend more if needed – but a balance of 50/50 should be maintained whenever possible. The final proportion of actual letters received will depend on whether the external evaluators submit their requested evaluations and may not be a 50/50 proportion of candidate/head recommendations.

The committee <u>does not recommend</u> a requirement that external reviewers hold a professorial rank that is equivalent to or above the candidate.

The committee instead recommends that there should be direction and guidelines from Academic Affairs on this to candidates and unit heads. These guidelines could be part of a larger description of the ideal external review panel, but <u>exceptions should be allowed</u> when necessary. Justifications for these exceptions should then be included in the explanation regarding the selection of the external reviewers by the department head/chair/director in the WyoFolio RTP case. Possible exceptions could include:

a) When a candidate's scholarly or creative research field is so narrow, small, or new that the pool of willing and qualified external reviewers at the required level, especially at full professor, is small.

b) When it is important to reach outside of academia for an external reviewer who has unique expertise related to a candidate's creative or scholarly research focus.

Committee members also pointed out that restricting rank for external reviewers would not be advisable because not all academic institutions have tenure rank for certain disciplines. It also should be acknowledged that academic rank is not the only method for determining whether an individual has expertise in a field or is able to weigh in on an RTP case as an external reviewer. In some cases, an Associate Professor in a field could be better situated to discuss the candidate's research than a Full Professor with expertise outside of the candidate's field of creative or scholarly research.

The committee is mixed on whether multiple reviewers from a single institution should be allowed.

Some committee members believe that multiple reviewers from a single institution should not be allowed or at least strongly discouraged. Other committee members believe that multiple reviewers from a single institution should be allowed, albeit preferably from different departments or programs at the institution – and that the number should be limited to a maximum of two reviewers from a single institution. And other committee members believe that this decision should be left to the discretion of the unit leader and/or department and would then require explanation in the WyoFolio RTP case. **The committee in general believes** that there should be a set of guidelines from Academic Affairs regarding the number of external reviewers allowed from one institution. This recommendation could be part of a larger description of the ideal external review panel, but that exceptions should be allowed when necessary. Justifications for these exceptions should then be included in the explanation regarding the selection of the external reviewers by the department head/chair/director in the WyoFolio RTP case.

The committee is mixed on whether there should be an expectation regarding inclusion of reviewers from R1 universities.

The committee believes it is important to have R1 representation in external reviews – but recognizes that this may already be happening to sufficient degree already. The committee recommends requiring department heads and unit leaders to list which external reviewers are from R1 institutions in WyoFolio RTP cases. The committee further recommends that Academic Affairs start tracking these numbers. Committee members also pointed out that for some disciplines the best reviewers are not necessarily at R1 institutions – and therefore specifying a minimum number for a candidate's case is not in the best interest of the RTP process. It may be UW is already meeting some minimum number in most or all RTP cases. More data collection is necessary to understand where UW is already – before implementing arbitrary minimum standards.

The committee is mixed on whether there should there be guidelines on limiting the number of reviewers that come from non-U.S. institutions.

Many on the committee believe that the descriptor of "non-U.S." institutions should be redefined as "non-North American" in order to be more inclusive of all North American academic institutions. This belief is not unanimous, however, as some committee members feel that "non-U.S." more appropriately recognizes the differences among Canadian, Mexican, and U.S. institutions as well as difference among institutions outside of the continent.

Some committee members believe that there should be no limit on reviewers from non-U.S. institutions – or, if a limit is imposed, it should be decided at the department level. Other committee members voiced a preference for limiting the numbers of external reviewers from non-U.S. institutions. There were concerns that reviewers from outside U.S. academia may not fully understand the review process conducted at UW – and may not provide helpful or appropriate responses. Conversely, it is important to note that external evaluators from outside U.S. institutions can often be helpful if candidate's creative or scholarly research area is internationally connected or strongly international in focus. **In general, the committee believes** that a majority of reviewers should come from U.S. institutions. A statement like this could be included in a set of guidelines from Academic Affairs regarding the preference for U.S. external evaluators.   The committee also recommends that unit heads include a justification for international referees through Academic Affairs' External Evaluators Cover Sheet.

