


MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 11, 2009

TO: Dr. Brenda Konar, Chair  
Senate Unit Criteria Committee

THROUGH: Provost Susan Henricks

FROM: Robert B. Arundale  
Department of Communication

Handwritten signatures of Susan Henricks and Robert B. Arundale. Susan Henricks' signature is written in cursive and is positioned above Robert B. Arundale's signature, which is also in cursive.

SUBJECT: Approval of Department of Communication Unit Standards and Indices

Attached you will find a set of Unit Standards and Indices developed by the Department of Communication in accordance with Regent's Policy. These particular Departmental criteria have been in place since the 1980s. The faculty of the Department have reviewed these criteria this semester, and have unanimously reaffirmed them. We request that the Faculty Senate approve them for continued use by the Department in promotion and tenure evaluations.

As background to this request, let me briefly describe the history of prior approvals of these same criteria. The Department originally formulated these criteria in response to the first request for same in the early 1980's. We have available copies of the first approval by the Chancellor's Office in 1984, if you care to examine them. Our criteria were subsequently reworked in format, though not changed in substance, during the second round of Unit Criteria approvals beginning in 1989. At this point our criteria were included, along with those for other disciplines, in a single document covering all of CLA Social Science II. Those criteria were approved by the Vice Chancellor in June 1993 (again copies are available). The current presentation follows the model set in 1993, but is for the Department of Communication only, as one discipline within the CLA Division of Arts and Communication. There are no changes in content from the version of our Department criteria approved in June 1993 or again in May 1998. The only changes in the present version are ones that accommodate the recent revisions of the UAF regulations.

The Department's Unit Criteria are fully in keeping with the "Judgment Model" for tenure and promotion criteria identified and discussed in the attached article by E. Matusov and R. Hampel.

Please direct any questions to me at 6799 or [ffrba@uaf.edu](mailto:ffrba@uaf.edu).

**UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATIONS OF  
FACULTY  
AND DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND  
INDICES**

*THE FOLLOWING IS AN ADAPTATION OF UAF AND BOARD OF REGENTS' CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, PRE-TENURE REVIEW, POST-TENURE REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE, SPECIFICALLY ADAPTED FOR USE IN EVALUATING THE FACULTY OF THE COMMUNICATION DEPARTMENT. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ITALICS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENT'S FACULTY, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS TO UAF REGULATIONS.*

**CHAPTER I**

**Purview**

The University of Alaska Fairbanks document, "Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," supplements the Board of Regents (BOR) policies and describes the purpose, conditions, eligibility, and other specifications relating to the evaluation of faculty at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF). Contained herein are regulations and procedures to guide the evaluation processes and to identify the bodies of review appropriate for the university.

The university, through the UAF Faculty Senate, may change or amend these regulations and procedures from time to time and will provide adequate notice in making changes and amendments.

These regulations shall apply to all of the units within the University of Alaska Fairbanks, except in so far as extant collective bargaining agreements apply otherwise.

The provost is responsible for coordination and implementation of matters relating to procedures stated herein.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **Initial Appointment of Faculty**

#### **A. Criteria for Initial Appointment**

Minimum degree, experience and performance requirements are set forth in “UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies,” Chapter IV. Exceptions to these requirements for initial placement in academic rank or special academic rank positions shall be submitted to the chancellor or chancellor’s designee for approval prior to a final selection decision.

#### **B. Academic Titles**

Academic titles must reflect the discipline in which the faculty are appointed.

#### **C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank**

Deans of schools and colleges, and directors when appropriate, in conjunction with the faculty in a unit, shall observe procedures for advertisement, review, and selection of candidates to fill any vacant faculty position. These procedures are set by UAF Human Resources and the Campus Diversity and Compliance (AA/EEO) office and shall provide for participation in hiring by faculty and administrators as a unit.

#### **D. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Special Academic Rank**

Deans and/or directors, in conjunction with the faculty in a unit, shall establish procedures for advertisement, review, and selection of candidates to fill any faculty positions as they become available. Such procedures shall be consistent with the university’s stated AA/EEO policies and shall provide for participation in hiring by faculty and administrators in the unit.

#### **E. Following the Selection Process**

The dean or director shall appoint the new faculty member and advise him/her of the conditions, benefits, and obligations of the position. If the appointment is to be at the professor level, the dean/director must first obtain the concurrence of the chancellor or chancellor’s designee.

