

Promotion Process Year-to-Year Faculty, Career-Track (Non-continuing)

For year-to-year faculty in the College of Agriculture, Life and Environmental Sciences (CALES), there should be very clear position responsibilities. There must be criteria and measures for the activities that are part of the job description and a process for evaluation just as there are for regular faculty. Even if little or no research is involved, there should be criteria and measures for the activities that are a part of the job. The process should be equitable for both continuing and career-track (non-continuing) faculty in similar positions.

The model which we have used for professorial titles, career-track (non-tenure) is also appropriate for faculty with agent titles, career-track (non-continuing) eligible. These candidates are evaluated by the same process as other CALES faculty with similar positions up through the level of the dean. The packet then goes to the provost for a final decision. There is no review by a university committee as there would be if they were continuing- or tenure-eligible.

The dossier should be the same as for continuing-eligible faculty with similar titles. It must include Section 2 (Summary of Candidate's Workload Assignment) and appropriate criteria and guidelines for promotion to each level in the position (i.e., asst. agent, assoc. agent, and full agent). The college guidelines specifically address the use of a position description to provide the context for all evaluations – Section 2 is provided by the provost to provide a position description for the purposes of promotion review – so if the position description does not call for scholarly research the candidate would not be evaluated on that basis. An abstract of the college guidelines and a set of Extension guidelines would be part of the packet.

Outside letters (5) should be obtained by the unit head. Independence may be an issue if the candidate knows all or most of the appropriate people who would provide outside letters. If necessary, that would be an area for the unit head and dean to address in their letters. The candidate should not contact any of the outside reviewers. The university allows the candidate to suggest names but the unit head makes the final selection which may include no more than half from the candidate's list. The unit head describes the process of selection and provides brief background information on the referees.

There should be review by both a unit-level committee and a college-level committee. It is also possible to modify the peer committee by adding someone with greater knowledge of the candidate's area of responsibility to the regularly designated members.