On March 22nd, CUPP received an inquiry from a constituent requesting information about the process used to review tenure lines, wondering if the university is still in triage mode for filling tenure lines, and if a global vision for the university was taken into account during the decision making process.

CUPP welcomed these questions, took them as an opportunity to share the process it followed in reviewing proposals, and to discuss the larger questions raised by the constituent.


On February 23rd, the provost delivered proposals to CUPP.

CUPP members read and reviewed each proposal before meeting four times in executive session to discuss them. On 2/28, 3/2, and twice on 3/6, CUPP worked through the proposals in alphabetical order. The chair took notes during these discussions, in order to provide summary comments and CUPP’s final recommendations to Provost Green.

CUPP members requested more information from Provost Green after the March 2nd meeting (by email), received a written response on March 4th, and met with Provost Green during the second meeting on March 6th.

Criteria used for evaluating proposals were:

- Evidence of reliance on a position. Reliance on a position should be demonstrated by reference to how the position will serve a range of interests including some (but not necessarily all) of the following:
  - the primary major/minor program(s) to be served by this position (see Evidence of programmatic needs below),
  - other programs (including disciplinary and interdisciplinary),
  - all-university programs (including General Education, May Term, Writing Program),
  - the mission of IWU,
  - student interest,
  - external accreditation or professional certification criteria.

- Evidence of programmatic needs. Programmatic needs should be based on a realistic assessment of where a department, school, or program should be. The argument for a program's needs may be supported by results from an external review and/or survey of peer institutions. Programmatic needs should be demonstrated by reference to all of the following:
  - program profile, vision, goals,
Evidence of enrollment pressures. Enrollment pressures are strains induced by high student demand for courses presently offered in a department, school, or program. Enrollment pressures should be demonstrated by reference to statistical evidence, including some (but not necessarily all) of the following:

- units generated per FTE,
- a high ratio of majors or minors per tenure line, and
- reliance on non-tenure track faculty to teach core courses.

University-wide data used for evaluating proposals were:

- Units generated per FTE,
- Academic Ratios Report (ratio of majors or minors per tenure line),
- General education seats generated by departments.

With regard to discussions of specific proposals, CUPP would like to highlight a few areas of importance:

- During the discussions there was remarkably consistent and strong agreement among members, as well as a high level of collegiality, open discussion, and professionalism.
- Although CUPP did consider quantitative aspects of proposals (as outlined above), council members also spent considerable time discussing the qualitative aspects of proposals. CUPP endeavored to keep the following questions at the forefront of all discussions: What is best for the university overall? How can departments, schools, and programs best support the mission of the university? CUPP encourages departments, when writing future proposals, to articulate their departmental vision and demonstrate how it fits into the university mission.
- After taking the vote, there was a marked degree of accord, and the results fell logically into the three categories: approved, conditional and postponed.

Procedures for Voting on Tenure Line Proposals:

CUPP members who had proposals under consideration from their departments, schools, or programs, or who had conflicts of interest, recused themselves from all relevant discussions and did not vote on the proposals in question. After members agreed that all questions had been answered and that there was no need for further discussion, balloting took place.

Each CUPP member was given as many votes as the number of tenure lines provided by the provost (in this case, 10). Those members who had proposals under consideration from their

---

3 See http://www.iwu.edu/instres/internal/ for data.
departments, schools, or programs, or who had conflicts of interest with a particular proposal, were not able to vote for those proposals.

Voting was simultaneous and by secret ballot.

Bullet voting (voting for fewer proposals than the number of votes allotted) was permitted, as per the Faculty Handbook. Cumulative voting (voting multiple times for the same proposal) was not permitted, as per the Faculty Handbook.

The total number of votes for a proposal was divided by the number of members eligible to vote for that proposal. For example, if only 9 members could vote on a proposal, the total number of votes was divided by 9; if all 10 members could vote on a proposal, the total number of votes was divided by 10.

The proposals were then ranked according to mean (average) scores. The ten proposals receiving the highest averages were recommended to the provost for approval.4

CUPP used the same voting procedures to determine which proposals were recommended for conditional approval. Proposals that were neither approved nor conditionally approved were deemed postponed. It is possible to deny a request if 2/3 of eligible CUPP members vote by secret ballot to deny the request. A vote of this nature was not suggested and did not occur.

Recommendations (approved, conditionally approved and postponed) were forwarded to Provost Green on March 6th (see attached). CUPP reviewed and approved its chair’s summary notes on individual proposals.

**Discussion of Recommendations with Provost**

CUPP met with Provost Green on March 20th to discuss the recommended tenure lines and the summary comments on individual proposals. Provost Green will offer developmental feedback to chairs and directors by the end of the spring semester. In addition, CUPP provided a list of

4 **Approval** signifies that CUPP recommends to the provost immediate authorization for the search to take place in the following academic year.

**Conditional approval** signifies that CUPP recommends to the provost conditional authorization, pending enrollment projections and budgetary considerations. Chairs/Directors will be notified by June 15th whether final approval has been authorized. Proposals that do not receive final approval will be considered postponed.

**Postponement** signifies that CUPP recommends to the provost that the proposal not be authorized for the following academic year. The proposal is deemed meritorious, but the budget cannot currently support the line. Chairs/Directors are invited to resubmit an updated proposal or indicate that the current proposal should be reviewed the following year.

**Denial** signifies that CUPP does not recommend to the provost authorization for this position. In the case of a request for a replacement position, this recommendation signifies that the position should be eliminated.
recommendations for the provost to consider for next year’s proposals (see attached).

**Response to Constituent Inquiry**

As part of the follow-up to the constituent inquiry, the CUPP chair sent an email to Provost Green on 3/22, asking if he would like to comment on the need for university-wide strategic planning, particularly in relation to proposals for tenure-line positions. The provost responded:

> We have been setting the stage for more effective academic planning. Some of the work related to preparing for HLC, the establishment of an assessment program, creating some new meaningful data sets, and our initial discussions of how to integrate our efforts logically have all needed to occur prior to embarking on a legitimate planning course. I think some additional organizational elements will also need to unfold concurrent with these planning efforts.

CUPP agrees in principle with the need to have an institutional vision in place to guide it and the provost while considering tenure-line proposals. The process for creating this vision has yet to be articulated.

With regards to whether or not the university is still in triage mode, the unfortunate answer is yes. Provost Green approved hiring ten new faculty, and CUPP received sixteen proposals to review. It is a difficult reality that we could not approve all proposals, and it is not clear when, or if, the ability to hire tenure lines will catch up with the actual need.

The process of reviewing tenure-line proposals is by necessity an evolving one. CUPP’s procedures respond to the state of the university, which is continuously influenced by internal and external forces. This year’s CUPP can report confidently that procedures currently in place provided a useful guide for making difficult choices and that its members offered their recommendations with considered regard for the global needs and mission of the university.