

Tenure Standards Committee Report

PREPARED FOR:
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST, DUKE UNIVERSITY
PREPARED BY:
DUKE TENURE STANDARDS COMMITTEE, 2017-2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. Introduction: Work of the Committee**
- 2. Existing Policies and Practices**
- 3. Diversity**
- 4. Public Scholarship**
- 5. Digital Scholarship**
- 6. The Arts**
- 7. Conclusion**

1. INTRODUCTION: Work of the Committee

The baseline rationale for creation of the Tenure Standards Committee (TSC) was established in *Together Duke*, the University's academic strategic plan approved in May 2017, as stated by Provost Sally Kornbluth:

We recognize that **increasingly diverse forms of scholarship** have not been taken into account in our appointment, promotion, and tenure processes. While progress has been made on the consideration of interdisciplinary efforts, criteria for rigor and impact in less traditional, alternative, or emerging forms of scholarly expression, including online education, public scholarship, and policy outreach, have not been well defined. Furthermore, while **new modes of communicating scholarship** have allowed for the work of the university to be expressed creatively to a broader audience, these contributions have also not been adequately considered...The Provost will charge a committee **to re-evaluate the criteria for tenure and promotion** to clearly define criteria that reward the many scholarly activities we value as a community.¹

This was further articulated and reinforced by President Vincent Price in his October 2017 inaugural address:

We must prevent our research from ossifying around practices that were designed to confront another century's challenges and that limit our ability to confront the emerging problems of today...Are we bold enough now to invent more productive and sustainable ways to organize and catalyze scholarship around pressing problems...flexible enough to alter our expectations of what "counts" as valuable research?²

The President and Provost see these issues as central to the multi-faceted nature of Duke's overall mission. Indeed, Duke's importance and that of universities as vital social institutions—locally, nationally, globally—is only increasing amidst the challenges of the 21st century world. While far from the only factor in Duke's ability to fulfill its intellectual mission and public role, the excellence of Duke's faculty and the innovation of their scholarship is a crucial one.

Within this context the Provost's direct charge to TSC was "to ensure Duke's commitment to diverse and innovative scholarship" by "studying the parameters within which promotion and tenure are awarded today, and consider if and what changes are called for," including:

- Identifying and defining what types of knowledge creation and dissemination should form the scholarly basis for tenure and promotion at a twenty-first century research university like Duke;
- Creating rubrics for evaluating and assessing excellence in identifiable categories of knowledge creation and dissemination, including measures of engagement and impact;

¹ <https://strategicplan.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2017/09/TogetherDuke-Sept2017.pdf> (emphases in original)

² <https://today.duke.edu/2017/10/vincent-e-price-again-we-are-called-upon-answer-challenges-day>

- Considering how to provide appropriate guidance for annual reviews of tenure track faculty, as well as more significant pre-tenure reviews (e.g., in third year or fourth year depending on the school);
- Considering changes to the guidelines for the tenure and promotion process (around formation of tenure and promotion committees, selection of evaluators, and provision of guidance to letter writers);
- Establishing appropriate mechanisms of outreach and engagement with schools and Duke faculty to ensure broad input in its deliberations.

We also took into account interrelationships of the tenure and promotion process and standards with other major *Together Duke* initiatives and broad University strategic priorities.

Professors Anne Allison (Cultural Anthropology, Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies) and Bruce Jentleson (Sanford School of Public Policy, Political Science) were appointed as co-chairs. Committee membership (16 full members, 7 ex officio) was broadly representative of the University (Appendix 1). The full committee met at roughly monthly intervals throughout the 2017-18 academic year (Appendix 2), with additional consultations within the five subcommittees: Existing Policies and Practices; Diversity; Public Scholarship and Engagement; Digital and Other New Technologies; and The Arts (Appendix 3).

Over the course of the 2017-18 academic year, the TSC co-chairs met with the Deans' Cabinet, Academic Programs Committee, the Board of Trustees' Academic Affairs Committee, and the Academic Council (Appendix 4). In addition, committee members liaised with their departments and schools. Throughout the process committee members and particularly the co-chairs consulted with individual faculty members and administrators.

The Report is based on these consultations and committee deliberations as well as external outreach to other universities, scholarly professional associations, and other faculty to learn from their efforts to address tenure standards and connected university issues in the 21st century. We also conducted substantial research on tenure and promotion standards in higher education and other relevant literatures to establish analytic and empirical bases for our policy recommendations.

