



**UNIVERSITY SENATE  
Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee**

**Report and Recommendation on the Ten-Year Rule**

**1. THE CHARGE**

*S-0917* **Application of the “Ten-Year Rule” in Promotions to Full Professor:** Investigate the application of the "ten-year rule" in promotions to full professor. In particular, investigate the relative frequency it is being invoked and the resultant success rate. Also assess whether it has accomplished its original goal of providing an alternative basis for promotion for faculty who continue to make significant contributions to the academic and professional mission of the university after achieving tenure, and whose publication record has not kept pace with what was expected of them when tenure was awarded. Propose changes as needed. Respond to Senate Executive Committee by March 2011.

**2. SUMMARY**

In summary, the Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee (FPAC) concluded that:

- ☐ The alternate promotion method known as the “10-Year Rule” (TYR) is rarely used.
- ☐ Successful promotion by that route is much less probable than through regular promotions to full professor (PI)
- ☐ There is both ignorance of, and hostility to, the process by some administrators.
- ☐ The original goal of the TYR has not been accomplished.

The FPAC proposes to the University Senate the following recommendations to be advanced to the Administration:

- ☐ Communicate the existence of the TYR through the annual promotion instructions.
- ☐ Clarify that the TYR is University Policy, and that its implementation is not at the discretion of administrators.
- ☐ Clarify the requirements, including whether some scholarship is indispensable and essential.
- ☐ Generate external letter templates specifically for promotions under the TYR.

**3. BACKGROUND**

In 1986, Rutgers University President Bloustein “charged an external review team with the task of conducting an intensive study of the University’s promotion process.” The external team submitted to Bloustein its report, known as the Corson Committee Report, named for its chair, Dr. Dale Corson, President Emeritus of Cornell University. The review was timely, as Rutgers University was then undergoing changes in its character and mission, and was aspiring to join the Association of American Universities (AAU), which it did in 1989. The Corson Committee found that promotion at Rutgers was extremely bureaucratic and, in particular, that promotion to PI should be streamlined. The committee noted that “the critical decision concerns promotion to a tenured position” and recommended that “the University establish a schedule of normal promotion” and that “fuller review should be instituted in cases of accelerated promotion.”

A Committee on Promotions chaired by Professor David Mechanic (“The Mechanic Committee”) was charged with recommending implementations based on the recommendations of the Corson Committee Report. The Mechanic Committee report noted that “faculty play a variety of roles in a University community” and that

“over time the types of contributions faculty make may appropriately change.” They further recommended that “in the case of associate professors who remain at that rank after ten years, the balance among criteria used to evaluate faculty be altered to give greater consideration to excellent and significant contributions to teaching and service.” Rutgers’ Board of Governors approved the following addition to the University Regulations<sup>1</sup>:

**Rutgers Policy 60.5.17 - PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR OR EQUIVALENT RANKS (paragraph B):**

“In the instance of associate professors who have remained in that rank for ten years after the grant of tenure, the balance among the criteria applicable to their appointment alters to provide increased consideration to excellent and significant contributions to teaching and to service...”

In 2005, the New Brunswick Faculty Council composed a report on the TYR, which included a finding that the failure rate for associate professors going up for promotion to PI was 6% under the normal track, and 25% after 10 years at rank. The report also found that associate professors who are at rank for more than 10 years are at that level for significantly longer than those ten years. Specifically, the statistics were as follows:

- Camden Campus: 32 associate professors were at rank for more than 10 years, with average time 20 years.
- Newark Campus: 45 associate professors were at rank for more than 10 years, with average time 21 years.
- New Brunswick Campus: 161 associate professors were at rank for more than 10 years, with average time 19 years.

In 2009, the Committee on Academic Planning and Review<sup>2</sup> (CAPR) examined the implementation of the TYR. According to Professor Andrew Norris, current chair of the CAPR, the issue was raised by department chairs because they were dissatisfied with the regular letter-seeking process used for candidates invoking the TYR. Letter writers appear confused; they are asked to evaluate scholarly excellence, but where the TYR is invoked, language supporting scholarship is lacking, and this diminishes the case for promotion. The initiative was intended to improve the process by seeking outside letters more germane to the TYR case (excellence in teaching and service). CAPR examined the process overall, and put forth three major recommendations in its report (Appendix A):

1. That a new form, Form 1aa, be created where performance items, such as national teaching awards, are listed.
2. That Section 60.5.17 of the University Policy Library be amended to clarify the level of achievement required for promotion to PI under the TYR.
3. That a new solicitation letter for external evaluation be developed that will explain the altered criteria for promotion.

#### **4. DISCUSSION**

The FPAC took all of the above into consideration and discussed the charge in every one of its meetings from September 2009 through March 2011 (ten in total). In addition, the committee heard testimony on the subject from CAPR Chair Andrew Norris, and from Professor Emerita Mary Gibson, Staff Representative of the AAUP. Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee (FPAC) Co-chairs Ann Gould and Paul Panayotatos had a valuable discussion with Professor David Mechanic, and Paul Panayotatos interviewed a former acting dean and a former FAS-NB area dean on the subject<sup>3</sup>. Statistics for faculty who went up for promotion based on the TYR are

---

<sup>1</sup> Currently the University Policy Library.

<sup>2</sup> Formerly known as the Committee on Standards and Priorities in Academic Development (CSPAD).

<sup>3</sup> The former Acting Dean remembered four or five cases that invoked the TYR, and none of them were successful. He commented that the TYR as it stands serves no purpose. The former FAS Area Dean said that there were three TYR cases over seven years, and none were successful. As chair, he put up the same person twice, but was only successful the third time, just in time too, because immediately after promotion the candidate received a Carnegie award for teaching.

difficult to compile because, until recently, there was no place on the form to check that the rule was being invoked by the candidate. A survey (Appendix B) was conducted among 209 current and former chairs and administrators from all campuses to gauge, among other issues related to the TYR, the relative numbers of PI candidates being evaluated under the TYR.

## The Survey

The FPAC decided to develop an anonymous survey and distribute it to current and past administrators (deans and chairs). The survey's focus was on: whether or not such an alternate track for promotion to PI would be of benefit to the University; if outside letters should be solicited, and if so, what form they should take; and whether or not (or to what degree) scholarly activity by the candidate should be a necessary condition. The FPAC developed a list of 209 current and past deans and chairs from all units and departments at Rutgers, and e-mailed to each of them a request to take the anonymous survey. The survey was administered by the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research (CTAAR), which has often provided invaluable services to the senate. The response rate of 43.5% (91 responses), was exceptional, and 56% of those responding (51) also wrote additional comments<sup>4</sup>.

In summary, a majority of the responding administrators:

- ☐ Agree that an alternate track for promotion to PI is for the benefit of the University
- ☐ Believe that the process is currently not serving the goal for which it was designed
- ☐ Believe that outside letters should be solicited
- ☐ Narrowly believe that a minimum of scholarship should not be a *sine qua non*

In addition, the survey indicated that:

- ☐ There is urgent need for communication of the existence of the TYR.
- ☐ There is need for clarification of the rules of the TYR.
- ☐ Very few cases are pursued per year.

The survey included 18 questions, 11 of which asked respondents to rate on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = strongly disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, and 5 = strongly agree. Respondents were also provided space to write additional comments should they choose to do so.

The results were as follows (grouped by subject rather than by question sequence):

### **3. Having an alternate process for promotion of tenured Associate Professors at rank for a "long time" is of benefit to the University.**

59% Agree or Strongly Agree, whereas 30% Disagree or Strongly Disagree – a 2-to-1 endorsement of the process.