Conflict of Interest

The committee recommends that there should be guidelines regarding disclosure of potential conflicts of interest between the candidate and external reviewers.

For example, current or former collaborators, former graduate mentors or thesis advisors, co-authors, and reviewers at the institution where the candidate earned their terminal degree or performed postdoctoral research all have the potential for conflicts of interest and, if chosen as external reviewers, should be disclosed as such. Some members of the committee recommend Academic Affairs define a maximum timeframe for conflict of interest disclosures (e.g. ten years).

The committee recognizes and supports the current language in the FAQ on the Academic Affairs website:

> *A tenure or promotion packet should contain at least four letters from referees who have no personal connection to the candidate. Examples of personal connections are serving as a dissertation advisor or advisee, previous or pending co-authorship, sharing of research funding, and family relationships. Avoid selecting academic referees who are not tenured and/or who do not hold rank at or above Associate Professor or Professor.*

Level of Reviews

The committee recommends that Year one reviews should be maintained only as Annual Performance Evaluations at the College/School Level for tenure-stream faculty and non-tenure-track faculty reappointments.

The committee discussed the value of Year one reviews extensively and concluded that new faculty need feedback, but that a full multi-level RTP review is not the mechanism to provide the needed feedback because it is currently based on insufficient information. Therefore, the committee recommends that First Year reviews no longer be full RTP cases focusing only on the first fall semester. Instead, the new faculty should receive an Annual Performance Evaluation conducted by their department or unit head.

In its discussion of first year reviews, the committee identified another option: to move to a Second Year, full multi-level RTP review in the fall of the candidate's second academic year. This would then effectively be a review of their first two semesters. This option is not supported by the entire committee and is discussed further at the end of this report as part of a

recommendation from a subset of the committee to consider a year 2, 4, 6 model for RTP tenure stream reviews.

The committee <u>recommends</u> that Year Three Mid-Probationary Reviews should continue to rise to the level of the Provost, as they do now, with conflicted cases reviewed by the University RTP Committee.

If the first year reviews are removed from the RTP process and managed solely in the Annual Performance Evaluation Process, and the rest of the RTP review schedule remains as per current UW Regulation 2-7, then the Year Three Mid-Probationary Review becomes the first and only RTP review before a tenure vote. The committee feels that this review requires institutional awareness at all levels – especially in conflicted or difficult cases.

The committee <u>recommends</u> that Year one, Year two, Year four, and Year five reviews should be maintained at the College/School Level for tenure-stream faculty.

Specifically, the Year one, Year two, Year four, and Year five reviews would be Annual Performance Evaluations and not full multi-level RTP reviews. Annual Performance Evaluations do, and should continue to, have a place for acknowledging progress or lack of progress towards tenure or FTRC reappointment for those moving through these processes. The committee further recommends departments develop and enact procedures to allow feedback from department peers (all faculty or committee of faculty) to the candidate on tenure or reappointment progress at the department level in years one, two, four, and five. This feedback from peer faculty would also be important in cases where the Annual Evaluation shows that a faculty member is not making sufficient progress towards tenure or reappointment. The question remains how to best address these concerns and balance support for the candidate with maintenance of tenure and reappointment standards.

The committee <u>recommends that it is not necessary</u> for the university RTP committee to review all tenure and promotion cases for tenure-stream faculty and provide a summary report/recommendation to the Provost.

The committee recommends that only conflicted cases are necessary to be reviewed by the University RTP Committee, in addition to any other cases that the Provost identifies as meriting review.

The committee <u>recommends it is not necessary</u> for the university committee to review all FTRC and non-tenure track reviews.

The committee recommends that only conflicted cases are necessary to be reviewed by the University RTP Committee, in addition to any other cases that the Provost identifies as meriting review.

Separate RTP Committees for Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

The committee is <u>mixed</u> in its response of whether should there be separate university committees for tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty.

The committee recognizes that separate committees are used at some other institutions. Some committee members noted that in UW's current combined RTP committees, non-tenure-track faculty may not fully understand the demands, pressures, etc. related to the tenure process and, conversely, that tenure-stream faculty may not appreciate the packets of non-tenure-track faculty and so two separate committee may be merited. Some committee members would support two separate committees, but only if members of both sides of the discussion are in agreement and want separate review committees at UW. Other committee members believe that the current system works and that it is good to have tenured faculty read and learn about their non-tenure-track faculty colleagues – and vice versa.

