**Distilled Ideas from Faculty Meeting**

There were thirteen pages of single-spaced notes from the 5/31 faculty meeting, copied and pasted from the five of us who took notes. (That’s available as a separate document.) With Lauren’s help, I combined and refined those notes into this document. (There was an intermediate step, and I’ve also got that as a file, for anyone interested.) There’s still some redundancy in this document, but it’s more wieldy. I’ve put some comments in the margins on several statements, with my broad sense of how to proceed.

--Doug, 6/3

**Philosophy statement:**

* Wish for a concrete definition—in the philosophy statement—of what exactly “Teaching Assoc Prof” and “Teaching Prof” are. Is full TP a successful TAP who’s been here for 10 years? Or is it something else? This definition would be useful for committees in reviewing files. The criteria do not define the positions.
* Wish to define and operationalize words like *significant or substantive or aggregate*
* We should aim to capture what we actually do and not only what we spelled out X years ago; philosophy should highlight actual dimensions of our program culture; this might include public good and community work.
* We should not make the philosophy much more complicated than it is. The philosophy is an overview, whereas the criteria are what committees use to decide. We should devote specific energies to criteria, not the philosophy. Either way, we do need continuity between the established mission and the way its mirrored in the promotion/ review materials overall. If we think the mission and vision should be revised, we should take that on as a separate thing. The philosophy articulates mission and vision as basis of reappointment and promotion.
* What is our identity, and how do we form it? We’ve had very different shifts and attitudes after the switch in position types, and we haven’t really caught up with that

**Artifacts statement:**

* Wish for idea of “balance” to be more visible in statement.
* Wish for explicit statement about cross-listing between categories. The philosophy does imply that cross-listing is possible.
* The new statement goes some way in alleviating concerns.
* Concern that not being precise means things will be too ambiguous (“loosey-goosey”). We want people not to have to struggle either to understand their own work in preparing the portfolio or for committees in evaluating.
* Making models available will allow people to be less stressed out. This is a genre that not everyone understands, and we need structures in place to allow models…and maybe templates, too.

**Terminal Degree – Should terminal degrees be a requirement for full?**

* Grandfather people who came in as lecturers, etc.
* Support having an equivalent available for terminal degree. Supported idea of TIME/YEARS OF EXPERIENCE as the primary equivalent but also SCHOLARLY ENGAGEMENT as a reasonable equivalent.
* Some now say the MFA is no longer terminal—we might have to deal with that some day
* The terminal degree should be that strong as a consideration. The candidate is going to be eligible for full; why isn’t that enough? Sometimes a strong person comes along that doesn’t have a terminal degree, and we will hire them; it seems very strange to say that such folks also have to do something extra to be promoted to full someday.
* What if a terminal degree is just a “professional” bullet for full? That gives it some credit. But terminal degree as a bullet then makes promotion easier for those who have it; probably more fair just to get rid of the requirement and say we’re all on the same footing—or increase number to 5
* A terminal degree represents both training for the job and overall participation in the field. It should remain that way.
* It’s perfectly acceptable to keep the criteria for Full high. It privileges scholarship, but it does make room for other things, especially if percentages are flexible.
* A Teaching Professor should be based on teaching, not on scholarship.