The report is structured into five sections corresponding to the five subcommittees noted above. In each section we provide analysis of the relevant issues and policy recommendations. Our understanding is that at the next stage of the process a more executive summary-type document will be developed highlighting the principal recommendations. This document along with the full Report will provide the basis for review by relevant committees and University administrators during the 2018-19 academic year.

In both its scope and limits, our report manifests TSC's mandate to focus on the research component of tenure and promotion, and not teaching and service. The rationale was that the issues related to the research component were more than ample for the nine-month timeline set for this committee's work. While teaching and service enter into the report here and there, they did not receive focused attention. We encourage follow-up efforts addressing teaching and

service that will affirm their importance and review criteria and strategies for faculty excellence in these domains.

The co-chairs want to acknowledge the conscientious commitment and creative engagement of committee members. We also express our gratitude to graduate students Kerry Condon and Jake Silver for their valuable research assistance; Hallie Knuffman, Chief of Staff for the Provost's Office, for vital administrative assistance; Paolo Mangiafico and David Hansen of Duke Libraries for their presentation to the committee and other Scholars@Duke assistance; faculty and administrators at other universities with whom we consulted; and many others within Duke who contributed to our work.

2. EXISTING POLICIES AND PRACTICES

As part of the Tenure Standards Committee’s overall charge “to re-evaluate the criteria for tenure and promotion to clearly define the criteria that reward the many scholarly activities we value as a community,” the Existing Policies and Practices Subcommittee has focused on the following central questions:

- In the current practices and policies of tenure and promotion, where do problems exist, and how might they be attended to?
- In the general structure and process of tenure and promotion at Duke, are there improvements that could be implemented to strengthen and facilitate the system?
- What methods is Duke currently using to assess excellence; What are the problems/challenges/controversies with each of these; Are there alternatives (whether in lieu of, or addition to) we might consider?

In the work of this subcommittee, the principal issues fall roughly into two categories: **procedural** improvements in the Duke APT process, and **substantive** issues concerning metrics and other measures and criteria for assessing excellence. The analysis and recommendations put forward here are based on input from subcommittee members, discussion with the full committee, surveying of members’ own departments and schools, input from faculty outside the committee, and additional research.

Procedural Issues

While there may be multiple ways in which the APT process could be improved, the following are recommendations that came to the forefront in our deliberations:

1. **Changes for greater clarity in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3, Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure.**³ These recommendations (see Appendix 5) were developed by working with colleagues some of whom are not on our committee but, having served on APT, had started this effort prior to the formation of our committee. They are presented as minimalist changes to help clarify issues that have arisen in the past, but do not include new recommendations being made in this Report.
2. **Provide an annual training session for all members of APT** to cover a range of issues, both general problems that arise and also those issues specifically raised in our report. These include: concerns about the reliability and validity of commonly used metrics (see below), adequately/appropriately accounting for public scholarship as well as digital and new technologies, issues pertinent to the arts, and general patterns of diversity-related bias in peer-review publications (see section 3).
3. **Establish clear expectations for new junior faculty** regarding their research in consultation with chairs both at the time of hire and during the review after the first three-year contract bearing on such matters as: the disciplinary/interdisciplinary nature of their

³ Thanks to Joe Izatt and Ashish Arora as well as current and former APT members who are not members of our committee for their work on this and other parts of this section.