It should be noted that there is a risk that separating these groups may cause additional misunderstandings and division – and further isolate non-tenure-track faculty. Finally – if these two review processes were separated from the department level on upward, guidelines and protocols would need to be established for departments that have insufficient numbers of non-tenure-track and/or tenure track faculty to form a working committee of eligible voting faculty. There would need to be clear and useful methods for overcoming situations where faculty outside of departments were needed to create a valid voting pool. One interesting and important point is that if a separation is made between these two RTP groups – it might only need to be made at the College and University RTP Committee levels. Many departments are too small to divide these groups effectively at that level – and doing so may risk jeopardizing the anonymity of the votes.

Rank of Voting Faculty – and Choice of Voting Faculty by Candidate

The committee <u>recommends</u> that the candidate (tenure stream or FTRC) <u>not</u> be able to choose their voting pool as is currently the practice.

This should instead be determined at the College or University level. The committee recognizes that this current practice puts an awkward amount of control in the candidate's hands over who is allowed to vote on their RTP cases. The committee did not have a clear opinion on which level should determine the rules for this – but did recognize that a College or University-wide rule was preferable to allowing departments to choose the path forward.

The committee is <u>mixed</u> in its response on whether voting on RTP cases should be limited to faculty who hold a higher rank (e.g., Associate and Full Professors vote on T&P for assistant professors, Full Professors vote on promotion of Associate Professors).

The first and most important question brought up in the committee was what level of administration should determine this decision. Should this be determined university wide by Academic Affairs, college by college, or by each department?   If a university or college level decision is made to limit the voting faculty to rank or above for promotional cases, then what happens in small departments or departments without enough faculty at the necessary rank to provide enough votes or feedback? There are some procedures in place - but those would need to be made clear and re-presented again to faculty to avoid confusion and clarify the process. There is also a balance to be considered between expertise in a field vs. expertise because of academic rank (much like the external reviewers). If this is decided at the department level, would a department prefer to have lower ranks vote to preserve a culture of creative or scholarly research expertise? Or would a department prefer to have only higher ranks vote but then need to pull in others from outside the department to maintain a sufficient number of voting faculty at rank and maintain anonymity.

Committee members pointed out that policies that require 'above' rank de-value some of the top contributors to the university and are counter-productive in the long run. Some members of the committee recommend that untenured or probationary faculty not be allowed to vote on cases above their rank or reappointment. This essentially removes them from the RTP voting process until after they have earned tenure or reappointment and, importantly, protects them from the risks involved in voting on RTP as junior faculty.

In contrast, other committee members felt that having untenured/un-reappointed faculty involved in reading and viewing RTP presentations and cases was important because this provided untenured/un-reappointed faculty the ability to learn from others moving through the process. One possible solution identified by the committee to address the challenge of maintaining an adequate voting pool would be to declare at the university level that a department needs a minimum of three faculty at or above the promotion rank for a vote. If this minimum is not met, then the College Dean's office, in consultation with the respective department head/chair, would select faculty of the appropriate rank and expertise from within the college to serve on the departmental committee to meet the minimum of three faculty requirement.

Timeline of Reviews – possible to complete by end of fall semester

The Committee is <u>mixed</u> whether the review process should be completed by the end of the fall semester.

The key question expressed by the committee was why must the review process be completed by the end of the fall semester? No compelling reasons could be identified by the committee for making this change, but the committee nevertheless examined this question. The committee recommends that if such a change is to be made, it should be supported by compelling reasons that clearly elucidate the benefits to all involved parties.

Many on the committee felt that completion of reviews by the end of the fall semester depends greatly on the number of cases, frequency of reviews, and whether reviews are required at the Department, Head, College, Dean, and University levels. If a small number (undefined) of cases are moving through the system – or only to certain levels of the system – then this is more possible. Making this change may also require departments and colleges to change their methods of candidate presentations and voting at the department level. Some departments require candidates to present in faculty meetings for reappointment and/or promotion/tenure in addition to building their WyoFolio RTP case. Compressing the completion of all RTP cases by the end of the fall at the university level could become cumbersome for some departments who wish to maintain their internal methods and standards for candidate presentations. Other departments rely more heavily on the actual WyoFolio cases (instead of direct presentations in a meeting by a

candidate) and have departmental RTP committee meetings or work through all RTP cases in one full faculty meeting.

