



This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Award No. 2303732  
<https://bradley.edu/ADVANCEBU/>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ADVANCE BU REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON BRADLEY UNIVERSITY TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES

The recommendations contained in this document have been generated by a team of faculty (from all five colleges and the library) after analysis of (1) campus-wide survey data, (2) meetings with all College Executive Committees, (3) the analysis of all available internal TPR documents, and (4) a review of the literature on equitable TPR practices. They should be understood not as a top-down initiative, but as a starting point for campus conversations about revisions to Bradley's TPR practices. (See full report and review team members at <https://bradley.edu/sites/ADVANCEBU/reports/>.)

### Introduction: Institutional Challenges

- In 2024 survey, less than 1/5 of BU faculty feel that TPR expectations are “very clear.”
- In 2024 survey, approximately 1/3 of men, and fewer than 1/5 of women and nonbinary faculty feel that teaching and research are evaluated equitably at BU.
- Women Associate Profs at BU less likely see path to promotion than men or non-binary faculty; only 25% of Full Professors at BU are women (36% nationally).
- Chairs in multiple colleges indicate that TPR guidelines no longer accurately reflect the work faculty do.
- TPR documents at Bradley are not centrally archived and there is no expectation of regular reviews to keep pace with changes in the field or the institution.
- 44% of Bradley's TPR guidelines are more than 10 years old, with 24% being more than 15 years old.
- Bradley's TPR guidelines vary greatly in level of detail (3-48 pages), and 4 units do not have TPR guidelines.
- Some TPR guidelines at BU contain outdated information, or are out of alignment with *Handbook* (eg. counting advising under service instead of teaching)
- Inconsistent policies on TPR voting provide some people a double vote in TPR decisions or record a tie as a negative vote, which national research shows happens more to underrepresented groups.
- Lack of clear expectations or uneven application of rules violates “fair play” and increases opportunity for bias or the appearance of bias.

### ADVANCE BU Methodology and Findings

A team of three faculty independently coded all Bradley TPR documents (418 pages) for 15 elements that increase clarity and equity (Ampaw et. al 2024). The team achieved 98.4% intercoder reliability across the 551 codes entered. Broadly described, elements were coded as 0 (absent), 1 (present but lacking detail or clarity), or 2 (present, detailed and clear). Fully operationalized codes and median scores for each element are available in the full report and Appendix 1.

Ten out of the 15 elements received a median score of less than 1.0 (between 0.2 and 0.93), indicating an insufficient articulation of those elements.

Five items received a median score greater than 1.0 (between 1.0 and 1.46) but no items received a median score approaching 2.0, indicating that improvements are still needed.

### Fifteen Elements that Promote Clarity and Equity in TPR Guidelines (adapted from Ampaw et. al 2024)

<i>Teaching</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Detailed description of what “effective teaching” entails</li> <li>2. Detailed explanation of evidence and process used to judge effective teaching</li> <li>3. Detailed explanation of how student evaluations of teaching (SETs) will be used</li> <li>4. Concrete expectations for teaching performance at each rank</li> <li>5. Concrete expectations for quality advising</li> </ol>
<i>Research &amp; creative production (“scholarship”)</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Detailed explanation of research/creative production expectations</li> <li>2. Concrete expectations for research/creative production by rank</li> <li>3. Detailed explanation of how sole versus collaborative contributions are valued and weighted</li> </ol>
<i>Service</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concrete expectations for service by rank</li> </ol>
<i>TPR process</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Detailed explanation of relative “weight” (or value) of teaching, research and service in TPR decisions</li> <li>2. Detailed explanation of what materials to submit for TPR, how to organize them, and when, where, and how to submit them</li> <li>3. Detailed explanation of membership of the TPR review committee (ie. criteria for inclusion and means of selection)</li> <li>4. Detailed explanation of how votes are counted in TPR decisions</li> <li>5. Detailed explanation of selecting external reviewers (when required)</li> <li>6. Detailed information on (or links to) policies for accommodations, and pause in tenure clock</li> </ol>

### ADVANCE BU Recommendations

1. That all units develop TPR guidelines that incorporate clear articulations of the 15 elements discussed here. (Example language from varied units at Bradley is presented in Appendix 2 of the full report.)
2. That all units ensure that no one gets a “double vote” and that tie votes are treated as such.
3. That all college and unit TPR guidelines be reviewed and revised (and ratified by vote) no less frequently than every five years, and centrally archived.
4. That all units develop a Tenure and Promotion Roadmap for both pre-tenure and post-tenure candidates to help guide their professional activities toward continued advancement. (Example in Appendix 4.)
5. That university, college, and unit TPR guidelines be updated to reflect the growing range of professional activities that faculty engage in, using Boyer’s (1990) expanded model of scholarship: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of teaching and learning; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of integration. Each unit may decide the appropriate “weighting” of these different types of scholarship. (See Appendix 3.)
6. That the Senate clarify *Handbook* language regarding the relative “weight” of teaching and research/creative production. It currently gives “highest priority” to teaching, but in practice, research/creative production is often the most important factor, particularly for promotion to Full Professor. See example language whereby faculty applying for promotion to Associate or Full Professor must document satisfactory performance in both areas (teaching and research/creative production) AND a record of excellence in at least one area. (Appendix 2).

**References Cited:** Ampaw, Lisa Gandy, Tracy Galarowicz, Katrina Piatek-Jimenez, Kirsten Weber (2024) “Where could bias exist within department’s bylaws?” ARC/WEPAN (NSF ADVANCE) Community Convening, Baltimore; Boyer, Ernest L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ : Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.