

## Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures Committee Report (2025-2026)

### Members of the Committee:

Darrell Carpenter, Chair

Chris Bjornsen

Brooke Mathna

Andrew Yeagley

Jennifer Hutchinson

Tena Ewing

The Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures Committee received a charge from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to review the evaluation schedule / criteria for Senior Lecturers and Senior Clinical Educators. This charge was initiated based on feedback from Senior Lecturers / Senior Clinical Educators indicating that they were perpetually subjected to a Promotion & Tenure-style performance review (as well as Annual Performance Reviews) even though they are not eligible for future promotion or the award of tenure. Additionally, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was concerned about an unnecessary administrative burden on the Department Chairs who must conduct these ongoing evaluations.

The Committee began our work by collecting data on similar positions at peer institutions. We quickly determined that there was no prominent standard among our peer institutions. Some institutions had an additional academic rank such as “Master Lecturer” or “Master Clinical Educator”. Some institutions required continued Promotion & Tenure-style reviews and others did not. We took the data we gathered and then met with the three Department Chairs most affected by these positions (the Provost identified three departments we should focus on). Each of the three department chairs had different concerns and there was little consensus among them. For example, one chair was strongly in-favor of creating a new academic rank, one chair was indifferent, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> chair was strongly opposed to any new academic rank. Additionally, one chair felt the Promotion and Tenure-style reviews were critical for licensure and program accreditation initiatives while the other two chairs were in favor of eliminating this requirement after a period of time.

Committee members gathered additional feedback from their respective departments. There was little support for creating an additional academic rank so that path forward was quickly put to rest. We found much stronger support for a policy change that would end Promotion & Tenure-style reviews after 3 consecutive positive review cycles at the rank of Senior Lecturer or Senior Clinical Educator. We proposed a change to Faculty Policies and Procedure Manual Section III.V.5 to codify this language. Eventually, the Faculty Senate entertained an internal motion to remove the “3 consecutive positive review cycles” language and the Faculty Senate voted to otherwise accept our submitted proposal.