**Numbers/Criteria**

* The 60/30/10 does not map onto our responsibility division. 1: we should add more options to meet these numbers; this is more valuable than changing the numbers. Maybe we should have very large numbers of criteria available rather than changing the numbers we need to meet. Let’s give each other broad ranges of things to do to gain these levels, but then still require that people do a lot. When it comes to numbers in terms of artifacts, the number just seems to grow over time. If it’s 60, 30, 10, should the number reflect that breakdown for the criteria? Scholarship seems to be inflated. We would maybe like to reduce those numbers, especially to retain newer faculty.
* Take the pressure off artifacts and put it on the statement.
* Changing criteria now makes it *more* confusing for next year’s candidates.
* There’s a disconnect: the phil statement says not algorithmic, but the criteria do suggest algorithmic. Models and rubrics can therefore be helpful. There has to be some room to make a case for oneself, though. The algorithm isn’t the problem; communicating the algorithm clearly is the problem.
* Protect the junior folks, either by having them do less in their first years or to have less strict criteria.
* Associate level needs more options to fill criteria, more flexibility.
* Not everything should be cross-listable.
* Request that “programmatic implications” be more explicitly defined. Wish that “professional development related to teaching” be more explicitly defined.
* We don’t need to be so focused on the numbers. We should use a spirit of good will in thinking about how the criteria build a case
* Some of us reject the idea of having a criterion statement in every folder. I don’t need you to tell me what you’ve met, I’m going to go look for it. Some people did the portfolio criterion by criterion, others did not; both should work. If a person doesn’t claim all the criterion, committees should still look for them
* But really, we need a more direct, holistic rendering of what each level of person is. Most of us resist making it very specifically oriented to the criteria; let’s define in some global way what we are and make that narrative case
* Building the case should perhaps should come incrementally out of the annual review statements more strongly, and to be tracked through that system
* Let’s find ways to support the candidate, unless we can say they just aren’t doing the job. Let’s give people access to their own work—the ability to call on what they have done to make their case.
* Let’s have enough criteria that everything we could value would be represented there.
* And let’s not make us shoehorn things into places they don’t fit, or shape what we decide to do more toward checking off bullets than toward what we think is good work.
* What happens if we cut the required numbers and just say, use these criteria to make a case
* And then the breadth versus depth thing—the criteria value breadth; is that really what we want?
* People doing things toward meeting criteria does not seem like a healthy system. We’re asking each other to help with things that generate artifacts, and it seems very sad—people copying thank-you card. Scrounging for artifacts doesn’t seem like real professional development
* We need to have some brainstorming about what we currently value and come up with bullets that describe them; and add in our aspirational things, things we aren’t doing yet but want to. Let’s have a fall meeting where the homework is name a thing that you do that you think ought to be a bullet in a category. And we’d talk about those and valuing those.
* Specifically, we need to clarify what kinds or aspects of service-learning qualify as teaching, service, or professional. We’ve said that if it includes students in extra-curricular work, it’s service; but that’s not clear from the criteria
* Under Teaching A, Student Evaluations are so flawed that they should not receive primacy; they should move to B. Evidence of student learning or gain should go in A, though it’s more challenging to measure
* Discussion of how teaching evaluations are used, if selected; “unless they’re a standard deviation or more beneath our program average” (usually in the 5.0 to 5.3 range), “they don’t count against someone”
* As far as instructional effectiveness in the classroom, it’s demonstrated by a) how faculty represent they use class time (in “full” syllabi, teaching statements, articles/presentations about teaching; and b) observations and letters by others, reports that carefully explain and analyze what happens in classes
* For Assistant and Associate, at least 2 things from Category A should be required; Designing a good course and responding well to student writing are bottom-line things, and everybody should be able to demonstrate that
* Publishing an article and presenting at a conference (though not the same) are different than participating in a conference (100% vs. 80%).
* What does “increasing amounts” mean? Showing “growth” for Associate/Full is definitely important, but what does that mean for us? Does changing assignments equal growth? A good teacher should show proof of listening to students. Growth inside of a single class could be paying attention to what is working and what is not.
* Not unimportant note: It’s frustrating that living wages are tied to this imperfect process. There may not be much we can do about it for now, but that does seem to be a central issue here.
* We should be able to write our own percentages: Teaching 60%; Service 10%, Contributions 10%; 20% assigned individually.
* see John’s comments on the google document (cut and paste below)
* balance between open ended and not being ambiguous--unique and significant contribution (is an example of language that’s ambiguous)
* concerns that we’re “only” focusing on writing program mission rather than ALSO university’s mission and UAP’s mission. We are privileging writing center workshops more than GERI. We shouldn’t pigeonhole ourselves with our own mission
* current promotion criteria for service seemed super specific and in some cases outdated
* clarify “teaching teachers”
* We need to change the full professor publishing so that it doesn’t only count peer-reviewed publications

**Third Year review**

* more mentoring earlier
* clarifying what kinds of artifacts we should be including
* more guidance (because the only thing people have heard is from colleagues)
* purpose of third year review?
* meant to be developmental and formative; should give us insight into any deficits
* (confusion about how reappointment/review process works in general)

**Associate Promotion**

* we’ve talked about this a lot
* that seems pretty straightforward
* promotion to full should be clear, difference between associate and full should be clarified

**Debriefing and Large Group Conversation**

* Have an alternative to terminal degree so that there aren’t obstacles to TP, instead multiple diverse pathways. Same with promotion to TAP.
* Artifacts numbers should be more aligned with responsibilities, Question: are all criteria equally weighted? Maybe we need to clarify. Should there be a hierarchy of criteria? For example, “attend” and “create/initiate” might be differently weighted.
* Distinction to be made between vertical and horizontal growth/effort.
* Find a way to value research that is valuable in itself, and perhaps has outcomes in policy recommendations, programmatic changes, but not scholarship. How do we value this? Is there cross-listing potential?
* Clarify teaching categories A and B.
* Look at criteria regarding community engaged work and service serving program mission v others service. Review things in the service categories.
* Allow people to make arguments for themselves as members not just of program but of UAP, campus, discipline, and so on.
* Pages 12 and 13 have definitions of the jobs. Additional refining could happen here.
* When it comes to numbers of things for promotion it just gets bigger—get more numbers.
* In teaching, there’s a two-column thing; how about the same thing in other categories
* There are levels and strengths of these things, and we should make those matter. There also Degree of difficulty stuff—we could go there, would not have to be a formula
* With our language, privilege higher quality somehow
* Public good is part of the university mission (though not the university ATP); why not include it more specifically in ours?

**Fall discussions should include everything we’ve talked about, especially**

* Terminal Degree
* Algorithmic vs. Holistic
* Definition of Professor Lines
* Breadth vs. Depth
* A comprehensive, internally clarifying, and publicly facing statement about the role of community-engaged work in our program.
* How are we crafting ourselves as teaching faculty in the broader context of a university facing enrollment challenges (the national enrollment cliff) and also having higher aspirations for its research identity?

**Other Topics**

* There’s a proliferation of administration jobs…we’re worrying about small raises but damn, those assistant provosts…etc.
* We should have a year or five plan conversation, so we’re not planning year by year