- scholarship, their usage of digital or other new technologies, the extent/form of their public scholarship, and if and how they are engaged in creative production in the arts.
4. **Clearer guidelines and standards for third year reviews.** While the third-year review is the most formal assessment junior faculty receive from their departments regarding their trajectory towards tenure, there is vast variability in how this is practiced across different schools and departments. We recommend clearer guidelines and common standards by striking a balance between the collegial motivation to be supportive and encouraging, and the direct articulation of expectations for a strong tenure file.
 5. **Clarifying changes in the Tenure Review Committee Report Template** (https://provost.duke.edu/sites/all/files/Review_Committee_Report_Template-for-Tenure-Candidate-Revised.pdf). There is a certain amount of overlap in the template as currently written. That is, while there are some distinctive aspects to Sections 2 (Candidate's professional development, current research interests and likely future directions), 3 (Significance of the candidate's research/artistic agenda in relation to recent intellectual developments in the field), and 4 (Candidate's trajectory to date, including specific contributions, their impact and breadth), these sections also bear some overlap that can be confusing for the review committees and can lead to inconsistencies across reviews. For example, how to assess the candidate's professional development (2) without also talking about their trajectory (4)? Or, speaking to the significance of the research agenda (3) without taking into account specific contributions (4)? And, once (2) and (3) are done, what is left for (4)? We recommend that this framework be revised for greater distinctiveness across the categories. We also recommend clarifying two of the requested attachments ("Description of the broad field and its role in the discipline" and "Size of field and subfield") which, as currently stand, have some redundancy.
 6. **Changes in Annual Scholarly Activity Reports (Trinity, Pratt, Sanford, and perhaps other Schools).** The annual scholarly reports faculty filled out in December should be more closely coordinated with Scholars@Duke to ensure symmetry across types of information solicited and then disseminated. The section on research should make clear that public scholarship and use of digital and new technologies are to be included. There also should be a specific prompt for interdisciplinary work and collaboration. In addition, the section on teaching and curriculum should include prompts about involvement in signature Duke pedagogical programs (e.g., Duke Engage, Bass Connections).
 7. **Book-based disciplines.** Some "book-based" disciplines expressed concern that the very listing of a book as a single item in the top-ten itemization grossly undervalues the research and scholarly work entailed. This can arise as an issue both in departments that are interdisciplinary with mixes of senior colleagues from journal-based and book-based disciplines, as well as in single-discipline departments where there is substantial variation across subfields. Another issue for book-based disciplines are the budget-based cutbacks by academic presses, which makes publication of a single-authored book, particularly for junior faculty, increasingly difficult.
 8. **External reviewers.** Several departments have noted the increasing difficulty of obtaining external reviewers; e.g., some humanities in which the pools of potential reviewers have been decreasing and the same people are being tapped with more requests than they can agree to. Further complicating the availability of reviewers are such factors as increased co-authorships and other collaborations (restricting those who can be called upon), and finding appropriate fits for interdisciplinary scholarship. Also, the current

standard (not always implemented by departments, however) is that letter writers should be chosen on the basis of being distinguished in the field (rather than the sub-field of the candidate) and, ideally, from peer institutions. On this issue, the committee does not have a specific recommendation other than raising awareness of the issue.

- 9. Non-collegiality and poor teaching records.** Several departments reported disagreement among review committees, and in some instances more broadly among departmental faculty, over how to handle evidence of non-collegiality or poor teaching records among faculty under review. Having departments establish a policy of minimum standards for teaching, service, and collegiality within shared university-wide norms and practices should be considered.

Given the broad scope of the committee’s mandate and its limited timeframe, it is beyond our reach to fully flesh out these recommendations. Our understanding is that those recommendations that are accepted will be further developed by a follow-up committee.

Substantive Issues⁴

Our focus here is on the reliability and validity of commonly used metrics and measures of scholarly excellence. Other subcommittees conducted initial work on additional metrics and measures that relate to, respectively, public scholarship, digital and other new technologies, and the arts. It is to be stressed how important carefully selecting a comparison set of peers to whom the candidate is compared is for evaluation. This is a point that may need further stressing to both external evaluators and to the departments putting up candidates for promotion.

Most essential is resisting overreliance on metrics. We cannot stress enough the importance of careful and engaged readings of files.

Citation Counts

As Cassidy Sugimoto and Vincent Lariviere stress in their recent book, *Measuring Research: What Everyone Needs to Know*, citation counts attest to the quality and scope of a work’s impact, yet their reliability and validity can also be subject to a number of mitigating factors:⁵

- Citation counts can produce perverse incentives favoring incremental scholarship and “bandwagon-style research” that is more conducive to high citation counts than intellectually innovative work.
 - Papers presenting work that is well-known or heavily studied (by numerous others) tend to get high citation counts certainly in the short term over a few years.
 - Innovative work often takes more time, and consequently can mean fewer publications, and fewer citations.

⁴ Thanks to committee members Merlise Clyde, David Dunson and Kevin Hoover for their memos that helped provide the basis for this section.

⁵ Cassidy Sugimoto and Vincent Lariviere, *Measuring Research: What Everyone Needs to Know* (New York: Oxford University press, 2018).