#### **F. Letter of Appointment**

The initial letter of appointment shall specify the nature of the assignment, the percentage emphasis that is to be placed on each of the parts of the faculty responsibility, mandatory year of tenure review, and any special conditions relating to the appointment.

This letter of appointment establishes the nature of the position and, while the percentage of emphasis for each part may vary with each workload distribution as specified in the annual workload agreement document, the part(s) defining the position may not.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **Periodic Evaluation of Faculty**

#### **A. General Criteria**

Criteria as outlined in “UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies,” Chapter IV, evaluators may consider, but shall not be limited to, whichever of the following are appropriate to the faculty member’s professional obligation: mastery of subject matter; effectiveness in teaching; achievement in research, scholarly, and creative activity; effectiveness of public service; effectiveness of university service; demonstration of professional development and quality of total contribution to the university.

For purposes of evaluation at UAF, the total contribution to the university and activity in the areas outlined above will be defined by relevant activity and demonstrated competence from the following areas: 1) effectiveness in teaching; 2) achievement in scholarly activity; and 3) effectiveness of service.

#### **Bipartite Faculty**

Bipartite faculty are regular academic rank faculty who fill positions that are designated as performing two of the three parts of the university’s tripartite responsibility.

The dean or director of the relevant college/school shall determine which of the criteria defined above apply to these faculty.

Bipartite faculty may voluntarily engage in a tripartite function, but they will not be required to do so as a condition for evaluation, promotion, or tenure.

#### **B. Criteria for Instruction**

A central function of the university is instruction of students in formal courses and supervised study. Teaching includes those activities directly related to the formal and informal transmission of appropriate skills and knowledge to students. The nature of instruction will vary for each faculty member, depending upon workload distribution and the particular teaching mission of the unit. Instruction includes actual contact in classroom, correspondence or electronic delivery methods, laboratory or field and preparatory activities, such as preparing for lectures, setting up demonstrations, and preparing for laboratory experiments, as well as individual/independent study, tutorial sessions, evaluations, correcting papers, and determining grades. Other aspects of teaching and instruction extend to undergraduate and graduate academic advising and counseling, training graduate students and serving on their graduate committees, particularly as their major advisor, curriculum development, and academic recruiting and retention activities.

**1. Effectiveness in Teaching**

Evidence of excellence in teaching may be demonstrated through, but not limited to, evidence of the various characteristics that define effective teachers. Effective teachers

- a. are highly organized, plan carefully, use class time efficiently, have clear objectives, have high expectations for students;
- b. express positive regard for students, develop good rapport with students, show interest/enthusiasm for the subject;
- c. emphasize and encourage student participation, ask questions, frequently monitor student participation for student learning and teacher effectiveness, are sensitive to student diversity;
- d. emphasize regular feedback to students and reward student learning success;
- e. demonstrate content mastery, discuss current information and divergent points of view, relate topics to other disciplines, deliver material at the appropriate level;
- f. regularly develop new courses, workshops and seminars and use a variety of methods of instructional delivery and instructional design;
- g. may receive prizes and awards for excellence in teaching.
- h. UTILIZE AND DEMONSTRATE THEIR KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT CONSTITUTES EFFECTIVE ORAL COMMUNICATION IN THEIR TEACHING METHODS.
- i. DEMONSTRATE CONSISTENT ATTENTION TO STUDENTS IN THE ROLE OF AND ADVISOR REGARDING UAF AND DISCIPLINE RELATED MATTERS.
- j. DEVELOP AND REVISE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR USE IN SUPPORT OF THEIR TEACHING.
- k. ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE IN AND CONTRIBUTE TO THE WORK OF THE FACULTY OR THE DISCIPLINE IN CURRICULUM MATTERS.

**2. Components of Evaluation**

Effectiveness in teaching will be evaluated through information on formal and informal teaching, course and curriculum material, recruiting and advising, training/guiding graduate students, etc., provided by:

- a. systematic student ratings, i.e. student opinion of instruction summary forms,  
**and** at least two of the following:
- b. narrative self-evaluation,
- c. peer/department chair classroom observation(s),
- d. peer/department chair evaluation of course materials.

