

Insights

Tenure and Promotion

This paper represents a first set of insights into tenure and promotion, as surfaced in interviews and contextualized within current research on inclusive tenure and promotion policy. We present this paper in conjunction with our 2018 a2ru Leadership Workshop on Tenure and Promotion (April 30th-May 1st), which includes a diverse group of faculty and administrative leaders from across the country.

In keeping with our goal of using research to generate good ideas, we look forward to the additional insight that workshop participants—as well as readers like you—contribute to it. Please direct feedback to a2ru Research Programs Manager Veronica Stanich at vstanich@umich.edu.

Contributing Authors:

Gabriel Harp, ArtsEngine / a2ru Research Director

Veronica Dittman Stanich, ArtsEngine / a2ru Research Associate

On behalf of:

The Alliance for the Arts in Research Universities (a2ru)

a2ru.org

ArtsEngine at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

artsengine.umich.edu

Introduction

As part of its commitment to advancing the full range of arts-integrative research, curricula, programs, and creative practice in research universities, a2ru helps develop Tenure and Promotion policy that supports faculty in arts, design, and interdisciplinary practice. This paper highlights insights into Tenure and Promotion (T/P) policy from our Mellon-funded SPARC (Supporting Practice in the Arts, Research and Curricula) interviews with faculty and administrators at 36 research universities. These are contextualized within recent research on Tenure and Promotion policies for interdisciplinary practice, digital humanities, and public scholarship—fields that also contend with challenges around non-traditional modes of scholarship. It addresses the most salient issues for university leaders, both faculty and administrative, in their process toward clearer, more inclusive and efficacious policy.

A2ru's SPARC interviews reveal a range of institutional attitudes toward arts-integrative and interdisciplinary teaching, research, and engagement, as evidenced in T/P practices (SPARC ref¹). T/P policy fulfills an important dual purpose; it reifies an institution's values even as it incentivizes and supports the work that a university deems valuable (SPARC ref²). As one SPARC interviewee commented, "We can't say we would love for people to be interdisciplinary, but apparently on their own time and it doesn't count, because that de-incentivizes it" (SPARC ref³). If university rhetoric around the value of arts integration is not codified into policy, then such work becomes "icing" on top of faculty's regular obligations, resulting in difficult decisions about whether, how, and when to pursue this type of scholarship (SPARC ref⁴).

At stake is a fundamental shift in norms and values—from institutional assumptions restricted to disciplinarity and traditional scholarship to ones that include interdisciplinarity and arts-integrated scholarship. Such a shift necessarily results in productive tensions. How and when is interdisciplinary work valued? Can it be integral for junior faculty's career development, so that it has weight in a tenure portfolio (SPARC ref⁵)? Or is arts integrative work something that should come into play at the Associate Professor level, after faculty have established themselves disciplinarily (SPARC ref⁶)? How are interdisciplinary and arts standards in conversation with, and sometimes colliding with, the more familiar disciplinary and scholarly ones (SPARC ref⁷)? Questions like these raise complicated and contentious issues, but we believe that they are precisely the ones to tackle as we move forward.

This paper outlines a range of actions to cultivate T/P policy that embraces disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and creative work equally. Within this process of cultivation, there are in fact two distinct—but simultaneous and intertwining—journeys. One is at the institutional level; driven by upper-level university administration, it entails the assessment, mapping, maintaining, and implementation of inclusive policy. The other, at the individual level, centers on faculty and their personal professional trajectories from hire to tenure and on to promotion. Deans and Chairs participate equally in both journeys. Sections of this paper are designated according to players in these two processes and to their actions, as follows:

Institutional: Tenure and Promotion Policy

Map inclusive policy: assess, refine, make explicit (Administrators and Deans)

Update and maintain: check in, communicate (Administrators and Deans)

Evaluate individual cases: define excellence, ensure consistency (Administrators and Deans)

Individual: Career Trajectory

Starting together: establish shared understanding (Deans, Chairs, and Faculty)

Plan the journey to tenure: chart the course, navigate (Deans, Chairs, and Faculty)

Prepare for review: explain (Deans, Chairs, and Faculty)

Frame candidacy: present strategically (Faculty)

Administrators and Deans

Mapping an inclusive T/P policy

Assess the current landscape together

Assessment begins with identifying current attitudes and priorities (SPARC ref⁸), including those that may be implicit. Surfacing these types of unacknowledged elements requires the collaborative effort of an inclusive working group. The work of assessing policy landscape may include a measure of *institutional ethnography*^a—that is, examining what other university systems such as calendars, schedules, materials requisitioning, and job descriptions impact faculty progress toward tenure and promotion.

Refine definitions

Across disciplines, there exist numerous usages of terms like *research*, *creativity*, *engagement*, and *practice* (SPARC ref⁹). Once the combinations and permutations of these modes of scholarship have been surfaced, institutional definitions can be updated to accommodate traditional disciplinary endeavors as well as arts-integrative and interdisciplinary ones (SPARC ref¹⁰). The process requires time and attention: “And we had to spend quite a few faculty retreats and faculty meetings explaining to one another what the criteria were and recalibrating our understanding to allow for all of it, and to give each thing its due measure so that we didn't hold anyone up to something that didn't make any sense and we didn't inhibit anyone, but rather we encouraged everyone to embrace as much of everything” (SPARC ref¹¹). The idea of *continuum*—a continuum of scholarship from disciplinary to interdisciplinary and across levels of arts-integration, a continuum of scholarly and creative artifacts, and a continuum of professional trajectories—can help guide the process of crafting inclusive and supportive policy.^b

Make explicit

It is important to chart T/P policy that reflects the university's values around interdisciplinary and artistic work. A systematic approach has proven key to the

^aSociologist Dorothy E. Smith developed the practice of institutional ethnography, an approach to social research that centers on textually mediated social organization and is “...built from the examination of work processes and study of how they are coordinated, typically through texts and discourses of various sorts...The point is to show how people in one place are aligning their activities with relevances produced elsewhere, in order to illuminate the forces that shape experience at the point of entry.” In this case, the “point of entry” is the tenure and promotion process. (Marjorie L. Devault, “Introduction: What Is Institutional Ethnography?” *Social Problems*, vol. 53, no. 3 (2006): 294.

^bThe Tenure Team Initiative at Imagining America articulates the uses of “continuum” in their report on tenure policy as it relates not only to arts and design but also to publicly-engaged scholarship (Julie Ellison and Timothy K. Eatman, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University* (Syracuse, NY: Imagining America, 2008), ix.

success of interdisciplinary career development^c as faculty and administrators alike need a clear, explicit map that accounts for procedures, criteria, and body of evidence—what “counts” and how it is presented and executed to maximize success. The map tracks a faculty journey from the time of hire, ensuring that terms and expectations are consistent throughout.

Because arts integration entails work across institutional boundaries, individual colleges and departments each bring their own standards (SPARC ref¹²). One Provost recounts, “The handbook does not define what does it mean to be excellent versus satisfactory versus unsatisfactory. All of that is turned back to the individual academic units, so as Provost I turn it back to them and I say, ‘Okay, you are the ones making decisions and making recommendations regarding your colleagues’...Once it's approved, then we say, ‘Go forth, and apply and stay consistent.’” (SPARC ref¹³) To ensure this critical consistency, interdepartmental understanding is concretized and documented in letters of appointment and MOU’s (Memoranda of Understanding) between departments whose faculty work together, or who share a jointly appointed faculty member^d (SPARC ref¹⁴).

Updating and maintaining policy

Check in, update

University leaders are attuned to how the effects of current T/P policy ripple across the institutional ecosystem. They identify procedures and priorities that impact faculty career development and update as needed (SPARC ref¹⁵). One Chair explains, “I can't just walk in and change it all around, but I can tell you I'm trying to begin to change the standards” (SPARC ref¹⁶).

Leaders also address other policies that affect individual faculty members’ ability to succeed, removing barriers when possible: “I feel like my job is to help faculty get through the bureaucracy of the institution and to find ways to do what they're trying to do...That's going to be different for every situation, whether it's sitting down with the director and helping them brainstorm about how can we cover faculty A's duties and allow them to do this? Is there some way we can swap something out? Is there some way we can take some summer money and put it into your fall budget so that you can hire an adjunct to take this class? Or whatever that happens to be” (SPARC ref¹⁷).

^c Julie Thompson Klein and Holly J. Falk-Krzesinski, “Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Work: Framing Promotion and Tenure Practices and Policies” *Research Policy*, vol. 46 (2017): 1056.

^d Klein and Falk-Krzesinski, “Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Work,” 1056.

Communicate

T/P policies that support interdisciplinarity require additional communication effort if they are to flourish. Frequent, scheduled interface between often far-flung participants promotes the continued health and growth of these policies, as well as faculty success (SPARC ref⁸). In addition, Deans and mentors maintain communication with those faculty on track toward tenure or promotion to ensure that the work they do is weighted toward their goals.^e

Evaluating individual cases

Define excellence

The evaluation of arts-integrative tenure and promotion portfolios requires upper-level university administration to define excellence across the continuum of disciplines and domains of knowledge.^f Because the artifacts and epistemology of arts-integrated and interdisciplinary scholarship differ from those of other types of scholarship on the continuum, it can be helpful to identify the ways in which they are the same—to articulate university values of excellence that apply to traditional and non-traditional scholarship alike (SPARC ref¹⁹). Nonetheless, the determination of excellence becomes challenging where traditional values of prestige and quantification collide with those of impact and quality (SPARC ref²⁰).