- Factors other than scholarly excellence can contribute to citation counts.
 - Concerns are expressed in various disciplines about “citation cartels,” informal and tacit dynamics by which “groups of authors cite each other disproportionately more than they do other groups of authors that work on the same subject.”⁶ Given advances in technology, reports indicate that citation cartels have increased in recent years.⁷
 - Self-citation can also skew citation counts.
- There may be a tradeoff between the scope, and the consistency or reliability of the database on which citation counts are calculated.
 - For example, the Web of Science is more consistent and reliable in the way it gathers and reports citations. However, its coverage is limited mainly to journals and specifically to journals that meet certain standards set by the database provider: a process that may or may not relate well to the goals of the tenure process.
 - In contrast, Google Scholar picks up more sources of citations (not just journals, but books, conference proceedings, working papers, patents, etc.) but is more likely to pick up sources that are of poor quality, and thus less reflective of the importance of the cited scholar’s work.
 - Some databases allow authors to verify and even curate their own publication lists (such as Google Scholar), while others do not (such as Web of Science), and some are not even reviewable by regular faculty members (such as Academic Analytics).

*Journal Impact Factor*⁸

As with citation counts, impact factor is a major consideration in evaluating a scholar’s excellence in and on the field. And yet a number of problems exist with this rubric as well:

- Impact factor is usually tallied by relying, to some degree at least, on citation counts and thus incurs the same risks as outlined above. Journals publishing trendy work on topics closely related to what many people are publishing on will tend to have higher impact factors. And, even within a field, journals focusing on subfields that publish at a higher rate will be greatly favored.
- The time taken to produce scholarship greatly differs by field. Humanities and certain subsets of social science often require a longer citation window to generate impact.⁹ The journal impact factor is short term, and leads to smaller impact factors for even top journals in a field that publishes at a slower rate.

⁶ <https://blog.frontiersin.org/2017/01/03/citations-cartels-an-emerging-problem-in-scientific-publishing/>

⁷ <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/journal-citation-cartels-on-the-rise/2005009.article>

⁸ The journal IF is calculated by dividing the total number of times articles in a journal were cited by the number of articles in the journal. A journal’s IF is calculated for a specific year (Y) by counting all the citations in that year to articles in that journal in years Y-1 and Y-2 and then dividing by the number of articles appearing in the journal in years Y-1 and Y-2. For example, the 2015 IF for journal X would be 10.0 if on average papers published in journal X in 2013 or 2014 are cited 10 times in 2015 across journals included in the index.

⁹ Sugimoto and Lariviere, *Measuring Research*.

- High journal impact factors tend to be a function of a small number of articles that get high citation counts, and are thus not necessarily indicative of a general pattern that many or most articles in the journal are frequently cited. There thus can be a “tail effect” of an article benefiting from the journal impact factor even though the particular article does not get cited that often.
- A recent study by Lozano et al. looking at three different disciplines concludes that the link between high quality articles and journal impact factor “has been weakening steadily since the beginning of the digital age . . . the percentage of top papers coming from the top journals has been decreasing.” Overwhelmingly, the article concludes that “the IF is losing its significance as a measure of journal quality” and “there is no legitimate basis for extending the IF of a journal to its papers, much less to individual researchers.”¹⁰
- Some professional disciplinary associations have raised these and related concerns. For example, the American Society of Cell Biology issued a statement (the “San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment”—DORA)¹¹ highly critical of the journal impact factor.
- **In some fields, journals are not clearly ranked. One proposal we recommend for helping overcome this is to ask external letter writers in such fields to comment on the quality and impact of the journals in which the candidate has published.**

*h-index as a scholar-specific indicator*¹²

- *H*-index, like citation count and impact factor, is a highly used rubric to measure scholarly excellence. The *h*-index measures scholarly quantity or breadth of publication against quality of publication, where quality is meant to be captured by the influence of a paper as measured by citations. The *h*-index becomes bigger not just from attracting more citations or adding publications, but from advancing on both fronts at once; e.g., a publication with an extraordinarily large number of citations will not affect the overall *h*-index unless the marginal rank is moved. First created in the context of physical sciences, it has been used in fields that publish mostly in journals and have well-developed citation practices; these include virtually all natural sciences, mathematical sciences, and in social sciences such as economics. In humanities and those social sciences where books are more important, and in other fields that rely on a different publishing medium than journal articles (computer science, for example, which relies more on conference proceedings, which are not as well-indexed), the *h*-index has been less meaningful. But even in heavily journal-based fields (such as economics) or mixed books-and-articles fields (like philosophy), reliance upon the *h*-index is highly variable; some evaluators and committee members use them and some don't. As a rubric of measurement, the *h*-index may have some diagnostic value but it, too, has been found to be problematic.

¹⁰ G.A. Lozano, V. Larivière, and Y. Gingras, (2012), “The weakening relationship between the impact factor and papers' citations in the digital age.” *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 63(11), 2140-2145.