Although the alternate track for promotion to PI is endorsed 2-to-1 numerically and is supported by written comments<sup>5</sup> provided by the respondents, some of the more negative comments are troubling because they

---

<sup>4</sup> All comments are included in Appendix C

<sup>5</sup> Comments supporting the process included:

- ☐ Thanks for your interest in this lost opportunity to recognize and reward tenured associate professors who often make the system work. (signed) Former dean & current P II.
- ☐ I talked to the external review committee. It was clear that the intent of their recommendation has been captured by Professor Mechanic.
- ☐ 10-year-rule must be there. It should spell out the priority of research, teaching, and service and easy to implement.

indicate that some administrators are ideologically opposed<sup>6</sup> to the application of the TYR. It should be communicated to all administrators that promotion to PI under the TYR is a University Policy, and that interjecting personal ideological bias is not acceptable. University Policies should be applied uniformly across the University, and should not depend on who is chair or dean of the unit. In addition, comments<sup>7</sup> indicated that at least some administrators were unaware of the very existence of the TYR, and two chairs e-mailed the co-chair who solicited the comments to ask what the rule is and where it can be found. It seems crucial that information about the TYR should be included in the annual promotion instructions.

**1. Please indicate the level of your agreement with the basic premise of the Mechanic Committee Report as reflected by the following statement, with respect to the application of the 10-year rule, by Dr. David Mechanic:**

**“As I remember our original reasoning, and the perspective at most other major universities, was that tenured faculty are here for the long run and an involved and dedicated faculty member is preferable to a disgruntled one. When faculty demonstrate that they are doing a good job in teaching and service and work in the interest of the university's mission, promotion to full professor is appropriate after some extended period in rank such as 10-12 years even if research productivity is limited, or even nil. As far as I can see, the ten year rule has not been applied in this spirit.”**

53% Agree or Strongly Agree, whereas 35% Disagree or Strongly Disagree – overall agreement.

- 
- ☐ In my opinion, promotion for teaching and service considerations is entirely legitimate.
  - ☐ Without the ten-year rule and its ability to trade service for research, only a very small group of full professors would ever agree to be department chair. Management of the university's programs would eventually suffer.
  - ☐ The failure truly to value teaching and service in those more normative instances of personnel action make those considering applying for promotion under the ten year rule feel even more anomalous and uncomfortable at utilizing a procedure that is far more common and normative at other universities if David Mechanic's reasoning still holds true.
  - ☐ The only 10 yr rule promotion I saw as Dean was a well deserved one to a faculty member with extraordinary teaching/teaching admin service. It was long delayed until a publication appeared after a long gap in research productivity. The delay was stupid.
  - ☐ I am familiarized with cases that merit promotion, but because scholarship production is taking them too long to complete, do not dare to even consider it.
  - ☐ I think the standards for the 10 year rule are fine.
  - ☐ I believe there should be a 10 year rule. A&P Committees at School and University levels should be instructed that research is not the determining criterion in these cases. Absent that instruction, standard research expectations will continue to derail these promotions.

<sup>6</sup> Comments that did not support the process included:

- ☐ We are a flagship research university. If you are not doing research, you should not be promoted to Full Professor. I find the ten year rule objectionable.
- ☐ In my view, associate professor is the appropriate rank for professors who teach and perform university service only.
- ☐ Am new as a Dean (1.6 years) but am 100% opposed to this concept; I see some who have done this and they are rewarded for being asleep at the wheel. If we are a research university, then this rule makes no sense.
- ☐ Deans at FASN have made it known that without federal level funding there was no chance of being promoted, in the sciences, to full Professor even under the 10 year rule.
- ☐ For those faculty who continue to work hard at all three criteria (research, service and teaching), the ten year rule is insulting and sends the wrong message.
- ☐ I believe that the 10 year rule is a bad thing for Rutgers and should indeed be re-evaluated (and perhaps abolished).
- ☐ The ten-year rule is a recipe for cronyism and rewarding mediocrity.
- ☐ Ten-year rule lowers the value of full professorships. The tendency in peer institutions is to tighten up the criteria for promotion to full. Rutgers should do the same if it is to retain and improve its research credentials.
- ☐ Excellent teaching and services can be awarded in other ways, in stead of promotion to the full professorship. Full-professorship at Rutgers must represent the certain level of the scholarship, and is recognized by the outside professional society.

<sup>7</sup> Comments where respondents were unaware of the TYR included:

- ☐ I was not aware that there was a ten year rule.
- ☐ I don't remember ever hearing about this rule. I believe we have only one faculty member who would be impacted, and I'm wondering whether I should look into encouraging him to apply.
- ☐ As chair, I did not realize that members of my department could be promoted to full professor simply based on length of service. No one in my department asked to be promoted based on the ten-year rule.

From comments, the point of contention for the minority that disagrees, even if they believe that some such process should be in place, is the phrase “or even nil” (for research productivity). This was also a point of disagreement within the FPAC.

Anticipating such disagreement, another question was designed to give these responders a chance to vote in the positive:

**4. Tenured Associate Professors who have stopped contributing in terms of research should not be promoted regardless of their Teaching and Service contributions or time in rank.**

41% Agree or Strongly Agree, whereas 49% Disagree or Strongly Disagree – overall disagreement.

Only the question concerning optional outside letters had a lower overall average agreement. Thus, the average opinion of this group is that promotion is warranted under special circumstances even if research productivity “is nil.” The committee agrees with the responders to the survey: although some scholarship should in general be expected for promotion under the TYR, lack of recent scholarship should not automatically disqualify exceptional cases. The argument was made that the case for having some contribution in all three areas is not always made, and that stellar teacher-scholars would be deemed to be worthy of promotion even if their service is “nil.” Thus the FPAC proposes that, if a clarification is included in University Policy 60.5.17, such clarification should allow for exceptional cases where the level of teaching and service is of such caliber that would allow scholarship to be “nil.”

The general understanding among faculty, and echoed by comments within this group of responding administrators, is that the TYR is more like a 15- or 20-year rule. The following question was designed to probe whether the feeling is that the period should be extended.

**8. Ten years is too short an interval for the application of different weights to the scholarship-teaching-service mix.**

40% Agree or Strongly Agree, whereas 45% Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

Thus, it seems that for this group, 10 years is a reasonable interval.

Questions 5 and 6 were meant to probe whether faculty are hesitant to apply under the TYR.

**5. In my opinion faculty in my unit who would likely have a good chance at being promoted under the 10-year rule are hesitant to apply.**

52% Agree or Strongly Agree, whereas 30% Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

**6. For cases initiated at my level, most were not initiated by the candidate.**

50% Agree or Strongly Agree, whereas 34% Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

**7. I believe that the disposition by the higher evaluation levels of those cases, arising under the 10-year rule, of which I have firsthand knowledge, has been overly strict.**

45% Agree or Strongly Agree, whereas 37% Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

Thus, this group believes that, indeed, faculty are hesitant to apply, and must be coaxed. In addition, the perception that the probability of success is low creates an additional barrier. Comments<sup>8</sup> to that effect abound, and paint a picture of a process that is, more or less, only “on paper.”

The remaining four questions related to outside letters.

**2. Please indicate the level of your agreement to the following statement made by Dr. David Mechanic with respect to outside letters:**

**“With respect to requiring outside letters for promotion under the ten year rule, I would hope that our departments, A&P committees and PRC would have enough good judgment of teaching and other internal contributions to the university to have no need for such assessments from [external] referees who in most cases would only have superficial knowledge.”**

46% Agree or Strongly Agree, whereas 43% Disagree or Strongly Disagree – almost evenly divided.