**C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity**

Inquiry and originality are central functions of a land grant/sea grant/space grant university and all faculty with a research component in their assignment must remain active as scholars. Consequently, faculty are expected to conduct research or engage in other scholarly or creative pursuits that are appropriate to the mission of their unit, and equally important, results of their work must be disseminated through media appropriate to their discipline. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the distinction between routine production and creative excellence as evaluated by an individual's peers at the University of Alaska and elsewhere.

**1. Achievement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity**

Whatever the contribution, research, scholarly or creative activities must have one or more of the following characteristics:

- a. They must occur in a public forum.
- b. They must be evaluated by appropriate peers.
- c. They must be evaluated by peers external to this institution so as to allow an objective judgment.
- d. They must be judged to make a contribution.

**ACHIEVEMENT IN RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE  
ACTIVITY INVOLVES:**

1. IDENTIFYING AND EXPLORING NEW RESEARCH PROBLEMS IN THE DISCIPLINE, AND/OR CRITICALLY EXAMINING EXISTING RESEARCH PROBLEMS TO PROVIDE NEW INSIGHTS.
2. DEVELOPING NEW METHODS, THEORIES, OR APPROACHES TO RESEARCH PROBLEMS IN THE DISCIPLINE.
3. DEVELOPING AND MAINTAINING A FOCUSED PROGRAM OR PROGRAMS OF RESEARCH.

4. DEMONSTRATING GROWTH IN KNOWLEDGE OF THE DISCIPLINE, OR GROWTH IN EMPIRICAL AND/OR CRITICAL RESEARCH ABILITIES.

**2. Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity**

Evidence of excellence in research, scholarly, and creative activity may be demonstrated through, but not limited to:

- a. Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, proceedings and other scholarly works published by reputable journals, scholarly presses, and publishing houses that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by peers in the discipline.
- b. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas, these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.
- c. Presentation of research papers before learned societies that accept papers only after rigorous review and approval by peers.
- d. Exhibitions of art work at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by juries, recognized artists, or critics.
- e. Performances in recitals or productions, selection for these performances being based on stringent auditions and approval by appropriate judges.
- f. Scholarly reviews of publications, art works and performance of the candidate.
- g. Citations of research in scholarly publications.
- h. Published abstracts of research papers.
- i. Reprints or quotations of publications, reproductions of art works, and descriptions of interpretations in the performing arts, these materials appearing in reputable works of the discipline.
- j. Prizes and awards for excellence of scholarship.
- l. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.
- m. Development of processes or instruments useful in solving problems, such as computer programs and systems for the processing of data, genetic plant and animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.

**D. Criteria for Public and University Service**

Public service is intrinsic to the land grant/sea grant/space grant tradition, and is a fundamental part of the university's obligation to the people of its state. In this tradition, faculty providing their professional expertise for the benefit of the university's external constituency, free of charge, is identified as "public service." The tradition of the university itself provides that its faculty assumes a collegial obligation for the internal functioning of the institution; such service is identified as "university service."

**1. Public Service**

Public service is the application of teaching, research, and other scholarly and creative activity to constituencies outside the University of Alaska Fairbanks. It includes all activities which extend the faculty member's professional, academic, or leadership competence to these constituencies. It can be instructional, collaborative, or consultative in nature and is related to the faculty member's discipline or other publicly recognized expertise. Public service may be systematic activity that involves planning with clientele and delivery of information on a continuing, programmatic basis. It may also be informal, individual, professional contributions to the community or to one's discipline, or other activities in furtherance of the goals and mission of the university and its units. Such service may occur on a periodic or limited-term basis.

EFFECTIVENESS IN PUBLIC SERVICE INVOLVES:

1. ACTIVELY PARTICIPATING ON AND CONTRIBUTING TO THE WORK OF PUBLIC AND/OR GOVERNMENTAL BODIES.
2. SUMMARIZING AND PRESENTING KNOWLEDGE IN THE DISCIPLINE FOR THOSE OUTSIDE OF UAF.
3. APPLYING THEORIES OR FINDINGS OF THE DISCIPLINE IN PUBLIC SERVICE.

Examples include, but are not limited to:

- a. Providing information services to adults or youth.
- b. Service on or to government or public committees.
- c. Service on accrediting bodies.
- d. Active participation in professional organizations.
- e. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.