¹¹ <https://sfdora.org/>

¹² A scholar's publications are rank ordered with the most cited publication ranked 1, the next most cited 2, and so on up to the total number of publications. The *h*-index is then defined to be *the rank number of the publication with the highest rank number such that the number of citations for that publication is greater than or equal to the rank*

- The h -index imposes an implicit weighting on publications versus number of citations. This weighting may not be one that the university would want to explicitly endorse. There are inherent differences across fields. There are a number of reasons for this including the following: total citations are positively related to the size of the field itself; citation practices differ widely across fields; typical publications in some fields are shorter research reports (so that a long-term project may produce a large number of publications) while, in other fields, typical publications are longer and fewer in number potentially encapsulating more of the overall project.
- Within a particular field, there also can be differences across subfields. Some subfields are small and the practitioners mainly cite within the subfield itself. They may also have distinct publication patterns. For example, the history of economics is a subfield within economics, but whereas most economics is exclusively a journal-article field, the history of economics is mixed between articles and books.
- There are also variations that become much more specific to the scholar herself. For example, some scholars who have pioneered a new field/subfield with huge impact can still have a low h -index. The 1989 Nobel economist Trygve Haavelmo had an h -index (18) lower than many other accomplished economists with lower impact on the discipline.
- Google Scholar sometimes differently treats what is effectively the same cited work depending on how the work is recorded by the citing source. This may reduce h -indices; if a paper that would be ranked below (e.g., would be more cited than) the marginally ranked paper is effectively split into two or more papers that are ranked above it. Equally, a paper rich in citations may have enough citations that, when divided, each of the versions has sufficient citations to raise the h -index.
- What is to be stressed here is the need to take quantitative measures in a qualitative context. That is, rather than just taking h -index at face value, other considerations must be factored in such as selecting the right comparison of peers – and, again, careful and engaged reading of the file.

*Eigenfactor and Article Influence Scores*¹³

Similar to impact factor, the Eigenfactor measures “total importance” of a journal and is used most heavily, as with h -index, by those disciplines that centrally publish in journals.

- The purpose of these metrics is to estimate the relative influence of journals based on cross-citation data from a network of journals, and is similar to the idea of Google’s page rank. The scores are derived by measuring the number of times that articles published in a census period (one year) provide citations to papers published during the target window (5 years) and are iteratively weighted by their importance, such that journals like Nature or Science are weighted more heavily than less influential journals.

¹³ Eigenfactor is influenced by the number of articles published by the journal, so that increasing the number of articles published in a journal will often increase the score (PLOS One has a larger Eigenfactor than Nature as a result of the journal size.) When Eigenfactor is adjusted for the number of articles published in each journal, it is called the Article Influence Score.

- Journals with a narrow focus will typically have lower Eigenfactors. Because the Eigenfactor depends on the size of the network, journals in smaller fields may have lower scores. Journals that might be highly influential within a field may have lower scores than journals that are more translational.
- As with Impact Factors, the differential time lag across fields for articles to have a significant impact also means that it may be meaningless to compare Eigenfactor scores across journals in different disciplines.

Humanities and Interpretive Social Sciences

- Many of these metrics apply less well to the humanities and interpretive social sciences, for which the role of digital and new technologies is especially important.

Interdisciplinary Metrics

- While Duke promotes interdisciplinary and globally collaborative scholarship in its mission statement (as do a number of individual departments and schools), and while substantial progress has been made in enhancing valuation of such work in the tenure and promotion process, there remains a sense that more needs to be done.
- Research shows that current metrics do not take into account the growing prevalence of collaboration and interdisciplinary research.¹⁴ Interdisciplinary scholarship still can run contrary to current practices that reward sole authorship, high citation counts, and overall competition over collaboration.
- Measures suggested in the higher education literature for enhancing valuation of collaboration include references in relevant procedural documents to “discipline-spanning scholarship” and use of network analysis in assessing contribution and impact.¹⁵

Diversity and Biases

- A number of studies show inherent bias based on gender, race and related factors in the peer-review publication process. The Diversity report in the next section more fully addresses this.

Summary Recommendation

While the above metrics should continue to be used, assessments at all stages—hiring, three-year review, tenure, promotion to full—should take account of their limits and flaws as indicators of scholarly excellence. Tendencies to over-rely on them and reduce engaged and careful reading of files – whether by ad hoc committees, departmental/School reviews, or APT – need to be resisted. What is to be stressed here is the need to take quantitative measures in a qualitative

¹⁴ Sugimoto and Lariviere, pp. 59-61.

