

## MEMORANDUM

TO: CFA

FROM: Steering Committee

RE: **Charge to Revise Service Expectations in Reappointment and Promotions Document**

DATE: May 18, 2021

### **Background**

A [memo](#) was sent on March 3, 2021 from the HSS Anti-Black Racism Task Force to Steering and CFA. The task force requested that the Steering Committee send a charge to CFA regarding a revision to service expectations of faculty and librarians in the Reappointment and Promotions Document (RPD) with the goal to clarify, properly value, and quantify the service expectations for faculty and librarians. The RPD merely specifies guidelines for reappointment and promotion as “service” to the department/program, school, and/or College; community; and profession” but does not specify the quality or quantity of the service. The guidelines for promotion to professor specify “consistent service and leadership” at the department level and/or campus wide and likewise does not specify the quality or quantity of service, nor the nature or consistency of leadership. Unclear guidelines regarding service expectations and narrow definition of service can result in negative impacts for faculty and librarians including: uneven service loads; disproportionate level of service among certain groups of faculty (Black faculty, Indigenous faculty, and other faculty of color, women, trans and queer faculty, faculty with disabilities, etc.); and lack of rewarding exemplary service to the institution. Additionally, when service loads are high, a compensatory sacrifice of time dedicated to scholarship and teaching can have a negative impact as well.

The most recent revision of the RPD (approved June 30, 2020), specifies that applicants for tenure and promotion must meet certain guidelines in the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. Whereas the guidelines for teaching (15 specific listed criteria that faculty should strive to reach) and scholarship (specific standards for each discipline) are generally well-developed, the guidelines for service are less developed (in RPD see page 8 for defining service; page 11 regarding promotions for librarians; and pages 33-34 regarding promotion to either associate or professor for faculty).

### **Charge**

Steering charges CFA to review the service requirements contained in the RPD for candidates seeking reappointment and promotion for both faculty and librarians. CFA should provide clearer standards for a more robust definition of comprehensive contributions to service including the nature of leadership (e.g., committee chair or co-chair versus member), service to the College, service to the profession, and community-related service. The RPD should provide clearer standards regarding the type of service (i.e., quantity and quality) expected at various points of a candidate’s professional development (e.g., pre-tenure Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, etc.), and it should recognize that some forms of service are easier to quantify than others based on outcomes of service activities. The revised RPD should recognize that some candidates (i.e., Black faculty, Indigenous faculty, and other faculty of color, women, trans and queer faculty, faculty with

disabilities, etc.) might be called upon for service roles more often than candidates and that some candidates will be stronger in some service areas as compared to others. Lastly, CFA should consider a mechanism by which service can be assessed (i.e., threshold for excellence) – as is done for the areas of teaching and scholarship – and reflecting upon the contributions of the role of service and the tangible outcomes of said service activities.

Once CFA has completed this work, CFA should prepare a preliminary recommendation for a revised RPD and seek testimony (in person and electronically) from Faculty Senate; Librarians; Academic Leaders; PRC Chairs; Office of the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies; the Council of Deans; and AFT Union representatives.

### **Timeline**

CFA should begin work on the charge in early Fall of 2021. CFA should prepare a preliminary recommendation by early November 2021. CFA should then solicit campus testimony during the early spring 2022 with the goal of making a final recommendation to Steering no later than March of 2022.

### **Original Testimony Tier: Tier II-Faculty and Librarians and related-groups/committees Revised to Tier III Testimony (April 2022)**

The issue requires moderate testimony from the campus community. The assigned council or committee should consult with relevant individuals and groups in developing a preliminary recommendation. The completed preliminary recommendation should then be made available to the relevant stakeholder groups, and testimony should be solicited in the form of written feedback (through a survey and or e-mail).

