

Ten and Prom
Tenure statement needs be less ambiguous.
I would like to see the university as a whole place more emphasis on the decision of the department with respect to promotion and tenure. No one is better qualified to comment on an untenured faculty member's performance than the other people in the department, particularly with respect to the quality of publications. I would also like to see some consideration give to an individual's teaching load. This is particularly relevant for faculty who are in very small departments. Obviously, a department with only 5 or 6 faculty is going to demand more from their faculty wrt teaching and service than one with 15-20 faculty. I would also like to see some peer-benchmarking. Compare productivity of a department to productivity of departments of similar size with similarly organized programs. Finally, encourage individual departments to set goals for their untenured faculty that use the achievements of recently tenured faculty as a guideline. Obviously, we can't have policies that guarantee tenure if someone accomplishes x,y,and,z, but we can be more honest I am tenured, but I do think that more mentorship would be helpful. This may vary by areas across campus.
I oppose any attempt to create a university wide assessment instrument. We have to admit that it takes thoughtful people to make judgments about what appropriately meets requirements for tenure and promotion. Currently, the large number of committees that have inputs on T&P decisions acknowledge differences and rely sufficiently on decisions from those closer to the candidate's field, department, and college. I don't think we have a "problem" unless upper-level administrators attempt to take the decision-makers out of the process or try to come up with some standardized, one-size-fits-all approach that is unworkable.
more quantitative measures based on incremental increases from past tenure decisions. obviously this would vary from department to department. i'm afraid of a big jump in standards that others have not been held to.
Tenure and promotion rules that crosses departmental bounds. Having good teaching and program innovations carry substantial weight in tenure or promotion. Having a well defined role for emeritus faculty.
No comment
since I am not eligible for tenure or promotion, I have no opinion regarding this issue
For one thing, communication of guidelines across campus; policies seem remarkably flexible, and unknown
The junior faculty in every department deserve to have a list of requirements to meet tenure in that department. The Faculty Handbook is not sufficient guidance in this matter, and to try to make tenure based on hearsay and rumor is agonizing, and unnecessary.
My position is not a tenured position. Comments within and outside of the academic world might lead one to conclude that attaining tenure becomes a license to coast for the remainder of one's career. I hope that's not the case at UAHuntsville. It appears from having quickly read through the personnel sections of the faculty senate handbook that there are rigorous review and evaluation processes in place to make sure that the tenured faculty remain dedicated to the teaching ideals promoted by the university and that they actively contribute to their disciplines and to the community at large. If these processes are not being implemented consistently across the campus in all the colleges and other units, then changes should be made. I don't have specific changes to suggest at this time.
none
More emphasis on scholarly publication in refereed journals. I fear that our current budgetary crisis will lead to pressure to bring in research money without publication, as well as push through PhD students who do not publish. (President Williams' UAHuntsville-local-industry PhD collaboration is very troubling.)
No opinion
More uniformity across campus.
First, each new tenure-track faculty should be appointed a mentor; meeting regularly throughout the tenure process. Secondly, the tenure committees need to be specific in their comments. Comments such as "more rigorous" are not explicit enough. The committees should give examples/explanations/advice that is clear and to the point.Thirdly, someone from the committee should meet with the faculty under review to advise.
It should be even-handed especially the formation of the committee (the handbook says that the faculty member should be consulted in the formation, but apparently this is not done.)

Merit based promotion and tenure. Specific guidelines would be useful. While this doesn't apply to me, I would also like to see promotion to tenure for those who excel at teaching and perhaps service, even if they do not perform significant research. This goes against Dr. Williams philosophy, but I think having some people who focus on teaching is to the benefit of the students and ultimately the university.
No opinion
tenure and promotion decisions should in practice as well as in theory be separate decisions--it is assumed that the recommendation for one must coincide with the recommendation for the other to be supported by central administration. Also, the seeming threat of losing positions may influence the tenure and promotion process. Departments should be assured by central administration that no positions will be lost as the result of a negative T or P decision.
I think reviews of teaching ability beyond the documentation of courses taught and publication is important. Peer review is also beneficial. I have had professors who have no business teaching and interacting with students, and I know I would feel more professional if I knew someone other than my students (via SIEs) were reviewing my teaching.
PTAC seems fine to me.
be the same for all individuals
More peer faculty input and decreased Dean override abilities.
We need to match resources to performance. Each department does have unique contributions to UAHuntsville, but we need to tie future resource expenditures to measurable goals.
Would be interesting for the university to consider teaching tenure like some other universities.
actually i would just like to see them applied university wide.
Consideration of non-standard criteria such as patents/licensing, industrial partnerships.
n/a
Unless the standards are really low, there is no way those policies could be made University wide. How can you compare Art, Engineering, and Nursing?
The processes are very cumbersome and repetitive. These should be simplified. Tenure needs to be evaluated. Once tenure is achieved, there should be some way to ensure ongoing competence.
Criteria need closer definition.
I think the process works well
-- One general note about the Handbook committee: make sure you have some Chairs on it. --No other concerns about tenure process.
More emphasis on research.
More emphasis in quality of the faculty. Today, we are given tenure to faculty with a very mediocre research component. These faculty in no time abandon research, and the creative work. The same measure we use for students excellency must be used for selecting our faculty, which is the future of this university.
A little more emphasis in teaching, and a little less emphasis in funding.
more application of scholarly endeavours for tenure
More consistency in OSP so that grant writing is not so difficult at UAHuntsville.
Senior Lecturer rank to reward outstanding lecturers
clear policy on maternity/paternity leave in relation to tenure clock
I am a non-tenure earning faculty member so I haven't given consideration to these policies.
I'm not sure.
I haven't been through the process so I don't really know. I will say the CLA requirement of a yearly re-appointment dossier has helped me feel less anxious and more prepared going into it.
a better understanding of what the University really think sis important. Most of the time the messages are mixed between whether one should focus more on teaching or research. Until now there was much more emphasis on teaching. President Williams says otherwise.