Leaders also contend with the difficult task of assessing impact in the arts, where it may not be readily evident; one SPARC interviewee observes, “...in sciences or engineering, there's a much shorter timeline to demonstrable impact, but in creative work, [whose music] are we going to be listening to a hundred years from now is not something that you can prove in a T and P process” (SPARC ref²¹). Finally, Deans and administrators approve appropriate external reviewers (SPARC ref²²) and ensure that work is fairly represented, negotiating differing judgments of committee members or external reviewers.

Ensure consistency

Deans and upper-level administrators ensure that the membership and relative influence of tenure and promotion review committees are consistent with the expectations established in the appointment letter and MOU.^g

^e Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE), *Benchmark Best Practices: Tenure & Promotion* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2014), 2-3

^f Julie Ellison and Timothy K. Eatman, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University* (Syracuse, NY: Imagining America, 2008), 1.

^g Pfirman et al, “To Thrive and Prosper,” 5.

Deans, Chairs, and Faculty

Starting together

Establish shared understanding

Expectations are made clear from the point of hire, setting in motion with letters of appointment and MOU's the journey that will culminate in tenure review years later. One university leader points out how the very reasons for hiring a new faculty member can be at odds with his or her assumed career development: "The search candidates that people talk about and get excited about are the ones that are very creative, not the ones maybe that have a very clear path that they will be able to make contributions in a traditional university research" (SPARC ref²³). As such, there may be a need for heightened explicitness at the outset for artists and others whose work is not readily accommodated by traditional T/P structures (SPARC ref²⁴). In addition, documentation explicitly sets forth the new faculty member's relationship to each of the departments where he or she works.

Planning the journey to tenure

Chart the course

Working together creates a smooth and productive journey to tenure. Deans and Chairs foster a culture of reward.^h Working together, they regulate the time pressure on faculty, taking into account course loads and the responsibilities of those who have joint appointmentsⁱ (SPARC ref²⁵). This becomes critical for the career sustainability of faculty with joint appointments because, as one university administrator points out, "...they usually have to work harder because they have to kind of demonstrate effectiveness in both fields...it's not 50/50. It's actually 70/70, if we're being realistic. That's a struggle and some people will decide that's just too much" (SPARC ref²⁶).

Deans and Chairs also oversee long-term planning for interdisciplinary faculty's tenure review (SPARC ref²⁷).

^h Klein and Falk-Krzesinski, "Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Work," 1056.

ⁱStephanie L. Pfirman, James P. Collins, Susan Lowes, and Anthony F. Michaels, "To Thrive and Prosper: Hiring, Supporting, and Tenuring Interdisciplinary Scholars," in *What Works: A Resource* (Washington: Project Kaleidoscope, 2005), 2. http://www.pkal.org/documents/Pfirman_et-al_To-thrive-and-prosper.pdf (accessed March 21, 2018).

Navigate

Strategically timing collaboration maximizes the value of arts-integrative work in a T/P portfolios (SPARC ref²⁸). In addition, keeping in mind that “...individuals face a double handicap. Their work is judged typically by discipline-based standards, and their contributions to collaborative research are undervalued if they are not first author on publications or principal investigator on a grant,”^j faculty ensure that their roles in teams or partnerships are well-articulated and that they are credited appropriately (SPARC ref²⁹). They connect regularly with mentors who can advise them on balancing disciplinary and interdisciplinary demands^k and on positioning their work to maximize its impact and accessibility in the peer review process—a tricky proposition for some research (SPARC ref³⁰).

Faculty write about their work, both to document it and to put unconventional work in a more conventional form (SPARC ref³¹).

Pre-tenure review procedures and committees reflect the expectations set out at hire and foreshadow the eventual tenure review.^l

Preparing for review

Explain

The preparation of a T/P portfolio is informed by the fact that it oftentimes functions in an educational capacity—not only familiarizing reviewers with the candidate’s unique work but also articulating the nature of that work. Therefore, it may involve assembling institutional endorsements of the value of interdisciplinary and collaborative work, a FAQ page, a copy of the candidate’s MOU, and other explanatory materials about the nature of an interdisciplinary field and its genres of scholarship.^m For example, if a Principle Investigator (PI) system of recognition is assumed, candidates may need to explain the nature of a team’s collaboration: “You can have co-PIs but [here] there is one PI recognized. Yeah, and so oftentimes a lot of the recognition comes back to that documentation that says who really did that project? Well it must have been the guy's name that was PI” (SPARC ref³²). It is also important to ensure that any criteria that have been set for a T/P case at the department or college level travel with it as it goes up to the university level (SPARC ref³³).

^j Klein and Falk-Krzesinski, “Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Work,” 1055.

^k Pfirman et al, “To Thrive and Prosper,” 4.

^l Pfirman et al, “To Thrive and Prosper,” 3.

^m Klein and Falk-Krzesinski, “Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Work,” 1057-1059.

Faculty

Framing candidacy

Present strategically

Framing a tenure or promotion candidacy case that crosses disciplinary boundaries often requires special effort so that it is accessible to multidisciplinary committees. Candidates use disciplinary language to describe their work effectively to more discipline-focused committee members (SPARC ref³⁴). Artists and those working across disciplines often face unique challenges in framing their candidacies, simply because of epistemological differences between their modes of scholarship and more familiar ones (SPARC ref³⁵); they present their work strategically to transcend these differences.

Bibliography

- APA Board of Scientific Affairs. *Appointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Review Considerations for Psychologists with Joint Faculty Appointments and Involvement in Interdisciplinary/Multidisciplinary Research and Scholarship: A Resource Document*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2014. <https://www.apa.org/science/leadership/bsa/interdisciplinary-joint-appointments.pdf>
- Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE). *Benchmark Best Practices: Tenure & Promotion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2014. <https://coache.gse.harvard.edu/files/gse-coache/files/coache-tenure.pdf>
- Cox, Jordana, Sophia Krzys Acord, Bonnie Moradi, Laurie N. Taylor. *Best Practices for Cultivating Diversity and Public Engagement in Tenure and Promotion*. Gainesville, FL: Center for the Humanities and the Public Sphere, U of Florida, 2016. <http://ufdc.ufl.edu/AA00040771/00001>
- Devault, Marjorie L. "Introduction: What Is Institutional Ethnography?" *Social Problems*, 53 (2006): 294-298.
- Ellison, Julie and Timothy K. Eatman. *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University*. Syracuse, NY: Imagining America, 2008. http://imaginingamerica.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/TTI_FINAL.pdf
- Klein, Julie Thompson and Holly J. Falk-Krzesinski. "Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Work: Framing Promotion and Tenure Practices and Policies." *Research Policy* 46 (2017): 1055-1061.
- Pfirman, Stephanie L., James P. Collins, Susan Lowes, and Anthony F. Michaels. "To Thrive and Prosper: Hiring, Supporting, and Tenuring Interdisciplinary Scholars." *What Works: A Resource*. Washington: Project Kaleidoscope, 2005. http://www.pkal.org/documents/Pfirman_et-al_To-thrive-and-prosper.pdf
- Pollack, Martha and Marc Snir. *Best Practices Memo: Promotion and Tenure of Interdisciplinary Faculty*. Computing Research Association. <https://cra.org/resources/best-practice-memos/promotion-and-tenure-of-interdisciplinary-faculty/>
-

References to a2ru/Mellon SPARC Interviews

The following numbered references to the SPARC interviews include: **boldened text** that is relevant to the given section of this paper, surrounding text providing context for the speaker's statement, and a unique identifier that can be used internally by researchers to reference source interviews.

¹**a range of institutional attitudes toward arts-integrative and interdisciplinary teaching, research, and engagement, as evidenced in T/P practices**

[My institution] is happy to have me go above and beyond and teach an additional class, something that's not normally taught and I think they're excited about the interdisciplinary aspects. I think it would definitely help with the teaching aspect of tenure, which is valued significantly here. **On the other hand, it certainly takes away from some research time. If I weren't tenured, I would definitely have to not do this very often.** Being tenured, I feel like I can do it whenever. (Q38-1706-2604)

Over the course of my career I was in sciences, and then I switched to the humanities, and then I switched back to the sciences, and then as a professor I've been able to integrate it with these projects, but I'm at a point now where I want to go to the next level of integration. **I made a decision to change the nature of my work going forward for further integration because it's risky, because you don't fit anywhere and there's no administrative structure. You basically will be punished in the academy for trying to do something that doesn't fit anywhere.** I just can't keep going on in this way of doing something to try to please a system. (Q38-1319-7336)

The beauty of getting tenure is the ability to unchain your research in a way, right? Now you've met the requisite number of exhibitions or whatever the faculty has put in front of you, you have tenure now. I have this conversation with everybody who makes tenure. It's a time to maybe, not necessarily stop, but re-evaluate some of the things you're doing out of formula. Because you're on a wheel, right? You're on this hamster wheel. Things that you do in formula, okay, I need to get this body of work done by, I have to work all summer on this to get it done by the fall because I have to come back into teaching. (Q38-6007-8697)