**9. Outside letters are crucial for any promotion from tenured Associate to Full Professor, including those under the 10-year rule.**

57% Agree or Strongly Agree, whereas 26% Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

**11. The solicitation for outside letters for promotion of tenured Associate Professors at rank for a long time and under altered criteria should be different than the one used for usual promotions. The letters should inform the external evaluator about the altered criteria to be used.**

---

<sup>8</sup> Comments regarding faculty hesitancy to apply for promotion under the TYR:

- ☐ Very few faculty members seem willing to initiate a promotion process under the ten year rule since there is so little visible evidence of success, and failing at such a process is humiliating for someone who has served Rutgers well in terms of teaching and service for so long.
- ☐ There are faculty in my department who are good citizens, do some research, and teach well. They would hesitate to try the 10 year rule because how much relaxation of the high research productivity criterion exists, and concerns regarding outside letter.
- ☐ Let me say that this is easy in some departments and very difficult in others, so globally unfair. Many faculty in Assoc Prof rank were insulted that the Dean or their Department were considering promoting them under "lesser" criteria. Thus any change should emphasize the worthiness of this approach to promotion to Professor.
- ☐ I am familiarized with cases that merit promotion, but because scholarship production is taking them too long to complete, do not dare to even consider it. They are excellent, rigorous teachers, which are up to date with the latest scholarship in their fields but do care more about quality and not quantity.
- ☐ On the process: (1) in my department we have suggested to two people in the last ten years that they come up under this rule. Both refused. The one person who did come up while I was chair brought her/himself up. S/he did not go through as s/he had almost no published scholarship since promotion to Associate Professor. We failed to make the case that s/he was "outstanding" as a teacher. [We were subsequently informed it would have been enough to make the case of "outstanding" service.]
- ☐ Promotion under the 10 year rule, though perhaps appropriate for my situation, has always struck me as an invidious distinction.
- ☐ The 10-yr rule is more 15-20 year rule. Faculty are reluctant to use it because (1) being turned down is humiliating (even more so than to be turned down for regular promotion); (2) younger members of departments label faculty who use this rule--and faculty using it feel 2nd-class; (3) faculty should know if their chair and dean support the case BEFORE they initiate the process.
- ☐ Faculty in my department do not even consider the 10-year rule as an option for promotion, because there is the understanding that these will not be successful unless there is a substantial research profile, which would grant promotion outside the 10-year rule. In other words, the 10-year rule is, for all intents and purposes, not applied.
- ☐ Both the previous chair and I were discouraged from this approach. We have been given mixed messages on this.
- ☐ The cases that were successful were many years ago.
- ☐ The 10 year rule doesn't seem to work very well. Faculty are reluctant to use it and the higher administration is not sympathetic to its use.
- ☐ I do not think that this 10 year rule is being successfully applied. I have never seen it actually happen. We have many Associate Professors that have been in rank long enough and none have gone up for promotion--in part based of the belief that the 10-year rule is difficult to apply. There needs to be a greater effort on part of the university to educate all levels of faculty with regards to application of the 10-year rule.

78% Agree or Strongly Agree, whereas 14% Disagree or Strongly Disagree – No other statement had nearly that level of agreement.

**10. A candidate who wishes to be considered for promotion using altered criteria should have the option of whether or not to have outside letters included in the packet.**

25% Agree or Strongly Agree, whereas 56% Disagree or Strongly Disagree – No other statement had nearly that level of disagreement.

Thus, this group of 91 administrators believes that outside letters should be solicited. They strongly agree that the letters should be different (in agreement with the recommendation by CAPR), and they believe that the policy should be uniform with no “opting out.”

This concludes the discussion on the survey results on questions 1 to 11.

Some committee members agree with David Mechanic, who stated that external letters are not necessary since internal evaluators can best evaluate candidates for teaching and service. Most outside evaluators don't properly evaluate teaching even if they receive a teaching portfolio. In addition, sending packets with weak records of scholarship to outside evaluators does not promote a positive image of Rutgers. The majority of the committee agreed that there should be an option for outside letters, and that candidates should be allowed to decide whether or not this is appropriate. Given the strong opposition to such an arrangement by the surveyed administrators as well as a vocal committee minority, such a recommendation is not proposed here. Thus, the committee agrees with the CAPR report's recommendation to continue the practice of asking for external evaluation letters, and that these letters should be different from those used to solicit outside evaluation letters during the usual promotion process.

The FPAC believes that the sample letter drafted by CAPR addresses these concerns, but have some recommendations for alternative language to the solicitation letter. In addition, FPAC members noted that, in cases of teaching and service, there may be Rutgers faculty and administrators outside of the candidate's department and/or unit who are knowledgeable about contributions by the candidate that would not necessarily become part of the chair's and/or the dean's evaluations. Thus, the FPAC decided to recommend that an appropriate number of internal letters could substitute for external ones.

The FPAC agrees with the responding administrators and the CAPR report that a track for promotion to PI such as the TYR “is for the benefit of the University”. However, the FPAC expressed concern that some of the CAPR report recommendations would raise the bar, effectively removing from consideration those “workhorse” faculty who keep the system functioning but who do not receive fair value for their work, contrary to the original intent of the rule. As things now stand, the TYR is stigmatized and rarely invoked. Including an explicit list of prestigious awards on Form 1aa would probably discourage candidates even more. However, Professor Norris indicated that, in retrospect, other forms are not as specific, and that, instead, it would be better to have categories on the form that can be used to accommodate different items.

While examining the proportion of teaching faculty at different ranks at Rutgers, the FPAC found that the percentage of associate professors among all teaching faculty at New Brunswick, Newark, and Camden campuses was 24%, 24%, and 38%, respectively. There is complaint from Camden faculty (and to some extent from Newark as well) that teaching loads are heavier than in New Brunswick, yet candidates are judged on the same criteria used in New Brunswick. The application of the TYR would be even more crucial for associate professors who find themselves in such circumstances. The overall University percentage of associate professors, among tenured and tenure-track faculty only (excluding instructors), is 32%. This proportion is comparable to other state institutions but lower than Cornell University (where Dr. Corson is President Emeritus), where it stands at 26%,

in agreement with the perception that almost automatic promotion to professor is the norm at most prestigious private universities.

The answers to those questions on the survey<sup>9</sup> that were designed to gauge the frequency of cases judged under the TYR and their level of success were somewhat inconclusive. Per-year averages are so small that most would respond with “less than 1,” “0.1,” or similar responses which defy extraction of averages. Of the administrators responding to the survey, 79% never evaluated a case under the TYR, and among them, these 91 administrators have initiated, on average, only one TYR case every 13 years. It appears that the rule is not invoked more often partly because of the odds: faculty who do not invoke the rule have a better chance of promotion than those who do. The NBFC report indicates that the probability of failure under the TYR is four times as high as in the standard process. Nevertheless, the perception that promotion under the TYR is improbable is incorrect. Both the NBFC report as well as the recent survey results indicate that there is a better-than-even chance for promotion under the TYR once the process is initiated. One survey responder commented that if Rutgers showed a more genuine commitment to valuing teaching and service at all ranks -- or at least for all promotions to Associate Professor with tenure and Professor I, it might be easier to induce associate professors to apply for promotion under the TYR. The FPAC agrees with the assessment that teaching and service are undervalued and unappreciated at Rutgers, and believes that this realization keeps feeding the perception that promotion under the TYR is improbable.