### **TCNJ Governance Processes**

#### *Step 1 – Steering issues a charge*

If Steering considers the issue appropriate for Governance, it will generate a charge and assign it to the appropriate committee or council. The charge will include:

- A clearly defined statement of the issue;
- A specific action that the committee or council should undertake;
- A list of individuals or groups with which the committee should consult in the development of a preliminary recommendation;
- The testimony tier (see page 27) that the committee or council should use in presenting the preliminary recommendation to the campus community;
- A suggested timeline for completing the charge.

Copies of all charges will be cc'd to the presidents of the three representative bodies. This will notify them that Governance is undertaking a new charge. It will also give them the opportunity to request

that the testimony tier (see page 24) of the charge be changed. If such a request is made, it must be made within one week of receiving the charge.

### *Step 2 - Governance prepares a Preliminary Recommendation*

Once the appropriate standing committee or council has received the charge, it should start by collecting data needed to make a preliminary recommendation. It should receive input from affected individuals and all relevant stakeholder groups prior to making a preliminary recommendation. For issues that have broad implications or that affect a large number of individuals, initial testimony should be solicited from the campus community at large. For some issues, sufficient initial testimony may come from input through committee membership or solicitation from targeted constituent groups.

When, in the best judgment of the committee, adequate clarity of the principles contributing to the problem are known, a preliminary recommendation should be drafted and disseminated to the campus community.

### *Step 3 – The Relevant Stakeholders provide Testimony*

Once a preliminary recommendation has been completed, the standing committee or council should seek testimony from the campus community. The testimony should be gathered in accordance with the Testimony Tier (see page 27) assigned to the issue by Steering.

For issues that require public testimony from the campus community, the chair of the standing committee or council should approach the president of the appropriate representative bodies to schedule the next available time slot at a meeting of that body.

Testimony should be gathered in a way that allows stakeholders to weigh in fully on the issue. Members of the standing committee or council that wrote the preliminary recommendation should be present to hear and record the testimony.

### *Step 4 – Governance prepares a Final Recommendation*

Once the standing committee or council has received appropriate testimony, it should revise the preliminary recommendation into a final recommendation. Once the final recommendation is complete, the standing committee or council should use sound judgment to determine whether or not more public testimony is required. If, in its feedback to the original preliminary recommendation, a stakeholder representative body requests to review an issue again, the committee or council is bound to bring it back to that body. If a full calendar year has passed since the formal announcement of the preliminary recommendation, the committee must resubmit a preliminary recommendation to the campus community.

When the committee or council has completed the final recommendation, it should forward it to the Steering Committee. The final recommendation should be accompanied by a cover memo that

summarizes the initial charge, how testimony was gathered and the nature of that testimony, and how the committee responded to that testimony, including a description of how the preliminary recommendation evolved as a result of testimony.

*Step 5 – Steering considers the Final Recommendation*

Once Steering receives a final recommendation from a committee or council, it should consider whether or not the proper process has been followed. If it determines that the full process has been followed and that the recommendation is sound, it should approve the final recommendation and forward it to the provost.

If Steering decides that the process has not been followed, or that the recommendation is not sound, it should return the final recommendation to the appropriate committee or council and the charge should move back to Step 4.

*Step 6 – The Provost and/or President and Board consider the Final Recommendation*

The provost will consider the final recommendation and then accept it, accept it with minor revisions, accept it with major revisions, or reject it. In the case of acceptance, the final recommendation will either be sent to the next relevant individual for approval or will become policy, and will proceed to step 7.

If a final recommendation is rejected, or if changes are suggested, the provost will relay concerns and suggestions to Steering and the relevant committee or council chair. The steps listed under section X of this document – Governance Resolution – will then take place.

*Step 7 – Steering notifies the Campus Community*

Once an issue has been formally approved and has become policy, the provost will notify the faculty co-chair of the Steering Committee, who will in turn notify the campus community through the appropriate means. This may include email, a notification on the Governance website, and/or email to the presidents of the stakeholder representative bodies.

*For a complete description of all steps and of the testimony tiers, see Governance Structures and Processes, 2019 Revision, pages 24-26*