This [a physics/dance collaboration pre-tenure] is going to count and this is one of the things that I think has been **the benefit of the college of the arts merging and becoming part of arts and sciences, is that we now have more of an understanding, the junior faculty have a lighter teaching load and a lighter service role in order to accomplish their research. For the purposes of promotion and tenure.** So finding the collaborators in the physics department is its own challenge, I think, but slowly I think that there are more ways and avenues that are being sort of assisted by the college for that to happen, but I do think that there is an understanding. However, once you get tenured and you're still researching, that becomes a little bit harder to do I think, in terms of release time for classes, but that's what grants and funding from the university can help support. (Q38-6008-8714)

Tenure and promotion is often a convenient excuse for not doing the things you ought to be doing. My experience of being involved in every part of that process has been the promotion and tenure process is enormously flexible, if an administrator wants to use it that way. So if

you wanted it to be a possible for, say, 25% of the workload of the faculty to be interdisciplinary work and that be recognized as part of their workload--the department is the first person to do that. Particularly what that is to cajole and encourage the faculty and the unit to get on board with those criteria, and then to promote them off the chain, because from everything I've seen, as long as the criteria or what's supporting development at the department level, the rest of the university is not going to challenge them. It's just looking for you to really want to know what you want to do and have a good argument about why you should do it. Nobody is getting in the way of interdisciplinarity. (Q38-4601-2683)

²T/P policy reifies an institution's values, even as it incentivizes and supports the work that a university deems valuable

Well, we certainly encourage collaborations. Faculty are rewarded, obviously, for their innovation. **We are constantly trying to create opportunities for people to do things that are entrepreneurial and unique. And those are rewarded through academic honors and promotion.** And the notion that we collaborate, as a school, with our peers and the rest of the institution is something that I take every opportunity to promote. (Q38-3611-8152)

I think as universities are supporting these concepts of "interdisciplinary" or "integration"...**As universities encourage that, they also need to re-think the structure to support systems** and so forth. (Q38-4207-928)

There's no other structure [besides tenure] that allows and rewards and incentivizes people to go out and work with other people. So, more than one time, we've gotten a grant, we wanted to submit a grant and people were like, "Eh, I went to talk to my ARPT board and they said don't do it. I can't get tenure with this." (Q38-4014-6783)

We say a lot of things about interdisciplinarity being the future, but **I don't know that the rhetoric is followed up by a real substantial support for, this is a way to achieve tenure** because it's an important way of solving problems. (Q38-1112-5520)

The reality is the administration would like to encourage it. I think that the culprits tend to be at the level of departments. The department will say, well, we're not going to credit you for that because you're not doing it here. I think there's a lot of that. And every institution that I've ever been in, I think that this is something which central administration often doesn't know about. And that is a serious problem. I think that a lot of the obstruction is at the local level. Or conversely, you will have a department in which you have a far-sighted chair who said that the most important language, to promote the general intellectual quality and institutional imperatives. But then you have a dean who would say, well, we're not going to give you credit for teaching that course, or we'll not give you credit in terms of tenure and promotion. **I think how best to correct it is not only to actively encourage this rhetorically but to build this into the merit evaluation process on a yearly basis, and then build it into the periodic reviews of faculty.** Whether it's the third-year review here, the mid-tenure review, actually, tenure or promotion, you still look very carefully at what, if any, interdisciplinary activities in teaching or research an individual has been involved in, and then to make sure that they are rewarded for it, or at least if it's good if it's evaluated. I've seen enough merit committees' or performance evaluation committees' work to know that institutional ideals can die a quick death, and nobody ever knows. Except the person who's outraged, who's often too annoyed, powerless, or simply ignorant of what has actually happened. And I think that it is not difficult to correct these problems if you build it into the process. (Q38-4507-273)

³**“We can’t say...”**

If it's [T/P guideline] going to talk the talk of interdisciplinarity it needs to say: we would acknowledge it when we see it put into practice. **We can't say we would love for people to be interdisciplinary, but apparently on their own time and it doesn't count, because that de-incentivizes it.** (Q38-4404-4184)

⁴**If university rhetoric around the value of arts integration is not codified into policy, then such work becomes “icing” on top of faculty’s regular obligations**

I'm cognizant that I get to carry out those collaborations because I buy myself credits by doing what's viewed as my core work. I try to do that really well. Yes. I try to do my research and my teaching very well. Then I view that as buying me freedom to be able to do these other things. **If I'm publishing papers, if I'm giving good talks, if I'm doing a very conscientious job on my teaching, if I'm being very thoughtful about all those things, I view that as giving me leeway in which to conduct these other projects...That's the cake. And the collaboration with the arts would be the icing.** (Q38-2908-1472)

I don't see negative implications for spending some of one's time carrying out what might be considered outside work, like collaborating with artists, or designers. I think if you sort of see it as one of the things that that professor does, like another professor might work with policy makers and spend a lot of time on the hill talking to senators, or another one might be working on startup company. Well, that isn't research, that's something else, but it's still a valid thing to do. **So I think working with artists and other disciplinary folks on campus is viewed as something that you're allowed to do, so to speak, as long as it doesn't eclipse the real work of teaching and research.** (Q38-4001-6504)

I have tenure. I was hired here as someone who does and has done lots and lots of interdisciplinary work; I've sort of made my name that way...They knew who they hired, I think, when they brought me on board. So in terms of the work that I do that I'm patted on the back for with interdisciplinary work and public engagement work, this, to me, has seemed okay. **Now I think if I spend all my time doing this, and wasn't pumping out NSF grants and having graduate students in during my teaching, I could get in trouble.** (Q38-4001-6504)

I would say distinguish yourself in the ways that you care about, and the things that are really exciting to you. I would say go for that, first of all, because you're not going to be happy with yourself. **You're not going to be true to yourself if you don't do that, but then just be aware that you're going to have to do enough of the traditional stuff if you want to get tenure.** If you want to do what you love, then hope for the best...But you have to also face the fact that you're in a traditional environment that has different expectations. You made the choice to come into this environment. You really have to try to check a lot of boxes. Yeah, a lot of extra work, probably. (Q38-1319-7337)

To my dismay, over the years it seems to me that one's progress through tenure is an academic hazing ritual, and it's a very conservative one. The down cards are all score the big points in your discipline first to earn your freedom. It strikes me as remarkably like an old indentured system with the same number of years required to earn that freedom. After your seven years, if you prove that you can meet the disciplinary requirements. A junior faculty member who's doing that [collaborative] teaching, if he or she has a poor research record within the discipline, it will be viewed with

suspicion. **If he or she has a strong record there, and if it's someone that the department is really promoting and engaged with that work, then it would be seen as fine. It's really ancillary activity. Not exactly the parsley on the plate, but it's a side dish.** It's not the main dish. (Q38-2401-3922)

⁵it has weight in a tenure portfolio

All is taken into account; we have had the experience of promoting one of our colleagues who is a lawyer in the Planning department and he is publishing in law review journals and all kinds of things. All those kinds of knowledge are considered very important in the promotion process...I think the university knows that we are different. And so anytime they are looking at our promotion and tenure materials, they look at it with that understanding that we are different. We are not Engineering, we are not the Social Sciences, we are not big Ag: we are College of Design. And for us scholarship and creativity is very different and they do take that into consideration...**I think that our promotion and tenure document is broad enough to accommodate all kinds of scholarship that faculty in the Arts actually pursue.** (Q38-3805-1096)

What I'd like to be able to see in candidates who make it to at least the point of coming to campus is that they have pretty good understanding of our program, and **our expectations are one of collaboration, both within the group but then also outside on campus.** Certainly, sure, nationally as well, but the national stuff usually somehow moves back to a disciplinary focus. On campus I would want candidates who could come in and tell us very clearly people that they have identified as possible partners. (Q38-2904-1387)

First of all, the new vision statement is to be the national model of the engaged university, engaged with ideas and the world. They talk about three pillars of engagement...the three pillars being engaged learning, community engagement, and civic engagement. They're all interrelated, but engaged learning, in a nutshell, is about the high impact educational practices that we believe can have a transformative impact on students...**Now that relates directly to promotion and tenure and hiring because part of the message that we want to convey, including to faculty as we hire them, is this is a place where we feel very strongly about these types of efforts, and by the way, interdisciplinary collaborations are one of those high impact practices.** We very deliberately foster that. It's mentioned explicitly in the strategic plan. We've talked with the faculty and with all the academic units about making sure that our hiring and tenure promotion policies reflect the strategic plan. (Q38-2912-1543)

We have people that are pushing all kinds of boundaries. The faculty members we hire now are not the same faculty members you would have hired thirty years ago. They're far more interdisciplinary. They bring all kinds of different tools with them. You never know where this creativity is going to come up. We have another mathematician who's very heavily involved with the Institute for Visual Studies. She's a logician, but also a philosopher. Some of the work she does involves objects that are three-dimensional and are art. She's working on the mathematics of art. That's real and that's interesting. **If she co-teaches a course with somebody from art, that's great. She'd be given full credit for it.** (Q38-2906-1427)

In fact they [co-taught classes] counted more than the regular classes that I taught because I definitely made a point in my tenure materials of highlighting the fact that this class supports the goals of the school... There is in the tenure process here a kind of criteria for services to the school in which if you can say well, here is very clear example, but I'm following a

general policy or an ambition of the school which is to have this kind of interdisciplinary work happening. Then it's certainly respected, and contributed to my success to an extent. (Q38-4116-2992)