It was noted by committee members that Rutgers as an institution has changed dramatically, and we need ensure that what we do is fair and effective with respect to faculty members who have met the qualitative standards for tenure but have taken a different track. These faculty members carry administrative loads and make the institution work. We need to demonstrate that Rutgers exhibits flexibility and creates more than just scholars. The FPAC, and those responding administrators who understand the process, also understand that the TYR is a “sliding scale.” Whenever it has been applied, it has been interpreted to mean that the balance of criteria only begins to shift at year ten, and that the longer one remains at rank, the more the balance shifts towards teaching and service. However, the key point of contention is whether any time interval justifies promotion to Full Professor on (exceptional) teaching and service alone. David Mechanic stated that the scholarly output of someone promoted on the TYR may remain low or nil. The responding administrators endorse “nil” as acceptable, if not overwhelmingly. The majority of FPAC member believe that some form of scholarship should normally be required (book reviews, for example). Other members felt that, as long as a person using the TYR would have a level of accomplishment that is equal in its own way to a typical person going up under normal circumstances, singling out the TYR to specify that all three components must be present is not appropriate. A candidate with stellar scholarship and teaching record will probably get promoted (early) even if service is “nil.” The FPAC proposes that some scholarship be required. However we do not believe that this should be a rigid rule which would disqualify exceptional cases.

The FPAC had reservations about CAPR’s proposal for a different Form 1a (Form 1aa). Form 1aa will not have fewer categories in scholarship; it will only have more categories in teaching and service. If this was implemented, it would be unfair to faculty who are candidates for promotion under the usual process and who, in addition to an adequate scholarship record, have an exceptional teaching record and might want to document it the same way as their colleagues who are candidates for promotion under the TYR. If additional categories are needed under teaching and service, they should be added to the existing Form 1a. We contend that this form should continue to be used for promotions under both the standard and the TYR criteria.

The committee communicated with CAPR and provided the draft report to CAPR chair Professor Norris. Professor Norris responded that "I shared with CAPR the document you sent on 4/8. I received a few email comments. We also discussed it at our meeting on 4/21/2011. Based on all of the input I believe there is no major disagreement. The members of CAPR hope that a revised TYR policy can be implemented in the near future."

---

<sup>9</sup> Questions 12 onwards.



## 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, the FPAC examined the issue, having the benefit of the report written by CAPR. The FPAC agrees with most recommendations made by CAPR, and makes the following recommendations, some of which adopt the language from the report by CAPR with mostly minor modification:

**Recommendation 1:** Section 60.5.17 of the University Policy Library should be amended to explicitly specify that the requirement for a minimum of scholarship does apply in most cases other than for exceptional cases of teaching and service and significant time at rank as Associate Professor, and proposes the following language, replacing the last sentence in Paragraph B:

In the instance of associate professors who have remained in that rank for ten years after the grant of tenure, the balance among the criteria applicable to their appointment *gradually shifts* to provide increased consideration to excellent and significant contributions to teaching and to service. Other than in exceptional cases, these criteria still require that there be some contributions to each of the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. In order to be promoted under the altered criteria, there must be evidence that, since the candidate's last promotion, the candidate's workload and total accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship, and service to the University, the department, and the community are comparable, in their own way, to the value of the contributions of other professors in the same department or college who have already been promoted to Professor under the standard criteria.

**Justification:** There is widespread confusion on how “the balance among the criteria applicable to their appointment alters<sup>10</sup>”. The proposed new language clarifies the application of the TYR, and is in agreement with the current practice of interpreting the altering of criteria. This interpretation applies “altering” as a gradual shifting that begins at year ten and continues with time at rank asymptotically so that, in most cases, the requirement for scholarship never reaches zero. At the same time, the proposed language does not automatically disqualify exceptional cases of stellar teaching and service where recent scholarship is lacking.

**Recommendation 2:** Information about the TYR and the relevant language from Section 60.5.17 of the University Policy Library should be included in the annual promotion instructions.

**Justification:** There were several surveyed administrators who were unaware of the existence of the TYR. In addition, there were some who indicated they were ideologically opposed to the premise of the TYR. Finally, it emerged that there is a culture of associating a stigma with promotion to PI under the TYR. Reiterating the existence of this alternate track for promotion to PI in the annual promotion instructions will address, to some extent, all three concerns. Two additional recommendations are put forth to address these issues as well:

**Recommendation 3:** Information about the TYR and the relevant language from University Policy 60.5.17 should be included in the annual letter that solicits self-nominations for promotions mailed to associate professors at rank from the tenth year onwards.

**Recommendation 4:** The EVPAA and the chancellors should communicate to deans annually during the promotion process briefing that the TYR is a University Policy, and that any internal unit policy that renders it unacceptable cannot be condoned. Deans should be required to communicate the same message to chairs.

**Recommendation 5:** An appropriate number of internal letters can be used in substitution of external ones. In the case of outside evaluators, solicitation letters specifically drafted for those cases in which the candidate has

---

<sup>10</sup> Rutgers Policy 60.5.17

elected to be considered for promotion under the TYR should be sent. The sample proposed by CAPR is adopted with some modifications: the fourth paragraph has been removed, deemed by the committee as requesting assessment that outside evaluators could not readily make, and additional modifications are indicated in underscored text as follows:

**SAMPLE LETTER – SOLICITATION OF EXTERNAL CONFIDENTIAL EVALUATION FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL TEACHING/RESEARCH FACULTY SEEKING PROMOTION UNDER THE TEN-YEAR RULE**

Dear (name):

The (department) of the (college/school/faculty) is considering the promotion of (tenured) (current rank and name) to professor effective July 1, 20\_\_.

To assist the department and the University in this consideration, it is the University's practice to solicit written evaluations from specialists outside the University in the candidate's field. These letters are essential in assisting us to evaluate Professor (name)'s achievements and professional standing in comparison with colleagues in (his/her) field.

While scholarly achievement is usually the most important consideration for promotion to professor at Rutgers, according to University regulations, after ten years at the rank of Associate Professor, the balance among the criteria applicable to the candidate's appointment can be altered to provide increased consideration to excellent and significant contributions to teaching and to service. The altered balance among the criteria has been interpreted to mean that the longer in rank after ten years, the more significance is accorded to teaching and service, although, in cases other than those exhibiting stellar teaching and service, it is expected that the candidate will have some contributions to each of the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Professor (name) is eligible and will be considered for promotion under the altered criteria.

I am writing to ask if you would send me a confidential letter assessing Professor (name)'s achievements in scholarship, teaching, and service, taking into account the altered balance among these described above. We would also appreciate your assessment of Professor (name)'s accomplishments relative to others in comparable positions in the discipline, as well as your judgment of whether (his/her) work meets the requirement for someone being considered for promotion at your institution, if a promotion under comparable criteria exists.

It would also be helpful if you would provide us with a biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise including research, teaching, and service interests and/or a curriculum vitae. Finally, please advise us of your relationship to the candidate, if any, and the prior basis of your knowledge of the candidate's work, if any.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of Professor (name)'s curriculum vitae. If you would like to have copies of any of the publications or other material beyond those which I have enclosed, I will be happy to send them to you. Because our departmental deliberations must be concluded by (date), I would appreciate your response by no later than (date). If you are unable to respond by then, please let me know.

I want to assure you that the University will make every effort to maintain the confidentiality of the letter you write. Let me express in advance our deep appreciation for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

(Chairperson)

Enc.