I'd like to see discipline-specific guidelines approved and then have committees actually ADHERE to them, instead of everyone saying \"this is the way everybody has to be, because that's the way I am!\" Keep tenure earning faculty in the evaluation loop at all times -- it does not have to be a closed, arcane, secretive, anonymous process (unless we just don't trust our colleagues and/or ourselves)
I'm all for high standards. Tenure at UAHuntsville should not be less than tenure at other schools.
Just that each department follow the same guidelines for all faculty within the department.
Administrators must respond to faculty concerns - this is particularly important during tenure/promotion decisions. PTAC recommendations seem to be routinely ignored, seem arbitrary almost. I am personally DISTRESSED at this process now. I do not see how this can be improved. IT MUST
Prior publications before joining UAH are not counted towards tenure currently. I would like to see that changed.
I don't know how specific policies can be university-wide... each discipline and college is so different. Our business school, for example, puts out more research per faculty member than any of our \"peer institutions.\" On the other hand, we don't bring in lots of research funding in the way engineering does, because there isn't much research funding in our disciplines. Apples and oranges...
tenure and promotion to associate professor should be linked. I think the requirements for promotion should include anything that is required for tenure
Dossiers should have common minimum required contents across colleges.
Merit-based pay raises for untenured faculty, with higher raises for more publications. Since there are no raises this year, I'm not sure how the system works.
A clearly defined statement of what is required for tenure and promotion.
Appears to work OK as it currently exists.
Having fewer university-wide policies; leaving more to colleges, who are better familiar with standards and procedures appropriate to the disciplines in their departments!
Clear delineation of research and teaching emphasis and the role of service. Clear delineation of what is expected of a faculty member.
These policies work well in my opinion.
The intentions to \"codify\" expectations for tenure are very problematic, as expectations vary by discipline. Administrative and service responsibilities should be given greater weight in tenure and promotion reviews.
In my limited opinion, the tenure process seems good and fair to me.
The policies followed by the College of Liberal Arts are sufficiently clear and well defined. Some degree of flexibility is necessary. Stated policies regarding teaching, research, and service should be equitably applied and enforced across academic affairs.
Outside letters reviewing of scholarship of all tenure cases
Rules applied uniformly regardless of college.
Mentoring of tenure earning faculty with regards to research and publications. It is a niche at the College of Nursing. I am of the opinion working with other faculty on campus would be valuable; especially if one is not in the niche.
We have departmental tenure committees as well as a college of science PTAC. The upper administration should not ignore the recommendations of those who work most closely with those faculty up for promotion and/or tenure.
- formal mentoring process - improved institutional support & start up package for new faculty
a university wide requirement for quality external review of key publications for all applicants should be required for tenure. proof of national and international recognition should be required for promotion to professor.
I would like the university to understand that publishing norms and performance standards vary by college and by departments within colleges and to avoid unnecessary and detrimental standardization. One size does not fit all.
Uniformity of basic expectations.

I would like a metric applied where teaching load, advisor load, graduate student load and research (papers and grants) are all added together as different faculty will have different ratios. In Biology we have a heavy teaching load and in addition we have a relatively small PhD program. And biological research, growing neurons for example, takes forever, and one then has to acquire the data, so each paper is a large, hard to acquire set of data. For this reason it is the custom in biology to publish fewer bigger story papers rather than smaller, more focused papers, so the publication numbers may not be as high in biology. However every field has its own difficulties. I myself have had very good luck and have publications and grants despite my teaching load of Human A&P (110 students) and 6 lab sections etc etc..and despite my use of human adult CNS cells, which are very fussy!!!!

One of the biggest problems we've had previously in the tenure and promotion process is in the college promotion and tenure committees, people from different departments try to impose their own departmental standards on persons from different departments. When I've served on PTAC, we've had arguments such as "but I had 40 journal articles when I came up for tenure, they should have that in other departments as well." Clarifying the standards of each department is helpful, but the departmental standards I've seen are still very vague. I think we need some kind of comparative tenure standards. What I think would be best would be some sort of summary, presumably without names, of recent vitas that were granted tenure or not granted tenure in each department for which candidates are being examined (# journal articles, # conf papers, avg SIE scores, # committees served on, etc.) just so PTAC can get in the appropriate ballpark range.

no comment