


Memorandum

To: Faculty Senate
Seton Hall University

From: Karen E. Boroff, Ph.D. 
Interim Provost and Executive Vice President

Re: Executive Committee Resolution about Tenure and Promotion Guidelines
(2019-FS-26)

Date: February 26, 2020

The Office of the Provost is in receipt of approval of the Executive Committee's resolution regarding Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. This was passed by the Senate at its Oct. 11, 2019 meeting.

The tenure and promotion process, in Article 4 of the *Faculty Guide*, includes a peer review process. The faculty, the deans, the Provost, as well as the candidates, all share an interest in clarity of expectations. In the current *Faculty Guide* and the revised version, which is under review, there are provisions for departments to review annually and prepare evaluations of a probationary faculty member's progress toward tenure. Special attention is provided to the third-year review in order to give the probationary faculty member time to remedy any perceived deficiency in his/her portfolio.

For those seeking promotion to Professor, the *Guide* standards in 4.5.d call for, among other requirements, "demonstrated professional recognition of meritorious publications, research, or other creative work, continued and consistent excellence in teaching; service and leadership in the university, the profession, or the community." While these *Guide* standards are general, and any others created by a department must be at least as rigorous as these, it would help for those seeking promotion to have some idea as to how these translate in their specific discipline. It would also aid those who need to make judgments regarding whether the standards have been met.

I endorse the resolution that departments propose these tenure and promotion guidelines and it would be beneficial to any new hires to have these in place by the end of the spring term 2020.

The Senate may post these on its webpage as it chooses, but for the sake of clarity, the Senate should specify if a given document has the support of the dean. Otherwise, readers will be tremendously confused, causing the exact opposite of the objective of this resolution. The document should also be dated with the approval level noted, so if these change over time, candidates are not confused or misled. Guidelines will be posted on the Provost's webpage when these have been approved by the respective deans. As administrators who have the obligation and the authority to review independently candidates for tenure and promotion, there should be clarity and concurrence for them in understanding what these standards represent. Deans may also wish to view them through the lens of consistency across departments in their schools or colleges. I trust that if there are some disagreements, these will be handled in a collegial manner.