## **5. RESOLUTION**

In Support of the University Senate's Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee's Report and Recommendation:

***Whereas, the University Senate Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee has examined and reported on the Application of the "Ten-Year Rule" in Promotions to Full Professor; and***

***Whereas, the University Senate has reviewed the Committee's report and its recommendations, finding those recommendations to be sound and in the best interests of Rutgers University;***

***Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Rutgers University Senate endorses the "Report and Recommendations on Charge S-0917, on Application of the "Ten-Year Rule" in Promotions to Full Professor" and urges the Rutgers Administration to implement its recommendations.***

### **Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee 2010-11**

*Gould, Ann, SEBS (F), Co-Chair - Executive Committee Liaison*

*Panayotatos, Paul, GS-NB (F), Co-Chair - Executive Committee Liaison*

*Abercrombie, Elizabeth, GS-N (F)*

*Boylan, Edward, FAS-N (F)*

*Creese, Ian, Other Units-N (F)*

*Ellis, Nancy, PTL-C (F)*

*Fernandez, Vivian, Vice President for Faculty and Staff Resources - (Non-Senator)*

*Finegold, David, SMLR Dean (A) - Administrative Liaison*

*Fishbein, Leslie, SAS-NB (F)*

*Gurfinkiel, Israel, FAS-C (F)*

*Gursoy, Melike, Engineering (F)*

*Janes, Harry, SEBS (F)*

*Levine, Justine, NB Staff*

*MacLennan, Toby, MGSA (F)*

*Mojaddedi, Jawid, SAS-NB (F)*

*Niederman, Robert, GS-NB (F)*

*Simmons, Peter, Law-N (F)*

*Thompson, Frank, SPAA (F)*

*Thompson, Karen, PTL-NB (F)*

*Wagner, Mary, Pharmacy (F)*

*Watson, Stevie, RBS:N/NB (F)*

## APPENDIX A

### **Committee on Academic Planning and Review Review of the Promotion to Professor Under the Ten-Year Rule Report on Promotions by the Committee on Academic Planning and Review (REFORMATTED)**

November 3, 2009

According to Section 60.5.17 of the University Policy Library, “In the instance of associate professors who have remained in that rank for ten years after the grant of tenure, the balance among the criteria applicable to their appointment alters to provide increased consideration to excellent and significant contributions to teaching and to service.” CAPR endorses this policy, because excellence in teaching (including scholarship related to teaching) and service are important contributions to the reputation of the University. The committee recommends, however, that the criteria for promotion to Professor under the ten-year rule be clarified in three ways.

#### **1. CAPR recommends that a new form, Form 1aa, be created for those candidates who are eligible for consideration and desire to be considered for promotion to Professor under the ten-year rule.**

Form 1aa would be similar to Form 1a but would include a new page 1 that features criteria typical of those that have been used in the past to justify promotion to Professor under the ten-year rule. While items on the list would be neither necessary nor sufficient for promotion to Professor under the ten-year rule, such a list would provide faculty with a guideline of what is expected for promotion.

Based on interviews with current and former members of the Promotion Review Committee (PRC), criteria for demonstrating worthiness of promotion to Professor under the ten-year rule might include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Publications in pedagogical journals.
- b. Innovative textbooks and texts that impact the market nationally or internationally.
- c. Significant grants in education-related activities.
- d. Recognition as a master teacher by the candidate’s professional society.
- e. Awards for teaching won in state or national competitions or significant university teaching awards.
- f. Leadership in a professional society’s doctoral student consortium.
- g. Leadership in substantive curriculum development committees or participation in state or national certification testing programs.
- h. Development of new and innovative courses.
- i. Extensive service on state and national boards providing expert advice to government and federal agencies, and to educators and the public at large.

- j. Significant impact on the University through long-term service on campus-wide committees.
- k. Distinctive and lasting contributions to the university that would not be classified primarily as scholastic or instructional in nature, such as the formation or administration of programs serving the community.

A separate Form 1aa, different from Form 1a, would be helpful to prospective candidates as it recognizes that the roles taken on by the candidates would evolve differently than those of candidates who emphasize research. The sample list is not intended to be comprehensive, and no specific number of items on the list is intended to be either necessary or sufficient for promotion. Thus, flexibility is preserved in judging the candidate's qualifications.

Explicit statement of the criteria would also reduce the number of faculty who apply for, but fail to achieve, promotion by dissuading those whose records do not yet warrant promotion to the rank of Professor. The new form would also help set broad objectives for those who wish to achieve the rank of Professor under the ten-year rule.

**2. CAPR recommends that Section 60.5.17 of the University Policy Library be amended to clarify the level of achievement required for promotion to Professor under the ten-year rule.**

Since there are very few promotions to Professor under the ten-year rule, few professors and department chairs are familiar with the level of achievement required for this promotion. An amended policy such as the following might help to clarify this issue.

In the instance of associate professors who have remained in that rank for ten years after the grant of tenure, the balance among the criteria applicable to their appointment alters to provide increased consideration to excellent and significant contributions to teaching and to service, while still requiring that there be some contributions to each of the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. In order to be promoted under the altered criteria, there must be evidence that, since the candidate's last promotion, the candidate's workload and total accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship, and service to the University, the department, and the community are comparable, in their own way, to the value of the contributions of other professors in the same department or college who have already been promoted to Professor under the standard criteria.

**3. CAPR recommends that a new solicitation letter be developed for external evaluation of candidates being considered for promotion to Professor under the ten-year rule. The letter should explain the altered criteria for promotion and request an assessment of the candidate based on the altered criteria.**

The current letter asks for an assessment of scholarship and only at the end asks for comments on teaching and service. Thus, it is likely to produce letters of evaluation that give a distorted view of the accomplishments of the candidate. A sample of a new solicitation letter is attached to this report.

SAMPLE LETTER – SOLICITATION OF EXTERNAL CONFIDENTIAL EVALUATION  
FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL  
TEACHING/RESEARCH FACULTY SEEKING PROMOTION  
UNDER THE TEN-YEAR RULE

Dear (name):

The (department) of the (college/school/faculty) is considering the promotion of (tenured) (current rank and name) to professor effective July 1, 20\_\_.

To assist the department and the University in this consideration, it is the University's practice to solicit written evaluations from specialists outside the University in the candidate's field. These letters are essential in assisting us to evaluate Professor (name)'s achievements and professional standing in comparison with colleagues in (his/her) field.

While scholarly achievement is usually the most important consideration for promotion to professor at Rutgers, according to University regulations, after ten years at the rank of Associate Professor, the balance among the criteria applicable to the candidate's appointment can be altered to provide increased consideration to excellent and significant contributions to teaching and to service. The altered balance among the criteria has been interpreted to mean that the longer in rank after ten years, the more significance is accorded to teaching and service, although it is expected that the candidate will have some contributions to each of the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Professor (name) has elected to be considered for promotion under the altered criteria.

In order to be promoted under the altered criteria, there must be evidence that since the candidate's last promotion, the candidate's workload and total accomplishments in teaching, research, and service to the University, the department, and the community are comparable, in their own way, to the value of the contributions of other professors in the same department or college who have already been promoted to Professor under the standard criteria.

I am writing to ask if you would send me a confidential letter assessing Professor (name)'s achievements in scholarship, teaching, and service, taking into account the altered balance among these described above. We would also appreciate your assessment of Professor (name)'s accomplishments relative to others in comparable positions in the discipline, as well as your judgment of whether (his/her) work meets the requirement for someone being considered for promotion at your institution, if a promotion under comparable criteria exists.

It would also be helpful if you would provide us with a biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise including research, teaching, and service interests and/or a curriculum vitae. Finally, please advise us of your relationship to the candidate, if any, and the prior basis of your knowledge of the candidate's work, if any.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of Professor (name)'s curriculum vitae. If you would like to have copies of any of the publications or other material beyond those which I have enclosed, I will be happy to send them to you. Because our departmental deliberations must be concluded by (date), I would appreciate your response by no later than (date). If you are unable to respond by then, please let me know.

