Contract Renewal Guidelines Revision Draft: Introduction

Reasons for revision:

2. Current guidelines not aligned with current strategic plan.
3. Current CR guidelines significantly different from T/P guidelines,
   a. making transition to T/P document difficult and
   b. justifying administrative request that folks in non-tenure-track positions write both a CR and a Promotion dossier in one single calendar month when they are up for promotion.
4. Current guidelines written by administrators; should be purview of FS.
5. Current guidelines significantly different from those recommended at the system level.
6. Faculty complaints about current guidelines include:
   a. Too different from T/P guidelines.
   b. Artificial separation of Primary and non-Primary duties, especially with regard to responding to recommendations of reviewing bodies.
   c. Six page limit is unrealistic, especially when reviewing 2 years.

Survey undertaken in April 2009 to poll faculty response to draft of new guidelines.

Draft further revised in 2009 and 2010, but not substantially, to correct inconsistencies and because of Evaluation Committee concerns about the optional inclusion of health and wellness activities.

Attached, please find:

4. Responses to 4/09 survey of faculty regarding draft.

Please note:

1. Suggested new due date for Contract Renewals (October 1).
2. Activism embedded: directions for submission as both CR and T/P dossier (much easier now that the documents are more closely aligned).
3. Faculty support for draft as indicated in survey.

Questions:

1. What role does/should administration play in approval?
2. Further discussion with departments or revision needed?