A lot of barriers were taken away and I think the faculty understood that looking at someone's teaching record for six years as they go up for professor, **having those interdisciplinary things is actually something to be celebrated; it's not the idea, oh, they're teaching outside the unit, they're not really contributing to the unit...**The college committee is an interdisciplinary committee. I think that as it goes up to the college level, the committee is made up of scientists and humanists and biological sciences. All of the divisions in Arts and Sciences are represented on that P&C committee at the college level. So that kind of interdisciplinary research, teaching and outcomes would be valued by that group, I think quite high because they're an interdisciplinary group by design. There are no barriers. (Q38-6007-8697)

⁶ that should come into play at the Associate Professor level, after faculty members have established themselves disciplinarily

The academic disciplinary structure is an octopus. I mean it just exerts its strangle hold in so many ways. For most faculty members, if I were advising them, it would be a matter of the first people that you really have to satisfy are those in your area. That might be a sub-group within a larger unit. **You need to make certain that you're developing a recognizable focus area of expertise. It doesn't have to be fully developed by the time you come up for tenure, but people need to have something of a sense of what your core expertise would be.** Also, for really satisfying that disciplinary group you need to get publications or exhibitions or whatever the product is in a place where they agree it will count. (Q38-2613-3755)

I would say that collaboration, the ability to collaborate in different ways, whether it's teaching or research, is part of an individual's profile, but I still think the gold standard in Humanities is the individual research product. **I think it's difficult to imagine somebody getting tenure solely on the basis of collaborative projects.** These things are neither sufficient nor necessary for getting tenure, but you can imagine a particular case where the collaborative aspects of the profile are very attractive as well. (Q38-5007-3121)

Candidly, I'd say, "You're not going to get tenure for that." I would say, "If you can do really cool research that gets in the top journals in our field, and it's creative, then people really respond well to that, but it has to be in that path. You can't just have some sort of ancillary thing that is not actually pumping out papers." **If you're pumping out papers in the journals that your colleagues respect, then the creativity, I think, wins you points, but as a practice separate from the things that will create papers, and the kind of papers that they want to see, I'd recommend they don't do that if they want to get tenure here.** (Q38-3403-730)

I'm partnering with everyone across the university, and actually I'm partnering with other universities like Rutgers, MIT, NOVA and people like what I'm doing. **They think it's interesting, engaging, innovative, but when I go for tenure these things do not count.** (Q38-2903-1364)

My College of Pharmacy is a pretty well defined college when it comes to what the research looks like...**In this case, such an open-ended activity [collaborative research] would be more considered a hobby. The research definitely would not count towards the tenure.** (Q38-4021-6935)

My committee and the chair support me, but **they want to keep me on a path that they see as the path that will lead to my tenure, which is release a CD, teach master classes, perform recitals at other universities and outside of the state...** I think a lot of it has to do with, in the School of Music, we recruit students. And so I'm not going to recruit students because I had a chemist and a limnologist speak at a talk at the Discovery Center. I'm going to recruit students because they heard my CD or heard me give a master class and wanted to study with me. (Q38-3911-7609)

I'd say if you don't know what your paper's going to be coming out of this collaboration, if you don't know what your exhibition or what your outcomes are going to be from this in the next two years, three years, you should save that kind of open-ended stuff for after tenure. Reserve this for after you've achieved tenure, or have it be hyper-defined. (Q38-1109-5473)

So all this—and it's like five blocks from my house—would not have counted any... Even with all the press and everything, that didn't happen until after. So they wouldn't know ahead of time because you can't guarantee. If it were in some other, if it was in New York City in someone's bathroom, it would be fine. I always thought I should just have a friend rent a bathroom, hang little strips of paper, here is my show, and then put that up, and then you get a line on your resume. That's what it seems like: ooh, it's New York. But there's this thing of anything local doesn't count. Then there's this whole disconnect where our state and our government doesn't get why we're important. And it's like, duh, everything we're doing is elsewhere and we're not supposed to do anything here. Is it any wonder that nobody gets what we do or why arts are important, because we're off doing these things at important places instead of dealing with real people? **And, actually, there's some really meaningful, important work that could be done in people, in communities. But for us, at least, that doesn't count for tenure.** But I have tenure now, so I can do this. So I was like, I have tenure; I'm going to do a local show... (Q38-3907-7711)

⁷interdisciplinary and arts standards in conversation with, and sometimes at odds with, the more familiar disciplinary and scholarly ones

We don't live and die by the peer review journal. That's certainly important and a component, but there are many ways that your scholarship can be externally validated. You can be a consultant that's sought after. You can be involved in sponsored projects, grants and contracts. I could imagine creating something that would be in a juried exposition, that would win a design prize. (Q38-2915-1597)

It would depend a little bit what discipline—within art and design in particular—people were coming from. If they were an artist, this isn't hard and fast, but it's probably better to be seen as an individual. If you're a designer, it's much harder to demonstrate things individually. You may as well collaborate because that will be more substantial. The advice to people in the design fields is to collaborate as much as you can, because that way, you will be able to have more opportunities for demonstrating effectiveness. **The problem with design and tenurability is how you demonstrate your credentials. It's weirdly different from artists and composers, and different, again, from engineers and technologists. It's treading that kind of line.** (Q38-1121-5678)

The interesting thing is that it looks as if we're all in lockstep, but, truthfully, each Dean presents their materials in a different way, right? Some have photographs in the case, right? Others do not.

There's just those different cultures attached to different schools, right? And, you know, in [one department] they have to do X number of articles. In engineering it's probably times two or times three at that, so the cases really aren't the same and some of them are incomprehensible, to tell you the truth. You look at a math case and it might be such an abstract form of mathematics that the Dean of that school probably can't understand it, right? **And we laugh about these things because although, it looks all squeaky clean and regulated, you know, we all know we have to look at it within the framework of what it is itself.** (Q38-1701-2518)

I was dealing with this all the time when I was dealing with theater and film, for example. There was a mixture in that department of scholars versus producers. It was pretty easy within the university context, which was all about the scholarship model, the academic scholarship model, to integrate that. To integrate the scholarship. **It was the scholar who wants to do the creative work that is heading towards the boundary of what we can wrap our head around,** versus the other direction...The entire culture really is based much more on the scholarly book and article. I just think the atmosphere around here, for example, in our creative writing program there are a lot of those people who, they write poetry, but they also write reviews of poetry and then they write scholarly treatments of poetry. It's fairly easy for us to make that transition, right? When the biologist writes poetry, now we've got a problem, that's the bigger one. (Q38-2502-5014)

Some of those people will decide if interdisciplinary work is important to them and some of them will not, but to me the defining feature is excellence within their own field, because we've already decided that field is important and we wanted it to be represented at a strong level.

Interdisciplinary work is important, but not by itself, or not as a substitute for excellence in their own field. (Q38-1014-1972)

I think because this person is being hired as a poet, the critical mass will be the poetry and how the poetry is evaluated...**I think it [his interdisciplinary work] will be considered, but it won't be a primary consideration.** The letters that were written for him addressed his poetry. It mentioned the other things, but in passing, and so he's being hired as a poet. All that I can do it buttress this with the idea that we need him to do these other things and we want him to do these other things. (Q38-1004-1844)

The departments are the first step in the tenure process. They evaluate the candidates. The majority of faculty members are looking for somebody who excels specifically in that field. **Let's suppose the person came forward with nothing but high grade projects involving the saxophone and sociology. I think that person would probably have a hard time because various colleagues would question whether that was a material contribution to the discipline that would advance the fortune and the rankings of that department.** At the college level, I think it's a little bit better because the deans are aware of the universal nature of the university, but you've got to get to the dean first, and if the department doesn't recommend the candidate, that is de facto the end...If that person were going out, say, to innovative online journals that somehow or other had ended up specializing in saxo-sociology let's call it, it's very unlikely that that person would get through on the strength of that credential. That person would have to say show experience in the Journal of the American Musicological Association or whatever appropriate journal is for that field, so there is not much momentum in the direction of vehicles for research that are outside the disciplinary silos. (Q38-2716-2260)

I've been trying to advocate for pathways to success and rewards for people who work in this way [as “connective thinkers”]. The same as people who do silo, mono-path success. I've been trying to advocate with university leaders for, like I said, different kinds of professorships, different kinds of ways of acknowledging and encouraging that...What I'm talking about is a scholarly style. You can be in any field, at least housed in any field because that's our only choice right now in the university, but working across all kinds of bounds. Your questions might be requiring you to cross all kinds of bounds, and learn from many fields and collaborate with a lot of people. That's what I'm talking about is the discrimination on the basis of scholarly style, not on the basis of a traditional discipline, a singular discipline. (Q38-1319-7336)

⁸Upper-level university administration identifies current attitudes and priorities

If I discuss it with faculty as a Dean and I say, "Let's talk about balance." **Your most research intensive faculty who want to be primarily working on research will immediately read that as you are non-supportive of research.** It doesn't matter what else you say, or your own research record—because I have had that said to me before from faculty who have published less than I have, received fewer grants than I have, produced fewer PhD students than I have—I am not sufficiently supportive of research and it is simply because I said, "You know what? Are we really doing truly innovative work, and what is our role as scholars in the classroom?" Those are signals that they are going to raise our teaching load and suddenly we are all going to be teaching faculty instead of research faculty. It is a very tricky thing to raise, a very difficult thing to raise. (Q38-1119-5636)