I want to assure you that the University will make every effort to maintain the confidentiality of the letter you write. Let me express in advance our deep appreciation for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

(Chairperson)

Enc.

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW  
2008 – 2009**

**Richard S. Falk** (chair)

Professor II of Mathematics  
School of Arts and Sciences

**W. Steven Barnett**

Board of Governors Professor of Education (Economics and Public Policy)  
Co-Director, National Institute for Early Education Research Graduate School of Education

**George M. Carman**

Professor II of Food Science and Director of the Rutgers Center for Lipid Research  
School of Environmental and Biological Sciences

**Roger A. Jones**

Professor II, Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology  
School of Arts and Sciences

**Kenneth E. Kendall**

Professor II of Management  
School of Business - Camden

**Doyle D. Knight** *(Serving until January 2009)*

Professor II of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering  
School of Engineering

**Ah-Ng Tony Kong**

Professor II of Pharmaceutics  
Glaxo Professor of Pharmaceutics and Director Graduate Program in Pharmaceutical Science  
Ernest Mario School of Pharmacy

**Asela R. Laguna**

Professor and Chair, Department of Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures  
Faculty of Arts and Sciences-Newark

**Michael McKeon**

Board of Governors Professor of Literature  
Department of English  
School of Arts and Sciences

**Joachim W. Messing**

University Professor of Molecular Biology, Director of the Waksman Institute of Microbiology,  
and the Selman Waksman Chair in Molecular Genetics  
Waksman Institute of Microbiology

**Andrew N. Norris**

Professor II of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering  
School of Engineering

**Bonnie G. Smith** *(on leave spring, 2009)*

Board of Governors Professor of History  
Department of History  
School of Arts and Sciences

**Lea P. Stewart**

Dean, Livingston Campus  
Professor of Communication and Director of the Center for  
Communication & Health Issues  
School of Communication and Information

**Larry S. Temkin**

Professor II of Philosophy  
School of Arts and Sciences



## APPENDIX B: SURVEY

### Senate Survey of Department Chairs and Unit Administrators on the 10-year Rule for Promotion to Professor

In order to respond consciously and in depth to a University Senate charge to the Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee, the committee needs to gather feedback from previous and current deans and department chairs concerning the 10-year rule for promotion to Professor. Please be as candid and complete as possible so that the Senate report can be based on actual circumstances and make appropriate recommendations.

This survey is completely anonymous. You may leave blank or mark "N/A" any question you feel is not relevant or you simply do not wish to respond to. You may go back and modify your responses at any time before you click "Submit Survey"

Using a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being "strongly disagree", 3 being neutral and 5 being "strongly agree", please rate the following. Please do not confuse 3 (neutral) with N/A (not applicable or insufficient knowledge) and do not hesitate to use N/A if appropriate	<div>Disagree</div> <div>Agree</div> <div>N/A</div>
<p>1. Please indicate the level of your agreement with the basic premise of the Mechanic Committee Report as reflected by the following statement, with respect to the application of the 10-year rule, by Dr. David Mechanic:</p> <p>"As I remember our original reasoning, and the perspective at most other major universities, was that tenured faculty are here for the long run and an involved and dedicated faculty member is preferable to a disgruntled one. When faculty demonstrate that they are doing a good job in teaching and service and work in the interest of the university's mission, promotion to full professor is appropriate after some extended period in rank such as 10-12 years even if research productivity is limited, or even nil. As far as I can see, the ten year rule has not been applied in this spirit. "</p>	<div> <input type="radio"/> 1           <input type="radio"/> 2           <input type="radio"/> 3           <input type="radio"/> 4           <input type="radio"/> 5           <input type="radio"/> N/A         </div>
<p>2. Please indicate the level of your agreement to the following statement made by Dr. David Mechanic with respect to outside letters:</p> <p>"With respect to requiring outside letters for promotion under the ten year rule, I would hope that our departments, A&amp;P committees and PRC would have enough good judgment of teaching and other internal contributions to the university to have no need for such assessments from [external] referees who in most cases would only have superficial knowledge."</p>	<div> <input type="radio"/> 1           <input type="radio"/> 2           <input type="radio"/> 3           <input type="radio"/> 4           <input type="radio"/> 5           <input type="radio"/> N/A         </div>
<p>3. Having an alternate process for promotion of tenured Associate professors at rank for a "long time" is of benefit to the University</p>	<div> <input type="radio"/> 1           <input type="radio"/> 2           <input type="radio"/> 3           <input type="radio"/> 4           <input type="radio"/> 5           <input type="radio"/> N/A         </div>



<p>13. Approximate average number of 10-year rule cases per year I initiated as chair/dean: <input type="text"/></p>							
<p>14. Approximate number of these 10-year rule cases that were successful : <input type="text"/></p>							
<p>15. Approximate number of 10-year rule cases I evaluated as chair/dean: <input type="text"/></p>							
<p>16. Approximate average number of 10-year rule cases per year I evaluated as chair/dean: <input type="text"/></p>							
<p>17. Approximate number these 10-year rule cases that were successful : <input type="text"/></p>							
<p>18. Comments and/or anecdotal information:</p> <div data-bbox="172 1079 859 1287" style="border: 1px solid black; height: 100px; width: 100%;"></div>							
<p>The Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee of the University Senate thank you for your time. Please click "Submit Survey".</p>							

Submit Survey

## APPENDIX C: ALL SURVEY COMMENTS

Thanks for your interest in this lost opportunity to recognize and reward tenured associate professors who often make the system work. (signed) Former dean & current P II

I talked to the external review committee. It was clear that the intent of their recommendation has been captured by Professor Mechanic.

10-year-rule must be there. It should spell out the priority of research, teaching and service and easy to implement.

In my opinion, promotion for teaching and service considerations is entirely legitimate but not for teaching and service at the same level as other faculty who also are under evaluation for their research activities. The University has a right to expect a higher involvement and contribution to teaching/service from those who do little or no research. For such cases, outside letters are clearly pointless since outside experts in a field of scholarship would have no knowledge of the teaching/service in question. Whether eight, ten or twelve years should be the appropriate timing is a matter for discussion.

I am in the relatively rare position of being a department chair while still an associate professor. The amount of time I spend on my chair duties is overwhelming. Without the ten-year rule and its ability to trade service for research, only a very small group of full professors would ever agree to be department chair. Management of the university's programs would eventually suffer.

Very few faculty members seem willing to initiate a promotion process under the ten year rule since there is so little visible evidence of success, and failing at such a process is humiliating for someone who has served Rutgers well in terms of teaching and service for so long. If Rutgers showed a more genuine commitment to valuing teaching and service at all ranks -- or at least for all promotions to Associate Professor with tenure and Professor I (with tenure when applicable), it might be easier to induce Associate Professors to apply for promotion under the ten year rule. The failure truly to value teaching and service in those more normative instances of personnel action make those considering applying for promotion under the ten year rule feel even more anomalous and uncomfortable at utilizing a procedure that is far more common and normative at other universities if David Mechanic's reasoning still holds true.

There are faculty in my department who are good citizens, do some research, and teach well. They would hesitate to try the 10 year rule because how much relaxation of the high research productivity criterion exists, and concerns regarding outside letter.

Believe the key thing is to have well defined criteria for the alternative/ten year route and then to measure performance against these. Believe that simply normal teaching, service aren't enough, but playing key leadership roles in either/both would be. Also would like to see some evidence of continued work as a scholar, even if publications/conference presentations are fairly limited.