- f. Consulting.
- g. Prizes and awards for excellence in public service.
- h. Leadership of or presentations at workshops, conferences, or public meetings.
- i. Training and facilitating.
- j. Radio and TV programs, newspaper articles and columns, publications, newsletters, films, computer applications, teleconferences and other educational media.
- k. Judging and similar educational assistance at science fairs, state fairs, and speech, drama, literary, and similar competitions.

**2. University Service**

University service includes those activities involving faculty members in the governance, administration, and other internal affairs of the university, its colleges, schools, and institutes. It includes non-instructional work with students and their organizations.

**EFFECTIVENESS IN UNIVERSITY SERVICE INCLUDES:**

- 1. ACTIVELY PARTICIPATING ON AND CONTRIBUTING TO THE WORK OF COLLEGE, UAF, AND STATEWIDE COMMITTEES, PANELS, TASK FORCES, ETC.
- 2. EXHIBITING LEADERSHIP AND MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS IN POSITION IN THE DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS, AND STATEWIDE.

Examples of such activity include, but are not limited to:

- a. Service on university, college, school, institute, or departmental committees or governing bodies.
- b. Consultative work in support of university functions, such as expert assistance for specific projects.
- c. Service as department chair or term-limited and part-time assignment as assistant/associate dean in a college/school.
- d. Participation in accreditation reviews.
- e. Service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office.

- f. Service in support of student organizations and activities.
- g. Academic support services such as library and museum programs.
- h. Assisting other faculty or units with curriculum planning and delivery of instruction, such as serving as guest lecturer.
- i. Mentoring.
- j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.


### **3. Professional Service**

Examples of such activity include, but are not limited to:

- a. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.
- b. Active participation in professional organizations.
- c. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations,  
OR ORGANIZATIONS CLOSELY RELATED TO THE DISCIPLINE. .
- d. Committee chair or officer of professional organizations.
- e. Organizer, session organizer, or moderator for professional meetings.
- f. Service on a national or international review panel or committee.

### **4. Evaluation of Service**

Each individual faculty member's proportionate responsibility in service shall be reflected in annual workload agreements. In formulating criteria, standards and indices for evaluation, promotion, and tenure, individual units should include examples of service activities and measures for evaluation appropriate for that unit. Excellence in public and university service may be demonstrated through, e.g., appropriate letters of commendation, recommendation, and/or appreciation, certificates and awards and other public means of recognition for services rendered.



# Two Approaches to Tenure and Promotion Criteria

BY EUGENE MATUSOV AND ROBERT HAMPPEL

## *Should you emphasize procedures or judgment in tenure deliberations?*

In a recent flurry of e-mails and conversations about promotion policies in our school of education, we realized that our colleagues differ sharply in their notions of how scholarship should be evaluated. They agree on the importance of high-quality work, but they disagree on how to determine whether high quality has been achieved. Some faculty members prefer what we call a “procedural model,” others a “judgment model.” We are advocates of the latter model; it is the most democratic and the fairest approach to tenure decisions and gives departments the best chance of arriving at a real, rather than a default, decision.

### **Procedural Model**

The procedural model features a set of specific measures of the caliber of scholarship. Faculty need not decide on their own whether a candidate’s work meets the official criteria and what these criteria mean for particular cases because well-crafted policies, if applied faithfully by a committee, will do that. By prioritizing types of publications (for example, peer reviewed over non-peer reviewed), rating scholarly journals (for example, lower acceptance rates over higher rates), asking external reviewers to vote for or against promotion (and to justify the vote), and using other predetermined criteria to gauge the merits of the candidate’s scholarship, the faculty avoids the need to decide for itself if the work is good enough to merit promotion. Faculty meetings to discuss the pros and cons of the dossier are unnecessary. Even

candidates’ meetings with promotion and tenure committees will be infrequent because crystal-clear procedures let candidates develop their own cases without much oversight.