I think the university has to really grapple with individuals' self esteem, their self respect, their respect in the field; their understanding of themselves as an academic is what's tied up in this. It's very threatening to some individuals who feel that they've established a certain level of recognition and appreciation in a field for hard one work in the discipline. And then the idea is, well now we want you to spread out, we want you to be more interdisciplinary. If they've never been interdisciplinary to that point, and it's never benefited them in any way in achieving rank, status, recognition, publication—what's the motivation at this point to change their game plan? And also, what are they modeling for the students that come along behind them? (Q38-3106-6243)

We hire them for their disciplinary interests. I think, probably, **one hopes that some of them, although not all, will, after they've earned their stripes in the discipline, decide that, as the field evolves, they might reach out across various areas. It doesn't happen. I shouldn't say it doesn't happen. It happens rarely because the whole reward structure is set up to encourage disciplinary contributions.** It's not just the institution, it's the journals in the field. Journals are very disciplinary-based. A lot of it is just set against this kind of exploration across fields. My own sense is that, in some ways that's not bad, if the barriers in an institution, whether it's across departments or across areas of the university, are fairly porous. I think that well-trained, deep thinkers can be enticed later in their lives, perhaps, to begin to broaden and interact with people in fields that are quite different. (Q38-2205-4871)

⁹numerous usages of terms like *research, creativity, engagement, and practice*

Out of 52 faculty, seventeen of them are professors of practice. Our expectations of them are different. The same way we expect forty percent of their time teaching, forty percent research, twenty percent service, for them it is forty percent practice so they stay active in their practice and that's what they're sharing in the classroom. What we do is very real-world. You need to know what's current and happening and it changes so quickly...**I don't think we say “engaged**

scholarship.” We do say “research” or “practice,” “teaching” and “service.” If you're a professor of practice it's “practice” not “research”; if you're tenure-track it's “research” not “practice.” (Q38-2810-3325)

So “research,” I think in its traditional sense, people think of research as that which produces some sort of written documentation and “creative activity” is that which produces some sort of creative product that is out there in the world at some point. Whether that's a recording or a production or a visual art work or a sculpture or design or whatever it is, and that's my definition but I think that's generally how it's seen...I don't know that I could use either word, equivalent or hierarchical. I think they're domain specific. For example if I as a music educator, produced a peer review article or a handbook chapter or a book—well, books are the biggest thing for us—that would be seen as appropriate. If I as a music educator produced or did recitals, people would wonder why. And so it may not be that it's not valued or there's a hierarchy, it's that we tend to have created boundaries between what kind of research or creative activity is appropriate or not appropriate for what kind of faculty member. And that I think the more we can do to disrupt those boundaries, the better off we'll be...and [it's] incumbent upon [the person seeking tenure] to make the argument for what is appropriate in their discipline and in their career. (Q38-4903-64)

If a faculty member creates a really unique way of representing data—let's say it's data associated with computer networks, and that's in fact one of the areas that we conduct research on. The creation of that sound, that music of the network if you will—it's a creative accomplishment. But it's also a research from the standpoint of saying...gee, **does this creation allow you to more easily interpret and detect network attached and so on? That's “research.”** (Q38-4605-2718)

I don't think it's a tenure and promotion package that says anywhere “creativity” in there. I don't know, it may change. With our new dean I hope that. I'm on a committee where we're trying to make some changes to the tenure and promotion packages, which I think creativity would be certainly a great aspect to have in there. But usually it's not. (Q38-2515-5207)

I think that in the arts disciplines we're in a funny position because to make art and to exhibit, we're in the position of how to demonstrate how the making of art is scholarship and that's sometimes an interesting dilemma. And then because the arts themselves have changed, particularly with digital media and participatory types of engagements in the arts or arts practices that seek to draw in and have people participate in what is made, that's different than doing a gallery exhibition. That's something different than doing a recital. That's something different than performing a play. If the production of the art is engaging other people in an event, how do you curate that? **How do you persuade someone that that kind of engagement is “scholarly work” or “creative work” or “research” in some way?** And I think within the arts, we're still trying to come to terms with how public practice that engages people actively rather than sitting in a recital hall, how does that become part of scholarship and research and creative activity? That's a tricky question. (Q38-4903-63)

I read all the tenure files over the last nine years, and so a couple years ago had a violinist, or last year I think we had an organist—they're giving in their recording. They're giving in the reviews. They're giving in their programs that describe the work and those are creative. **That's “creative activity.” That's not “engaged” because it doesn't have, the way that we're looking at engaged work is that it has a connection to a community...** Take two architects, one is doing design projects for clients, that's what makes up their portfolio. Another architect gets engaged with building a food co-op in a food desert, in a part of the city that is poor. The accounts that they give

of their work are probably going to be quite different and the second one, even though if you look at the actual renderings and design work, it doesn't look so different. (Q38-2816-3407)

One of the things I have to deal with is the very, very, very different kinds of research that happens, in terms of more direct scholarly research to more kind of creative research. Where the University is much more comfortable in measuring academic research or scientific research, so in a way that actually works to our favor because they really don't know, they don't have the same level of comparison to say, "Okay, it has to be the book," right? Or, it has to be this. In order for them to function within a tenure and promotion system, they have to be considered analogous, or you set up a kind of hierarchy that again, almost would put PhDs against the MFAs. (Q38-2512-5165)

Well, it [interdisciplinary fellowship program] probably would have counted as “service,” and also it would have gone back to my teaching because again, the undefined but implicit outcome is that all the discussion that’s happening in that program eventually gets taken back into your own teaching and research. So I would have been able to make a case for that, for the conversation to feed back into my research, for the conversation to feed back into my teaching, and for the development of the Fellows Program itself to be service. So I think it would have been counting towards tenure. (Q38-3505-8544)

¹⁰**institutional definitions to accommodate traditional disciplinary endeavors as well as arts-integrative and interdisciplinary ones**

Well, we go back and forth on that because we sometimes talk about research and scholarship or research and creative activities because **we want to make sure that we are sending a message of inclusivity**, and now what we have discussions about is that we should be able to just use the word “research” and have everyone understand that included in research we can set all different styles and approaches or ways of doing creative work. So it's “research” with little “r” in that by its very nature you consider it to be broad. (Q38-3703-8269)

I think the spirit of that was saying, "We want to include that within the various things we assess when it comes to research to the point of tenure and promotion." I think there's an equation of things people do across the campus to a certain level. **You try to come up with language which is embracive as possible**, rather than using, let's say, just the word “research.” For a lot of people defaults not only to things that exclude the Arts, but things that exclude the Humanities, so the term “research” can be very narrowing even though to many of us that doesn't make any sense. (Q38-3404-746)

I think research is a specific kind of creative activity; that would be my way of saying it. ...So I think **having both terms in there is just not to leave anybody's valuable scholarly work out.** (Q38-4906-112)

Most faculty tend to imagine that somehow creative activity has to be justified as a form of research. But if you read the passage the passage closely and if you believe, as you might, that it was written carefully, it's actually research that is a form of creative activity. **It's “research or other creative activity.” So I think at the end of the day, the practice at [our institution] is to regard creative activity as filling the requirement of research.** We can have, I think, very interesting discussions about the research-like nature of creative activity. (Q38-3005-4603)

¹¹**“And we had to spend...”**

We're members of this community so in the end we have to make sense to the university. But internally, because we come from all these different backgrounds, one of the most fascinating and fruitful and satisfying things is that when we all arrive we all belong to different tenure understandings. From architecture, from art, from music, from engineering, from computer science, from film, from wherever people might have been. **And we had to spend quite a few faculty retreats and faculty meetings explaining to one another what the criteria were and recalibrating our understanding to allow for all of it, and to give each thing its due measure so that we didn't hold anyone up to something that didn't make any sense and we didn't inhibit anyone but rather we encouraged everyone to embrace as much of everything.** (Q38-4804-4704)

¹²**individual colleges and departments each bring their own standards**

If you had someone in the math department write poetry, what would you do with that? It might be somewhat, you might say “problematic,” and it’s not a judgment about poetry. But, it's a judgment about poetry in the context of the Math scholar....Between math and poetry as far as I'm aware, there's no emerging blend field...I suppose it will be an interesting process to try to define the cases in which it makes sense and the cases in which it doesn't. **But since this is all ultimately ad hoc, and I mean, it's case-by-case questions.** It's very difficult to define. (Q38-3005-4603)

Each teaching unit writes their own power of administration, and appointments, promotion, and tenure document. It does follow the general broad brushstrokes of the college PROMPT guidelines. But, each unit is responsible for setting the bar for what they understand to be the work of an Assistant, an Associate, and a Full Professor. In my home unit, Dance, interdisciplinarity is well received. It's understood. It's part of the norm. You would almost question why you weren't doing it. If you think about it, dance is a highly collaborative discipline, just like music, just like opera, and in many ways just like a visual artist. You don't just go it alone. The dancer has dance artists, they have a director, they have musicians, they have costumers, they have set designers, they have lighting designers. The musicians have musicians, they have conductors, they have stage directors, they have a composer...It's not just any singular endeavor. It's really not like just writing your book. (Q38-6006-8682)

I would never myself advise an Assistant Professor on what he or she needs to do in order to obtain tenure. I would shoot them right back to the department and say, "Learn what your department is expecting. Learn what the norms of your discipline are and figure out what really counts in that area," because it's going to be hard for me to advise a particular faculty member about those kinds of things. **I would say that the campus is able to manage a multiplicity of types of evidence for excellence and it is really up to the departments and the individuals and, of course, the external reviewers, to make a case for why things matter.** (Q38-1126-5760)