Others on the committee felt that there were no real obstacles to completing the reviews by the end of the fall semester. All that is required is to start the processes in the prior spring semester with the presentation of clear and timely guidance and deadlines from Academic Affairs (e.g. the RTP memo must be distributed in the spring and not in early August as it currently is.) These committee members nevertheless did not see compelling reasons for making this change.

On another note, if the review process is to be completed by the end of the fall semester for all cases, UW should revise its regulations and policies to clearly state that tenure stream candidates will be reviewed for tenure and promotion after five years, instead of stating it is a six year review. There has been confusion in the past in various RTP committees on what is expected from a candidate for their tenure review and the miscalculation that if, for example, they are required to publish two articles per year (to simplify the math) – that adds up to ten by the time they present for tenure, – not twelve.

Six Year Review Schedule for Tenure Stream Faculty

The committee in general <u>recommends</u> the following six year schedule for type and level of reviews for tenure stream faculty.

<u>**Year One**</u>
type of review:
- **Annual Performance Evaluation #1**
    Recommendation:
    Include distinct separate review/feedback forms for tenure progress and annual performance to de-couple these two aspects of the reviews.
    o   Annual Performance evaluations are temporal and distinct
    o   RTP reviews are cumulative and progressive
highest level of review required:
- **College Dean**
    Recommendation:
    Allow and encourage departments to have department peers (all faculty or a committee of faculty) provide feedback to candidate on tenure progress – not just Department Head/Chair

Year Two

type of review:

- **Annual Performance Evaluation #2**
  Recommendation:
  Include distinct separate review/feedback forms for tenure progress
  and annual performance to de-couple these two aspects of the reviews
  - o Annual Performance evaluations are temporal and distinct
  - o RTP reviews are cumulative and progressive

highest level of review required:

- **College Dean**
  Recommendation:
  Allow and encourage departments to have department peers (all faculty
  or a committee of faculty) provide feedback to candidate on tenure
  progress – not just Department Head/Chair

Year Three

type of review:

- **RTP Review #1 - Mid-Probationary**
- **Annual Performance Evaluation #3**
  - o Annual Performance evaluations are temporal and distinct
  - o RTP reviews are cumulative and progressive

highest level of review required for RTP Review #1:

- **College Dean and College RTP Committee**
- **University Provost with conflicted cases reviewed by University RTP
  Committee**

Year Four

type of review:

- **Annual Performance Evaluation #4**
  Recommendation:
  Include distinct separate review/feedback forms for tenure progress
  and annual performance to de-couple these two aspects of the reviews
  - o Annual Performance evaluations are temporal and distinct
  - o RTP reviews are cumulative and progressive

highest level of review required:

- **College Dean**
  Recommendation:
  Allow and encourage departments to have department peers (all faculty
  or a committee of faculty) provide feedback to candidate on tenure
  progress – not just Department Head/Chair

Year Five

type of review:

- **Annual Performance Evaluation #5**
  Recommendation:
  Include distinct separate review/feedback forms for tenure progress
  and annual performance to de-couple these two aspects of the reviews

- o Annual Performance evaluations are temporal and distinct
- o RTP reviews are cumulative and progressive

highest level of review required:

- **College Dean**
  Recommendation:
  Allow and encourage departments to have department peers (all faculty or a committee of faculty) provide feedback to candidate on tenure progress – not just Department Head/Chair

Year Six

type of review:

- **RTP Review #2 – Tenure/Promotion**
  Annual Performance Evaluation not required for this review year

highest level of review required:

- **College Dean and College RTP Committee**
- **University Provost with conflicted cases reviewed by University RTP Committee**

Review Schedule for Non-Tenure Stream Faculty

The committee in general <u>recommends</u> the following schedule for type and level of reviews for non-tenure stream faculty. The model below shows the first three years of a new fixed term rolling contract (FTRC) type position.