Advocates of this approach want to minimize painful surprises for candidates. Everything should be as predictable as possible. They don’t want to relive Alvin Kernan’s experience in the Yale English department in the early 1960s, which he sums up in his 2000 book *In Plato’s Cave*: “I suspect that some of us were merely lucky, some unlucky.” Because the criteria are elaborated in clear and detailed language, the promotion and tenure process is objective, fair, impersonal, and readily defended should anyone grieve or sue. Not only are candidates spared a jolt, but the entire department lives together more harmoniously. There is less chance of revenge—“you voted against me, next time I will vote against you”—and less chance of warfare between advocates of conflicting paradigms who rest their cases on the demolition of their opponents’ views. It is easier to collaborate with senior colleagues, sharing rough drafts and acknowledging mistakes without fear of unpleasant consequences later. The possibility for meanness cannot be eliminated—an expectation of fifteen refereed journal articles might cause widespread pain—but the intent is to minimize unpredictable nastiness.

### **Judgment Model**

The judgment model, which we favor, obligates the faculty to discuss and evaluate the quality of the scholarship under review.

Even if a promotion and tenure committee prepares a recommendation, each faculty member independently confirms or refutes that appraisal. Even if the promotion guidelines are clear and lengthy, the determination of what constitutes “excellence” (or other key words in the guidelines) cannot be made by a formula or subcontracted to external reviewers. Each colleague must devote the time and effort to decide whether a candidate’s work is excellent and then be able to explain and defend that assessment in a faculty meeting.

As advocates of the judgment model, we hear one criticism voiced more than any other: it is impossible to evaluate most colleagues’ work. Departments of education include

hand, some external reviewers are too tough because they want to guard a field that is very competitive. Moreover, many candidates can nominate external reviewers who they know will send glowing letters.

Less often discussed is the point that the reviewers’ judgments need to be judged. That is, a fixed standard of excellence in any field is usually an illusion. When a peer reviewer assesses a manuscript, he or she examines the author’s arguments, evidence, and research methods in relation to ongoing debates within the field. The ultimate basis of many external reviews is the strength of the contribution to the field. But who judges the strength of the field itself and its leaders’ notions

their colleagues’ specialties have acceptable standards of excellence. One wonders, in that case, what it means to be a department, but that question aside, faculty judgments can be partial yet still crucial. It is not the case that each and every person must make final judgments on the merits of a candidate’s scholarship individually and in isolation. Those judgments can and should be reached together, as with other important departmental issues. To that end, we should consult with each other and with colleagues outside the department, reread the external reviewers’ letters, share concerns and questions, and ask colleagues to explain and justify their views. For example, although the authors are not experts in sophisticated statistical models, we can still raise apt questions about the validity of such models. Then our colleagues who are experts in that area can address our concerns.

### **Mutually Exclusive?**

To be sure, these two models are not mutually exclusive. It is hard to imagine procedures without any judgments or judgments wholly without procedures. Even so, they represent two positions, and most of our colleagues know that the approaches differ significantly, points of overlap notwithstanding. In the procedural model, the exercise of individual judgment is considered a flaw in the promotion and tenure policies, inviting arbitrariness, while in the judgment model, such exercise is welcomed as constructive. In the procedural model, judgment is subordinated to rules, even if judgment was required in the past to create the procedures; in the judgment model, rules exist only to facilitate judgment.

Procedures, rules, and standards can work very well to evaluate recursive, well-defined, and stable

**UNFORTUNATELY, THERE IS NO WAY FOR CANDIDATES TO REMAIN UNTOUCHED IF COLLEAGUES TELL THEM THAT THEIR SCHOLARSHIP IS UNSATISFACTORY AND THAT THEY WILL THEREFORE NOT BE REAPPOINTED, PROMOTED, OR TENURED.**

too many specializations for any individual to determine accurately strong, weak, or mediocre research in the cases of all candidates. We might hazard an opinion, but when a colleague’s future is on the line, everyone wants to set forth more than a guess. Is it not better to entrust the judgment of the quality of the candidate’s scholarship to external reviewers who are experts in the field?

Although external reviewers can provide very good assessments of the scholarship’s quality and thus inform the department’s decision, their judgments alone are not enough. There are several well-known reasons for caution. Some external reviewers are too generous in their assessments in order to nurture their own field, especially when that field is small. On the other

of excellence? In our view, those are judgments properly made by the departmental colleagues of the candidate. For example, a candidate in the 1950s might have presented several qualitative case studies to an educational leadership department in a college of education. The external reviewers would probably have been skeptical; the quest for an administrative science was the rage in that decade. It would have been the duty of the candidate’s departmental colleagues to decide what that trend meant. Was the field, by favoring administrative science, finally acquiring the rigor educational leadership needed and had lacked? Or was it overstretching for precision unsuited to its subject matter?