¹³**“Okay, you are the ones making decisions...”**

To be promoted from assistant to associate, you have to be excellent in one of the areas of teaching, scholarship and service, but the handbook doesn't define teaching, scholarship and service. **The handbook does not define what does it mean to be excellent versus satisfactory versus unsatisfactory. All of that is turned back to the individual academic units, so as Provost I turn it back to them and I say, "Okay, you are the ones making decisions and making recommendations regarding your colleagues. You know what you're doing better than I do as a Provost. You come forward with the further delineation of the categories, the criteria,**

etc.," and then it comes back up, through the Deans and through me, to be approved. Once it's approved, then we say, "Go forth, and apply and stay consistent." Part of the reason we want to do that is so that incoming faculty have a real clear expectation about what's going to be expected of them. It serves that purpose. That is a lot of ownership obviously at the academic unit level. It develops community there in all those things that you would want to have happen. It does at times make it difficult when you have people who are cutting across different areas, because then people start saying, "Where does that fit? What cubbyhole do I put that in?" (Q38-2910-1512)

¹⁴**letters of appointment and MOU's (Memoranda of Understanding) between departments whose faculty work together, or who share a jointly appointed faculty member** Yes, there's an MOU [for a new faculty member teaching in a cluster]. Yes, everybody is supposed to know about it. They will know about it when it comes time for tenured promotion, because we'll make sure that they do. (Q38-2308-5934)

Now, that is the beauty of an MOU and if you do an MOU right, it lays out a path towards tenure. We have an MOU, for instance, for a person in Jazz Studies who has a 50% appointment in African-American studies. We got together and we really described how to understand his creative and scholarly work from the point of view of both departments because both departments have to vote and we have a document that guides that that is pretty explicit. We have three 50/50 appointments between the School of Music and the College of Education, so we have language that describes how we understand that person's work. We are going to have that same kind of thing and I am going to have to do a lot of thinking about how to arrive at that document because we are asking people to do things that aren't being done here and are not being done broadly across the United States and we purport that they are valuable and we are putting a lot of money and effort into it. We cannot set somebody up or failure; we have to set them up for success. (Q38-2310-5976)

There's going to be in the next probably five years a very interesting bid for tenure and promotion because last year the college hired its first interdisciplinary scholar. That person is not in the School of Art, or in the School of Music, or the Department of Theater and Dance. That person is housed in the college, the College of Visual and Performing Arts. **We have set up a structure that mirrors if she was in one of those departments, the process is structured the same.** The person that would stand in as her departmenture is an associate dean. Nobody told us we couldn't do that. The provost, when I talked to him after we had hired her and brought her on board, he thought it was pretty interesting. He said that when he was Dean of Arts and Sciences he wished he'd thought of that. Because he had many people that came in that after they got here they just really didn't fit within the discipline. He saw the need for that. (Q38-2607-3630)

Everything's in writing...It's in your file. So the review of your dossier isn't just the external letters or the opinion of faculty, it's what's in your dossier. So in your dossier there is an agreement that this course is important to the department and we're going to do it and that you believe it's going to impact your research in a positive way... There's two opportunities, both at the peer review at the department level and the chair does it separately to put that letter in context. And it should be put into context. It should be understood that this was for the benefit of you, you've proven it. There's evidence in your file of outcomes about research. There's evidence in the peer evaluation of four people out of five that's positive, and the faculty has written positive remarks about what you're doing with research. So when it leaves the department, that one outsider voice, or one kind of out-lier that's saying there might be some concerns here, that could be put in a way that's their concern. (Q38-6007-8697)

¹⁵**identify procedures and priorities that impact faculty career development and update as needed**

Now that being said, last year, **I asked the tenure and promotion committee to revise the rules and standards for individuals who are in a department but have substantial teaching or research interest in another department or program. So we just went through a year-long process in developing new tenure guidelines so that at least, people who do something besides their primary discipline have an opportunity to be evaluated fairly regarding that discipline.** So those are kind of the two sides that I'm trying to make sure that our tenure and promotion rule in fact, are aligned with the more interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, transdisciplinary, whichever words you want to use, academy. (Q38-4405-4198)

We felt that it was very important once again to change the language and be explicit about this, rather than just kind of leave it hanging there, because in our field, in our art it's everybody collaborating...In academia, that's a little bit different; art history for example demands the solo authorship of a book as supposed to a co-author of book. Well, if you are engaged in some broader social practice, it's really enhancement to have authors involved. So we included this sentence: "when the candidate role primary or one of shared leadership, collaborative, creative activities will be considered equal to individual efforts." And it was unanimously passed by the full faculty. (Q38-3105-6214)

We've got a new hire now over in art who's engaged with digital matter. **I suspect the policies, procedures within the school of art for guiding tenure and promotion activity are going to have to be revised to suit the nature of his activities.** (Q38-2613-3755)

¹⁶**"I can't just walk in and change it all around..."**

We have what I consider in America this absolutely insane, what I call "tenure cartel"...They are running these conferences every year and you have to go and participate because then you can put them on your CV...It's operating off fear; it's operating off controlling the path to tenure. Because what's happening is, we are so afraid of producing meaningful research that most people are caught in this kind of middle media of a path where they are so afraid of not getting tenure. But these cartels have enlisted them and now you have to come to these conferences, and you have to publish in this media et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Oh, and by the way we're going to charge you to come; we're going to charge to present your original research...**I can't just walk in and change it all around, but I can tell you I'm trying to begin to change the standards. And so yes, how do you get to tenure? Well, what I can tell you is that over the years as the Chair of Architecture I get to begin to set that agenda, right? I get to begin to say what it is I would like the tenure review committee to look at....So as the new chair, I actually have an opinion about what research is; I have an opinion about what publications are. I can actually read most of the articles written by almost forty faculty and understand the line shift of what they are doing. And I can even have a contribution to what they are doing. And so yeah, I think the agenda has to change but I think it has to change from the inside again.** (Title: Q38-3804-1076)

¹⁷**"I feel like my job is to help faculty..."**

I feel like my job is to help faculty get through the bureaucracy of the institution and to find ways to do what they're trying to do. I'm good at that. I know who does what and what happens where and who you have to go to. We just spent this morning, we're working on a new MA in arts and medicine, which is by its nature, an interdisciplinary program even though it'll be single degree

but the degree itself is arts and medicine. The faculty are being assembled from the schools and the college of medicine and different people with different expertise and so on. I've been running interference for the director of that program. We went over to the provost office and took the pre-proposal in and sat down with them and then she said, 'Okay, take care of this and this,' and so this morning we just went over to the grad school, but before we actually roll a formal proposal out, we're going to have a lot of people onboard. Those are the kinds of things I can do, so in terms of this sort of thing, I think it's a matter of when a faculty member says, 'We'd like to do this,' I feel like it's my job to figure out how to help them get it done. **That's going to be different for every situation, whether it's sitting down with the director and helping them brainstorm about how can we cover faculty A's duties and allow them to do this? Is there some way we can swap something out? Is there some way we can take some summer money and put it into your fall budget so that you can hire an adjunct to take this class? Or whatever that happens to be.** (Q18-2513-5183)

¹⁸**Frequent, scheduled interface between often far-flung participants promotes the continued health and growth of these policies, as well as faculty success**

It's one [tenure promotion] dossier for both departments, but it has been looked at by both departments. **I mean, the tenure is housed in [this] college because that's my primary appointment, but every year I also submit it to the School of the Music** and the Director of the School of Music has looked it over, and submitted his comments. It's sent out to faculty. It's a slightly different process because my case is housed in [this] college, but as I'm going up for tenure this fall, it is going to be going to the entire tenured faculty at the School of Music. (Q38-2408-4068)

¹⁹**articulate university values of excellence that apply to traditional and non-traditional scholarship alike**

It basically captures things in three basic principles. One is productivity; relevance, so it has to be relevant to a larger population than just your alum; and then dissemination. So basically, those kind of things. Then we have sort of guidelines that talk about things like for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, your work needs to have at least regional kind of feasibility significance, and you need to be moving towards national significance. And when you get promotion to Full Professor, you should be at least looking at national significance for your work, and maybe international. (Q38-4601-2685)

Really, the question is the same for anybody; we always look for two main things. What is new and innovative, and secondly, what is significant about the work? Those are the two questions that everybody has to answer. (Q38-1206-6434)

The best way to get tenure is to do excellent work; to publish in venues that are going to be highly visible and highly prestigious, to contribute to the department as a good citizen, and to teach well and take good care of your students. And that if you do those things, whether people like you or not, whether they like you to be a little bit more disciplinary, interdisciplinary, you're probably going to be okay. That's the first thing I'd say. The second thing I'd say is why did you become an academic? Who are you? What matters to you? What's important to you? Are you really being paid enough to simply just do what you're told or are you someone who is very worried about what will happen if you don't? (Q38-4507-273)