The only 10 yr rule promotion I saw as Dean was a well deserved one to a faculty member with extraordinary teaching/teaching admin service. It was long delayed until a publication appeared after a long gap in research productivity. The delay was stupid but the result of the clearly perceived view that some small pulse of research life was required. Let me say that this is easy in some departments and very difficult in others, so globally unfair. Many faculty in Assoc Prof rank were insulted that the Dean or their Department were considering promoting them under "lesser" criteria. Thus any change should emphasize the worthiness of this approach to promotion to Professor. Because of this perception of inferiority there were fewer official 10-yr promotion cases than the reality. I was led to believe that the 10 yr rule began to apply AFTER year 10, and that a "worthy" candidate for this promotion path might have 20 years in rank. I thought that was horrible. The letters requested of external

reviewers were stupidly the same as the legally defined form letter and very puzzling to the reviewers, many of whom ignored the palaver in the letter and wrote about the significant contributions the candidate had made to teaching. After you fix this, please do away with the PII.

I am familiarized with cases that merit promotion, but because scholarship production is taking them too long to complete, do not dare to even consider it. They are excellent, rigorous teachers, which are up to date with the latest scholarship in their fields but do care more more about quality and not quantity.

On the process: (1) in my department we have suggested to two people in the last ten years that they come up under this rule. Both refused. The one person who did come up while I was chair brought her/himself up. S/he did not go through as s/he had almost no published scholarship since promotion to Associate Professor. We failed to make the case that s/he was "outstanding" as a teacher. [We were subsequently informed it would have been enough to make the case of "outstanding" service.] (2) The rule, as you know, is not really 10 years -- it is described by the Vice President as a sliding scale with teaching (and perhaps service) allowed more weight the longer the period in rank -- my sense is that the 15 years is probably a minimum. [3] The letters pose the biggest problem. I personally would not be comfortable promoting a person with NO record of scholarship, but it does neither the individual nor the University any good to send out vitae to outside evaluators when the scholarly record is thin. And whatever the letters say, most people outside the University aren't much help with teaching and service. [4] If we keep the ten year rule as it is (with the outside letters), it ought to be applied to everyone who comes up -- that is, letters about scholarship and a willingness to promote people based on teaching/service after 10+ years -- if there is no option of "election" then there is no stigma, and departments, deans A&Ps, and PRC's can still promote on scholarship. [5] The rule does not address a problem that is as central to the faculty in my department as it once was. At the time of the Corson Report, my department had a number of full professors who had been promoted in an era of relatively lax standards, and the resentment among their younger colleagues was disruptive. Since then, most faculty members have met the standards, once tenure, for becoming full professors. We have only a few not research active professors in the department, virtually everyone does research because, along with teaching, that's why they joined the profession, and there is general agreement that one must continue as a scholar to be promoted. These comments, I think, point in contradictory directions. As a former chair with experience in a review capacity beyond the department, the point I would emphasize most of the above is that we must stop sending out packets for outside evaluation that reflect badly on the University.

I think the standards for the 10 year rule are fine. All 3 promotion categories count, so it makes sense to get evaluations of scholarship from outside letters. The candidate whose scholarship is not excellent needs excellence in either teaching or service (or both) Outside referees can comment on these areas if data are provided. However, I agree that the department, A&P and dean are probably the best judges. We don't want a system which encourages folks to stop working as scholars after they achieve associate status. We don't want a system that encourages administrators to make undue service requests either.

The 10 year rule should be applied at the discretion of the Chair and Dean who are the administrators of the unit involved. With vision they will be able to define when yes and when no. Substantial weight should be granted to their opinions as this is one key tool for aligning unit performance/contribution. The 10 year rule must NOT be an automatic pass. It should be granted for superior performance -- where this might be noticed in many different ways. The local administrators are most likely to notice such excellence and be ready to initiate such a promotion. The outside letters and their solicitation are problematic for ALL promotions. They perpetuate the old-boys network and conformance more effectively than any other incentive we have. The PRC must be wise enough to read letters and interpret them in this light. Letters should definitely be solicited for the 10-year rule candidates, too. I find it objectionable that we have a clock based rule by name. Our criteria and process should be flexible enough to give candidates and administrators the option of emphasizing more or less on the three aspects of faculty life: scholarship/teaching/service. Then the letter that solicits outside evaluation should probably SAY what the internal emphasis for the particular candidate might be. Outsiders are much less likely to have seen the

contributions that the candidate will have made. Yet somehow it has to be an evaluation that gets some external scrutiny.

Unusually good teaching that includes the development of a novel curriculum or content needs to be encouraged. While this may not be publishable, it is important. I do not believe that length of tenure is grounds for promotion, per se, but outstanding efforts to improve teaching deserve recognition. Individual cases differ as there may also be some conventional research, though not enough to warrant promotion under the standard rules. Promotion criteria for scientists should be different in my view because the ability to do research, in most cases, is mainly determined by the ability to secure funds - an undertaking that is subject to economic and other factors.

Several of these questions are ambiguously worded, so it is not clear exactly what is being asked. To clarify my position, I believe there should be a 10 year rule. No letters should be required. All 10-year rule cases should be treated the same way, so optional letters should not be allowed. A&P Committees at School and University levels should be instructed that research is not the determining criterion in these cases. Absent that instruction, standard research expectations will continue to derail these promotions.

I have been at the rank of associate professor for 14 years (11 years at Rutgers) and so obviously have thought a good deal about the 10 year rule. During my time at RU, I spent seven years as department chair and am now spending three years as professor in charge of an American research institute abroad, and so scholarly productivity has been slowed (just co-edited books, articles, chapters, no magnum opus since tenure). Hope springs eternal that eventually I will publish enough to be considered for P I under normal criteria. Promotion under the 10 year rule, though perhaps appropriate for my situation, has always struck me as an invidious distinction. But the option most definitely should remain in place, with clear criteria (at least some scholarly progress) and certainly outside letters.

I think the outside letter request should be different from the regular letter--but I think outside letters are essential: we want faculty whose reputations extend beyond the university; and these letters remind us all that we are accountable for scholarly activity. The 10-yr rule is more 15-20 year rule. Faculty are reluctant to use it because (1) being turned down is humiliating (even more so than to be turned down for regular promotion); (2) younger members of departments label faculty who use this rule--and faculty using it feel 2nd-class; (3) faculty should know if their chair and dean support the case BEFORE they initiate the process. I strongly believe in alternative processes for promotion to full professor. I do not think that "nil" research activity is acceptable--and I am certain that deans and above will not approve "nil." The problems are not chiefly about how the administration views the rule (it's probably as confused as others about when to apply it; and if it works). They also concern the ways one's colleagues see this rule--and how they view the faculty member who is considered under the rule. Peer evaluation is difficult--younger people are meeting standards that some older faculty cannot now meet. And younger people have--rightly, in my judgment--strong roles in their departments' governance now. Please don't make this an us-them thing ... there are too many variables in this process.

The title of this survey should contain "promotion to FULL professor." There are too many parts to the quote in question 1 for me to give a reasonable response. Perhaps the last sentence should be omitted or be made into a separate question. In question 5, I have no idea who might be successful under the 10-year rule. In fact, I know of no 10-year rule case university-wide. In my opinion, good service and teaching should be expected of all faculty members regardless of research contributions. In the absence of research, promotion should be considered only if the candidate's teaching and/or service are well above good. As an alternative to promotion to reward extraordinary teaching/service, I would favor a well-endowed merit raise system. FYI, I am a former chair of a department of moderate size.

The criteria might be better phrased as "scholarship" rather than "research". The expectation on hiring is that a faculty member will contribute to the body of knowledge and establish a reputation for him or herself outside of the walls of Rutgers. To drop that expectation seems inappropriate. To expect "nil" in the way of research seems

an abrogation of duty every bit as much as "nil" in the way of teaching and service. And there is where I think the real emphasis should be. The three legs of the evaluation stool do not need to be of equal length. But every stool must have three legs.