Year One

type of review:

- **Annual Performance Evaluation #1**
  Recommendation:
  Include distinct separate review/feedback forms for tenure progress and annual performance to de-couple these two aspects of the reviews.
  - o Annual Performance evaluations are temporal and distinct
  - o RTP reviews are cumulative and progressive

highest level of review required:

- **College Dean**
  Recommendation:
  Allow and encourage departments to have department peers (all faculty or a committee of faculty) provide feedback to candidate on tenure progress – not just Department Head/Chair

Year Two

type of review:

- **Annual Performance Evaluation #2**
  Recommendation:
  Include distinct separate review/feedback forms for tenure progress and annual performance to de-couple these two aspects of the reviews
  - o Annual Performance evaluations are temporal and distinct

- o   RTP reviews are cumulative and progressive

highest level of review required:
- **College Dean**
  Recommendation:
  Allow and encourage departments to have department peers (all faculty or a committee of faculty) provide feedback to candidate on tenure progress – not just Department Head/Chair

Year Three

type of review:
- **Year Three Review for receiving a fixed term, rolling contract**
- **Annual Performance Evaluation #3**
  - o   Annual Performance evaluations are temporal and distinct
  - o   RTP reviews are cumulative and progressive

highest level of review required:
- **College Dean and College RTP Committee**
- **University Provost with conflicted cases reviewed by University RTP Committee**

Additional Recommendations and Commentary

In addition to the six year timeline recommendation for tenure stream faculty review, several members of the committee – along with feedback from faculty senate – would like the Provost and Academic Affairs to consider the following review timeline for tenure stream faculty.

This model moves the current Year One RTP review to Year Two – and the current Year Three RTP review to Year Four. Some members of the committee believe that this would be a more balanced way to solve the currently problematic Year One RTP reviews and provide better and more consistent RTP reviews over the six years. Note that other members of the committee do not support this recommendation. They feel that pre-tenure faculty can receive appropriate feedback with only two full, multi-level RTP reviews at years 3 and 6, especially if the departments are allowed and encouraged to have department peers provide feedback to the candidate on tenure progress in years 1, 2, 4 and 5.

Year One
- Annual Performance Evaluation #1

Year Two
- **RTP Review #1**
- Annual Performance Evaluation #2

Year Three

- Annual Performance Evaluation #3

Year Four
- **RTP Review #2**
- Annual Performance Evaluation #4

Year Five
- Annual Performance Evaluation #3

Year Six
- **RTP Review #3** – Tenure/Promotion

On other topic not included directly in the committee charges, many on the committee recommend that the Provost and Academic Affairs re-consider and re-evaluate the need for anonymity in RTP voting faculty commentary – and/or whether it is necessary for these comments to be directly read by the candidate during the review process.

Clearly - anonymous votes and written feedback have value in allowing the voting individual the freedom to speak their mind without concern for direct retaliation or retribution. However, as is true on much of the internet and social media, anonymity also allows for unnecessary, unfair, untrue, unsubstantiated, and unwarranted comments to be made without consequence. The committee acknowledges that this is a challenging balance to successfully manage – but also believes that the question needs to be mindfully considered and reflected upon at this time of review and discussion regarding the processes of RTP reviews.

One possible solution is to only allow administrators and RTP committees to review and read voting faculty comments as well as the breakdown of the individual votes based upon rank. The various levels, department head/chair, College RTP committee, Dean, University RTP committee, Provost could summarize the faculty commentary and votes instead of allowing the candidate to read raw and unfiltered faculty feedback. Another solution is to remove anonymity altogether. Let the candidate see who voted and wrote what so that all are responsible for their words and actions.

Even though departments across campus currently require their voting faculty to read the Responsibilities of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee before beginning any RTP discussions - and departments recommend review by voting faculty of the Pythian

16

papers addressing tenure and promotion that should considered alongside our Departmental RTP Expectations, including papers on making tenure decisions, considering collegiality and service, and promotion to full professor – voting faculty still choose to write outside of the recommended and necessary boundaries of their charge as voters for RTP and inappropriately use the RTP process to comment on the candidate in harmful and unhealthy ways.