²⁰**traditional values of prestige and quantification collide with those of impact and quality**
Scientists tend to feel that you can quantify and put a number on productivity. NSF dollars generated or publications multiplied by the impact factor for the publication. There are all kinds of things that you typically see in promotion and tenure, or even at the time of hiring, as to what somebody's potential is based on how their citation index is growing. **I think that the harder thing is to try to assess the impact that's as often as not going to be very qualitative. I think that it's probably incumbent on artists that are working with scientists to recognize that the scientist is always going to be judged to some degree by these standard metrics of publications.** It's fine to do something that might be performance oriented, but I think that eventually the scientist is going to have to publish something. (Q38-2707-2131)

I think also academia has more and more allowed the market to make its decisions for it. And I feel a little ambivalent about that. In other words, if you're having a lot of shows, that's good, even if you're showing the same things over and over again. **It's often the case that you're measured by the number of external opinions you have, rather than the particular nature of the accomplishment and the critical response to that accomplishment.** So I mean, in general, I think that's a good thing. I think it's putting the value on the right things. I think that's what you want, what you're after there. (Q38-3614-8211)

It doesn't surprise me when I look at some our faculty's citation rates that they are almost never cited, even after winning awards for an article. You will have an award-winning article that nobody cited, or two people have cited in ten years. Now, something is amiss here in a field in which bibliographic scholarship is critical and your work is not being read, it is not being used. Probably it is not because you didn't write a good paper, especially for those that have won awards; it is because the volume is so great. So if we collectively said to ourselves, does the world need a thousand more papers on a particular author or artist or what have you?...What would be really great is if our students had more sustained attention in terms of the teaching that we are doing. I think you would find the quality of the scholarship actually go up, and the innovation potential go up. **Right now, junior faculty are under pressure to generate volume and, as a result, they go safe. How fast can they produce papers, and how many.** (Q38-1119-5636)

²¹**“...in sciences or engineering, there's a much shorter timeline...”**

You can argue that penicillin as a cure is something that benefits everyone; you don't have to like it or dislike it, its effects on our physiology are demonstrable to be consistent no matter who we are, right? You have a penicillin shot it helps your physical stuff. To look at a piece of art, we have no yet clear understanding of benefits that are as demonstrable as a penicillin shot might be in the case of an illness. I think that's where it gets tricky. You have an artist who's pursuing an arts practice that leads to a result that has personal interpretation about the quality or the impact of that result. How do we measure that popular vote? Leading edge thinking in the arts often requires people to think differently about the world that they live in. A kind of audience survey of did you like that piece? Is not going to necessarily validate the importance of the work. You think of, in my own discipline, the composer Johann Sebastian Bach, he was writing this stuff for a church and he had to do it every week and he was a craftsman and it was literally a hundred years after he was gone that later composers started to realize what an incredible creative mind was going on there, that the quality of his arts craftsmanship really was at a level that has impacted thinking in music-making for years and years. Now he stands as one of the great thinkers in musical practice. That's the other thing, **in sciences or engineering, there's a much shorter timeline to demonstrable impact, but in**

creative work, who are we going to be listening to a hundred years from now is not something that you can prove in a T and P process. (Q38-2518-5253)

²²**approve appropriate external reviewers**

They [external reviewers] don't necessarily have to be artists that are making that kind of work, but they need to be faculty that are in the environments where those kinds of works are being made. So the question is, I probably could find a print maker or two that works with sciences in a particular way or questions the boundaries between those two departments. But even if they're a print maker but they're in a department that's progressive and there are other faculty in their department that are doing this kind of work that have been successfully promoted, then I can have that person say, okay, you work in this environment, this is the environment. (Q38-6007-8697)

I think that everyone understands that a lot of very important work is going on in the intersections between fields, so they often will ask external reviewers from an adjacent field that is represented by the candidate. For example, a historian might have a political scientist letter, because they worked on political history. I think it's expressed partly through the cognate field, in the partner field, if you will. We are very aware that in most of our departments there are Venn diagrams that describe any particular candidate's work and we want to know how all the points on the Venn diagram think about the original contribution of this scholar. (Q38-1014-1973)

²³**“The search candidates that people talk about...”**

I think it's a dilemma that we constantly put ourselves in because, in fact, we hire folks because of their capacity for creativity....**The search candidates that people talk about and get excited about are the ones that are very creative, not the ones maybe that have a very clear path that they will be able to make contributions in a traditional university research.** (Q38-4911-168)

²⁴**explicitness at the outset for artists and others whose work is not easily accommodated by traditional T/P structures**

Exactly. **I think what I'm seeing is that there's this real disconnect between the training that people get in their art and design terminal degree programs, which are at a masters level typically, and then what's expected in the research university.** They just don't seem to be ready or prepared, and you can't gear up in time...The people that we hire who do fine, are people who have PhDs. They tend to do well. They know what to do. They know how to do it. They've got a dissertation to draw and they've got a next project ready to go...They know how to do research and they know the culture of the economy. (Q38-1120-5656)

I do think that it's not a coincidence that many faculty artists join the university later in the arc of their careers, because they can establish a certain kind of record that keeps their motor going. Keeps the motor of their careers going, after being appointed at the university. **So that, what I do think that the many universities have trouble with, is hiring the newish assistant professor [in the arts] who actually is at the beginning of his or her career. And creating conditions that help that person achieve national and then international recognition along that arc.** If you analogize the typical 29 or 30-year-old scientist who gets the faculty appointment, and the 29 or 30-year-old artist who gets the assistant professor faculty appointment. I think that creating conditions for their advancement to be equivalent is harder, for the reasons I said earlier. Especially for those artistic fields where it's quite hard to achieve national and international recognition and maintain a record of teaching and service at the campus. (Q38-3003-4579)

²⁵ **regulate the time pressure on faculty, taking into account course loads and the responsibilities of those who have joint appointments**

The campus itself has a history of encouraging collaboration and many, if not most people, have joint appointments... [Collaboration is provided for in tenure policy], but it's not entirely resolved, how that's happened. So several of us who were brought into media art and technology were brought in joint appointments in art, which we all enjoy because we all consider ourselves artists as much as anything else. In practice, not just in word. We would consider that whether or not we were at [this university]. **But what it meant for a while was not 75-25 or 50-50, it meant 100 and 100 which of course, you can't magically belong to two departments.** So eventually, the affinity and the sympathies and goodwill is there, there's more focus on where you want to be. So some of us have gone back to art. (Q38-4804-4704)

There is no reason why that collaboration can't occur. **It shouldn't occur as an overload in any case for a junior faculty member. Therefore, it has to be an on-load kind of solution and it should be something that balances the additional challenge of doing a new course or an innovative teaching option against all of the other things that they are worrying about.** I can imagine, with the junior faculty member, a little bit of experimentation. Maybe do one course like that if you can do it on-load. To do several, to do a lot of that where you are putting a lot of energy, is usually not going to be advisable. We do have some junior faculty who are capable and still do their research and creative work, but it is a little risky for any junior faculty member. (Q38-1119-5637)

The areas where you might see some problems would be if you want to do this [collaborative interdisciplinary teaching] to such an extent that the department couldn't rely on you to offer the basic courses it was anticipating you might teach. In that case the department Chair would have the authority to say no, we need you to teach this, this semester. (Q38-3005-4603)

There's way more emphasis on quantity and international performance than there was in the '90s. Service means less and less, but all of us feel like we're being asked to do more and more for less and less credit. And that's a real problem. **I think everybody that I know right now is stumbling under service load—thrilled to teach, up for the fight of doing serious creative work while teaching, but very bowled over by the programs and procedures.** The Dean's offices are themselves increasingly under pressure: dealing with metrics, counting outcomes, showing, improving wherever [it's needed]. All this takes time, and there's no one to do them but faculty. (Q38-3614-8211)

They've done lots of studies here, so [our university] helped jumpstart the cluster thing. So they study this. Some succeed; some fail. **Where things fail is basically, those positions get sucked back up into department... So for young folks, it goes back to being able to play two games at the same time.** (Q38-3913-7574)

²⁶ **“...they usually have to work harder...”**

I think in many cases, young faculty are kind of shy away a little bit from those. It's kind of odd, because in the documentation about the tenure process, collaboration and interdisciplinarity are fairly explicitly encouraged, but it's a little bit, I think people are a little wary about that. I can't think of

any examples where somebody who's been a kind of cross-unit collaborator has not got tenured, but **they usually have to work harder because they have to kind of demonstrate effectiveness in both fields. Somehow we're not terribly good at judging what something, which is a combination of those two things, whether it actually meets the threshold. It's like people doing dual PhDs. You kind of do, it's not 50/50. It's actually 70/70, if we're being realistic. That's a struggle and some people will decide that's just too much.** (Q38-1121-5678)

²⁷**long-term planning for interdisciplinary faculty's tenure review**

The bigger mechanics is creating the culture shift in the department, and creating the understanding of the peer review now has to be broader. **We have to think differently about the people that we're going to use for these term evaluations for [this interdisciplinary faculty member] in two or three years. We've got to start laying the groundwork for him to change the way he writes and speaks about his research profile in art.** (Q38-6007-8697)

²⁸**taking into account the timing of collaborations**

So that moment where you go from Assistant to Associate is another really, it's probably the best opportunity to make that really comprehensive research evaluation. So I have told people, maybe wait a year or two. Really develop the partnership, work up the logistics of what you want to teach [collaboratively], make it a really great course and we'll offer it the semester you get, then the other thing that happens is that you also have this sabbatical there, the potential of a sabbatical. So you also have to think about, well, do you want to offer that course right before you go on sabbatical? Do you have time to integrate it into a new research practice? Let's develop that partnership, talk it out fully. Offer that physics or chemistry partnership course and then go on sabbatical for a semester or a year and really look at your research practice. **So I think timing is very important. The bottom line is that rarely is the answer "no way"; it's usually about "not right now" or finding a way that makes sense for the department or person.** (Q38-6007-8697)