High quality teaching should be and has been rewarded, even with lower scholarship. Just being in rank, and "showing up to teach" should not be sufficient. The level of teaching must rise to excellence, not just doing a "god job".

There have been only two people who have come up under the 10-year rule in my department, and I remember one case when I was on the A&P committee. I anticipate that 1 of these will be successful, although it is still in process. The earlier case that was not successful was for someone who had done a lot of internal service, but who had not done any research at all. The case that I anticipate to be successful is for someone who has done extraordinary service both internally and externally and who has done modest research. We sought external letters that were all extremely positive, although a few noted the paucity of research, but made recommendations based on the extraordinary service and reputation in the field. This is the kind of case that I think warrants review under the 10-year rule. I agree that in the earlier case, promotion was not warranted, because there was no research at all. A third case when I was on the A&P committee was for someone who had modest research, with an article every 2 or 3 years and average teaching and service. That case was not successful as far as I know. I would have been favorable about the case based on the continued, although slowed research, that had continued since tenure but my colleagues were not convinced.

We are a flagship research university. If you are not doing research, you should not be promoted to Full Professor. I find the ten year rule objectionable.

Rutgers is a research university. It is the research component that distinguishes it from colleges and second-tier universities, and it is the research component that plays a major factor in faculty hires. Granting professors who are no longer professionally active promotion to full professor dilutes the achievements of professors who continue to carry out professional work. It also sends a very clear signal that research doesn't really count. In my view, associate professor is the appropriate rank for professors who teach and perform university service only.

Every faculty member should have a research program. It is part of the job. I can imagine a faculty member who does not publish much but who is a super good teacher or has a super service record. I do think that such a faculty member should be promoted. But I see no reason to promote an average teacher, average service faculty member who has a below average teaching record.

Am new as a Dean (1.6 years) but am 100% opposed to this concept; I see some who have done this and they are rewarded for being asleep at the wheel. If we are a research university, then this rule makes no sense.

For those faculty who continue to work hard at all three criteria (research, service and teaching), the ten year rule is insulting and sends the wrong message.

I am in my third year as a chair and in my 4th year at Rutgers, so I have limited experience with tenure and promotion at Rutgers--although I have evaluated two cases within that time and I also serve as chair of one of the A&P committees on campus. I believe that the 10 year rule is a bad thing for Rutgers and should indeed be re-evaluated (and perhaps abolished). It seems to reward endurance and "good enough" teaching and service rather than excellent teaching, service and research--all should be expected from Full Professors.

The ten-year rule is a recipe for cronyism and rewarding mediocrity. It cheapens the rank of full professor and makes the promotion process open to arbitrary and capricious whims from Rutgers administrators, who will doubtless consider their friends' teaching and service of more value than that of faculty they personally don't like. Unless we are going to say that every faculty member after X number of years automatically becomes a full

professor, in which case we do not need an evaluation process (for who is to really say this person is a better teacher than that person, or this person's service is worth more than that person), I would prefer the relatively objective evaluation process based on external letters that can really only speak to someone's research. We are not a Community College or High School. We are a research institution.

I would rather your committee focus their efforts on how to deal with faculty who get promoted and tenured and then provide mediocre teaching, research and service for the rest of their careers. Post tenure reviews are not the solution. For those who wish to be promoted after 10 years, I see the need for renewed and sustained excellence in their research and not a simplification of the criteria.

Ten-year rule lowers the value of full professorships. The tendency in peer institutions is to tighten up the criteria for promotion to full. Rutgers should do the same if it is to retain and improve its research credentials.

1. Scholarship is critical to keep the high quality and standard of the University. 2. The AAU universities must emphasize the high standards on the faculty scholarship which should be one of the core requirements for the faculty promotion. 3. Excellent teaching and services can be awarded in other ways, in stead of promotion to the full professorship. Full-professorship at Rutgers must represent the certain level of the scholarship, and is recognized by the outside professional society.

Faculty in my department do not even consider the 10-year rule as an option for promotion, because there is the understanding that these will not be successful unless there is a substantial research profile, which would grant promotion outside the 10-year rule. In other words, the 10-year rule is, for all intents and purposes, not applied.

During my period as chair, one colleague asked to come up under the 10 year rule. For a number of reasons, I believed that this was a weak case: I suggested (after discussion with my immediate Dean), that it might be appropriate for this Dean to talk to the colleague - who subsequently decided not to pursue the case.

I have only evaluated one such case, and it is not yet resolved

I'm a new chair. We have one case under consideration now, I do not believe there have been any other cases in several years.

The questions are not always straightforward. Answers can be easily misinterpreted.

Since I do not understand the issues raised here not the implications of this questionnaire, I am do not know how to answer these questions. I am only in my second year serving as chair.

I've been an associate for 3 years now and I'm currently my department's chair. So I have little basis for answering most of these questions.

Both the previous chair and I were discouraged from this approach. We have been given mixed messages on this.

The cases that were successful were many years ago.

The 10 year rule doesn't seem to work very well. Faculty are reluctant to use it and the higher administration is not sympathetic to its use.

been chair for 6 months. we have no cases so far.

I do not think that this 10 year rule is being successfully applied. I have never seen it actually happen. We have many Associate Professors that have been in rank long enough and none have gone up for promotion--in part



based of the belief that the 10-year rule is difficult to apply. There needs to be a greater effort on part of the university to educate all levels of faculty with regards to application of the 10-year rule.

To the best of my knowledge, there has been only one instance of a faculty member in my department who was possibly going to be considered under the 10-year rule during my time here at Rutgers. However, that candidate was advised that it was much more likely that the effort would be successful if he attempted promotion under the "usual" path. At first he was unsuccessful, but eventually (during my term as chair) he was successful. I know of some people, now retired, who (in my opinion) *\*should\** have been promoted under the 10-year rule, but they were still associate professors at retirement (either because their promotion cases were turned down, or because they were too discouraged to try).

I have no personal knowledge of any case involving the 10 year rule. I believe there should be some alternative route to promotion but I don't have a good sense of what it should be. It is clear to me though that the present one does not work.

Deans at FASN have made it known that without federal level funding there was no chance of being promoted, in the sciences, to full Professor even under the 10 year rule. Not sure about present Dean.

I was not aware that there was a ten year rule.

I don't remember ever hearing about this rule. I believe we have only one faculty member who would be impacted, and I'm wondering whether I should look into encouraging him to apply.

As chair, I did not realize that members of my department could be promoted to full professor simply based on length of service. No one in my department asked to be promoted based on the ten-year rule. I am very ambivalent at best about this idea. If research is low to nil, the teaching and service would have to be extraordinary to make up for that lack. Only in that case would I think it remotely fair to overlook lack of research following tenure. Length of service alone is not sufficient reason for promotion in my view. That gives those NOT doing research an advantage over those who put in long hours to get independent research done on top of their teaching and service responsibilities.

If outside letters are required for professors at rank for a long time and under altered criteria are required, there is a precedent for such letters. That is letters for the promotion of Clinical Faculty members. When those are solicited, the letter writers are informed about the altered criteria to be used.

The Camden FAS has a very active Appointments and Promotion Committee that meets for every promotion case and advises the Dean. I am 30 years at Rutgers, 15 years as Chair of a small research-active department (thus no 10-year cases), 10 years as chair of A&P committees deciding on ~40 cases in the natural sciences & math (with many 10-year cases). Your survey should have included similar questions as 15-17 for A&P chairs.