Faculty might claim that they are unable to determine whether or not

cases and events. However, evaluating out-of-the-ordinary, ill-defined, and nonrecursive cases and events requires judgment. We argue that scholarship demanding originality, creativity, and innovation is exactly this kind of out-of-the-ordinary case. In this regard, the relationship between the procedural and judgment models is analogous to the relationship between monarchy and democracy: a king might make a better decision than a parliament but, in contrast to the parliament, when the king is wrong, it is difficult to get rid of him. Without the constant public forums that a judgment model promotes, it is difficult both to sense a problem with a procedure and to change it when a particular case demands it.

A procedural model may value harmonious relationships over the quality of scholarship. For the judgment model, harmonious relationships are less important than assurance of the main purpose of academic research—the rigorous pursuit of knowledge. If academics prioritize predictability, safety, and harmonious relations over ensuring the excellence of their work, then the academic community will be in danger. As soon as we shy away from debates about “exceptional ability as a productive scholar, using this phrase in the widest possible sense,” to quote former Harvard president James Conant, we fatally weaken our claim to be a profession. Without peer review grounded on judgment-based appraisal, our scholarship will stagnate and deteriorate, as happened in the Stalinist Soviet Union in the late 1940s and 1950s during the rule of agricultural biologist Trofim Lysenko’s “Marxist biology” with its rejection of genetics, a field that did not fit the preset standards of the Marxist-Leninist dialectical philosophy.

We want to acknowledge one unsettling consequence of the

judgment model. It unavoidably promotes “nasty relations” among colleagues. Civil, friendly, respectful discourse should always mark the promotion and tenure process. We mean something else by the phrase “nasty relations”: the consequences of airing critical opinions of a colleague’s scholarship. Those critical judgments can be made cordially, but they are still negative when they cause a candidate to lose what she or he sought. In our view, negative judgments are unavoidable, at least occasionally, even when a department takes pains to hire well-qualified and promising junior faculty.

Unfortunately, there is no way for candidates to remain untouched if colleagues tell them that their scholarship is unsatisfactory and that they will therefore not be reappointed, promoted, or tenured. One cannot be calm on the grounds that this decision is professional, not personal (in fact, that would probably make the person feel worse). One naturally dislikes, if not hates, the colleagues who consider one inadequate. “Destabilizing” was the euphemism used by one of our colleagues who wrote a book chapter about her tenure ordeal.

A negative decision may also be difficult for those who vote. It is very hard to look straight in the eye of any colleague whose scholarship you have publicly criticized, even if the candidate is unaware of what you said. You may not want to harm the candidate’s professional or personal well-being, and you may feel guilty about the harm inevitably caused by a negative decision. But to paraphrase Winston Churchill’s famous quip about democracy, a judgment model for faculty tenure and promotion is the worst form of government except for all the others that have been tried.

Concern for our colleagues’ well-being might have to take another form. We may need to develop some

kind of ceremony of reconciliation where we collectively soothe the wounds left by a contested promotion and tenure case and come together again as a community despite our tough talk about each other’s work. It might even be a party, a festive meeting with your adversaries. For instance, after the Czech president Vaclav Havel lost the presidency in a parliamentary vote as a result of his support of the public referendum on Slovakia’s separation from Czechoslovakia, he invited his successful adversary to drink beer. We need something like that from time to time. And before that happens, we need to develop the habit of talking about each other’s work. Brown-bag lunches, mentoring sessions for junior faculty, posting drafts online, and other visible and public displays of what we are writing would help foster a culture of open discussion apart from the stressful promotion and tenure months.

Finally, there is a question left: can a large department carry out the judgment model? Several of our colleagues feel that we, at approximately sixty faculty, are too big—that unless everyone sits around a large table to exchange views, it will be too easy to hide, to avoid nasty relations, to save time by not reading the dossiers, to let someone else do the work. Do large departments necessarily promote the procedural model? Must smaller units be formed for judgment-based promotion decisions, thus leaving out many colleagues from an activity we view as central to what it means to be a community? We leave these important questions unanswered here, but we admit that it has been harder to rally our colleagues around the judgment model as our own school of education expanded in size over the past decade. ☞