²⁹**roles in teams or partnerships are well-articulated and credited appropriately**

I do believe that collaboration is so helpful in creating good work and advancing ideas. **The advice that I received about whether or not that was a good idea for tenure was that as long as you can distinguish what's is your responsibility versus someone else's than it's not problematic.** (Q38-1305-7131)

Early on in my academic career I was younger and more naive and I did a joint paper with a full professor which my assessment would be I did 75% of the creative contributions and I did about 95% of the work. And I ended up being the second author on it. So this particular individual had the connection to the publisher and I was appreciative of that and I let it go. That was unwise, because in fact in the tenure and promotion process somebody looks at that and says well, the full professor carried him on that ride, you probably didn't do much. **So I think that's important advice if you are in collaboration; the contributions need to be defined and very clear.** (Q38-4911-168)

I would say that in our discipline nationally, collaboration is pretty well understood, and when I'm reviewing cases, whether it's within our own school or when I review cases for other universities across the country, I look at a pattern of leadership in those collaborations. If you're always the eighth person on a grant, that doesn't look very good, but if you're the leader on one and not on the other and they are all sort of pointing in the same direction—basically what I'm looking for is a sense, and this is true across the country, of the promise of national impact for promotion to Associate, and then evidence of national impact for promotion to Full. You can't be spread too thin

to do that. **You have to be actually doing the work, not just the last name attached to every grant. That's what I look for. But the fact that it's collaborative is not a problem in our discipline.** (Q38-1309-7199)

If you are a humanist or artist and you can design one piece of it, but you don't know how to do the engineering piece of it or write the algorithms, you have to collaborate. **The question then is, how can you demonstrate really precisely exactly what your contribution to the collaboration has been? You would probably want to show that you were the lead.** You would want your name to be first on any co-authored articles, but if you're in a discipline where a single-authored book is still the gold standard, then I would advise you not to pursue it until that standard has changed or there's some indication that it's really changed. On the other hand, it would certainly help if you were able to attract large grants. Significant grants for your research with you as the principal investigator on them. That would matter. (Q38-1120-5655)

³⁰**positioning their work to maximize its impact and accessibility to the peer review process—a tricky proposition for some research**

Designers have had a really rough time getting tenure here, I think. I know in my department that's been true. I think it's been somewhat true in other departments because, if you're a landscape architect your terminal degree is going to be an MLA, and you've been trained to make designs of landscapes. **Your avenues for making peer-reviewed high-impact work would be either to do what most scholars in the university do, to write and publish about design work or design pedagogy. Probably a theoretical piece or something about teaching design to national or international design competitions in which you place in the first three, which is extremely difficult, extremely competitive. It's very difficult and very time-consuming. Or you design and build works that have a high profile, that have a high impact, which is also not easy to do...** (Q38-1120-5655)

For example, young historians, it's very difficult to get publication, particularly if your subject matter is pretty obscure...**If you're dealing with the nineteenth century, for example, something a little bit obscure, not to say that the scholarship isn't worthwhile, it's just that not many people are going out and buying these things. And then for young architects, for example, here is a real dilemma because you have to be able to do design work, which means you really do need to have some clients. Where do you have the time to find these people?** And then there's a whole process that could stymie the production of something because you've got the building codes, you've got the banks, you've got all of these things and so, you know, a lot of them end up doing small things like art installation, et cetera because they know they can control them. So it takes much longer for a young architect to get their portfolios together than it does for somebody who writes, for example. (Q38-1701-2519)

³¹**write about work, both to document it and to put unconventional work in a more conventional form**

Being a junior person, I haven't gone through tenure. My sense is that I need to do what is expected of every other member in my English department. Write a book. Produce articles that are squarely in my field, peer-review journal articles. And that all of this stuff in the game lab...**I will say that I've either accurately or inaccurately gotten a sense that it's important for me to not only produce the arts projects and incorporate them into pedagogy curriculum, but also to write about them.** I've been trying to have, in addition to the book project and the articles that are squarely my field, to also have a series of articles that are documenting, evaluating, and analyzing [my

interdisciplinary projects]. In each of those cases, I'd make sure that at least one article comes out of it. (Q38-2206-4849)

I have a friend on campus whose field is Religious Studies and he's in a group that he got together that's part of this stuff on the brain and these new ways of thinking about knowledge and all of these things. There, I think, it's a richer, different kind of conversation, but his work is writing. That's what he does. **If he doesn't get any writing out of it, then I don't know that there's any way to show how this richer conversation or this cross-disciplinary conversation mattered.** I think what I would say, thinking about these kinds of collaborations, is, "Let's sit down. Let's think about what would be goals for how to make that work visible, how to show impact."(Q38-1108-5453)

³²**“somebody gets to be recognized as the PI...”**

The total pitfall within the institutional structure of [our university] is the PI [Principle Investigator] recognition system. If I'm a Principal Investigator on a project, that works out great; Joe gets the \$50,000, Joe gets recognized, Joe does all work. As soon as Joe is working with twelve other people, now somebody gets to be recognized as the PI of the project and we can't have twelve PIs, we can't have two PIs, you got one PI. You can have co-PIs but [here] there is one PI recognized. Yeah, and so often times a lot of the recognition comes back to that documentation that says who really did that project? Well it must have been the guy's name that was PI...To me that undermines collaboration. (Q38-4911-168)

³³**any criteria that have been set for a T/P case at the department or college level travel with it as it goes up to the university level**

There isn't an articulate preference of creative activity above or below research in terms of its value. It's just a general lack of understanding that creative activity has value. **So we spend a lot of time contextualizing that and making sure that there are internal standards for criteria which travel with each case.** (Q38-4904-80)

I think all units have been asked to come up with their own standards of faculty evaluation plan that includes what counts for them. **So that then when you're being reviewed at the higher levels like a school level or college level or university level, hopefully they are looking at that and saying okay, these have been approved and this is what counts for them.** So therefore even if it wouldn't count for my discipline, here it is and that's okay. (Q38-5203-6061)

So in that case, then the case is made that somebody has a tenure home some place and the tenure home would be in one school or the other but then at the time of promotion to tenure, the opposite school or the other school contributes letters. **There is actually somebody going up for promotion in tenure right now who is in School of Design who works in Designing Health Environments and so has actually worked across disciplines within the university. So the Director of the Design School requested letters from faculty or administrators in those other disciplines to be included internally in the tenure file.** So that's how we go here. (Q38-4903-68)

³⁴**use disciplinary language to describe their work effectively to more discipline-focused committee members**

I would coach [a pre-tenure print-making faculty member] that when you do the interdisciplinary, anchor the language in print-making...There is a disciplinary legacy that you have to contend with. **If you go collaborate and do the data with the engineer, run like the wind and do it, but you need to anchor that activity within the legacy of print-making** and you can... You can re-define

and push your field ahead, when you jump into those kinds of activities. If you jump into them and you dismiss the legacy, that's when I think you'll get into big trouble. (Q38-2616-3833)

So for example, if a dance person was working with somebody in the School of Medicine, let's say, on bio feedback or other kinds of ways of embodying consciousness and working with that from electrodes and whatever, they have to rewrite how that is creative expression. I mean, it takes some massaging but I think it could happen. (Q38-4004-6572)

³⁵**Artists and those working across disciplines often face unique challenges in framing their candidacies, simply because of epistemological differences between their modes of scholarship and more familiar ones**

It's being in a performative state, as an artist, not to be so much in a presentation state. That often makes, I think, actually a very humble way of presenting. On the other side, if I'm looking at my historians and philosophers, they are in a more combative mode... Since it's much more aggressive, they are very easily in the stronger position. And it ends in staring at each other and just saying, "What are you doing?" The difference is that artists tried to bridge that divide and to understand intellectual thinking, the more linear thinking. And are able to understand much more of that side, but the historians haven't been as able to understand the other side and are asserting themselves in ways that are extremely disturbing... **I think it's an epistemic difference. So there are two different epistemes at work and the artist episteme is neither well-respected, nor has it been well-explained. And it needs support.** So I've been comparing it to diversity thinking... but epistemic diversity is not even a theme yet. (Q38-4106-2851)

You'll still have to pass the test of peer review, so other artists working in research space would have to assess this and see if it's appropriate methodology or whether the methodology is innovative. **I would say this is where artists have a lot of trouble expressing method or approach, as opposed to just saying this is the result.** I think artists have a hard time explaining how they get to their result. (Q38-1206-6434)

I was bold in writing in my statement that I like to do recreational computer science. I am probably the first to use that term, but recreational mathematics is the well-known area. Martin Gardner was the prototype of a recreational mathematician. He wrote a *Scientific American* column for decades and inspired a lot of people to get into mathematics just by looking at fun puzzles and magic tricks and things like that from a mathematical perspective. We like to do that from a computational perspective. That's our twist. We've studied magic tricks, we've studied puzzles, video games, things like that. That was part of my tenure case and it seemed to be well received. People were excited about the idea of Martin Gardner but from a computational perspective, which I was glad to hear. It was a bit risky from my perspective, but it was honest. (Q38-1706-2607)