¹⁵ Idem.; D. Berrett, “Tenure Across Borders,” *Inside Higher Ed*, July 22, 2011, https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/07/22/usc_rewards_collaborative_and_interdisciplinary_work_among_faculty; J.T. Klein and H.J. Falk-Krzesinski, “Interdisciplinary and collaborative work: Framing promotion and tenure practices and policies,” *Research Policy* (2017), 46, 1055-1061, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048733317300446>

context. That is, rather than just taking any one rubric at face value, other considerations must be factored in such as selecting the right comparison of peers – and, again, careful and engaged reading of the file.

Attentiveness to issues regarding diversity, and to scholarship involving digital and new technologies as well as public engagement, must also be given—as we turn to now.

3. DIVERSITY

Rationale

The establishment for this subcommittee stems from the university's commitment to diversity and inclusion at all levels of the institution. As laid out in the Board of Trustees' Mission Statement:

“Duke University is...to promote a deep appreciation for the range of human difference and potential, a sense of the obligations and rewards of citizenship, and a commitment to learning, freedom and truth.”

This “deep appreciation of human difference” spans the Duke community from students to staff to faculty. The bases for tenure and promotion, then, must also keep in mind this “deep appreciation” as a part of their role to secure fair and unbiased review of faculty from various genders, ethnicities, races, sexualities, nationalities, abilities, and ages.

This commitment to diversity and inclusion within the tenure review process, however, suffers from a major caveat: the factor most heavily considered in the review process—peer-reviewed publication—is subject to various forms of discrimination. Although the peer-review process is taken as the baseline rubric for scholastic impact, various scholars have studied the ways that factors such as gender, race, place of birth, or “prestige” of affiliated institution can impede one's chances of publication, regardless of the quality of their research. Without proper review of these structural complications within publishing and hiring, such forms of discrimination scale up to the tenure review process as well. Part of the work of this subcommittee has been to consider how to address such biases in order to ensure that the tenure/promotion review process is as equitable as possible. The subcommittee discussed making a commitment to diversity (of some kind) part of the dossier of every faculty being considered for promotion and tenure. But, finding this beyond the scope of the current deliberations, we tabled this proposal for the time being.

Many, if not most, universities mention a commitment to diversity at the outset of tenure review compendia. Drawing on research that outlines biases, or misperceptions, that can be at work in the hiring process—that a department must lower its standards to find a diversity hire, for example¹⁶—a number of universities, including Northwestern,¹⁷ Vanderbilt,¹⁸ and Wisconsin,¹⁹ have guidelines regarding unconscious bias—and how to address it—during job searches. Apart from the hiring process, however, we have not yet found universities or departments that specifically confront how certain structural realities within publishing and academia may affect the dossier of a candidate under review. This is the work we attempt here.

¹⁶ D.G. Smith, “How to diversify the faculty.” *Academe*, American Association of University Professors, September-October 2000, 86:5., <https://cpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/blogs.uoregon.edu/dist/b/323/files/2011/05/How-to-diversify-the-faculty-xwuv45.pdf>

¹⁷ <http://www.northwestern.edu/provost/faculty-resources/faculty-search-committees/unconscious-bias.html>

¹⁸ <https://vanderbilt.edu/provost/resources-faculty/Unrecognized-Biases-and-Assumptions.pdf>

¹⁹ http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/SearchBook_Wisc.pdf

Definition

- Scholars from fields across the physical, human, and social sciences have examined whether, and how, discrimination particular to their own disciplines crops into the review process at the time of promotion and tenure. Examples of such studies, and the kinds of bias discovered, include:
 - Within psychology, male names on curriculum vitae are deemed to have superior qualities.²⁰
 - In anthropology, while women produce a substantial proportion of the work available for citation, the proportion of women authors cited is lower than would be expected on that basis.²¹
 - Peer-reviewed physical medicine journals have demonstrated a preferential attachment to manuscripts from US institutions,²² compromising the research of non-American academics, especially those whose first language is not English.²³
 - Women in economics departments become less likely to obtain tenure the more that they co-author peer-reviewed articles.²⁴ The pattern was also measured for sociology and did not hold there. Another study found that women as sole authors face higher standards and other inherent biases in the peer review processes for economics journals.²⁵
 - Top political science journals do not reflect the subfields more highly represented by female scholars, conferring a publishing disadvantage for women.²⁶ Two other studies of the international relations subfield found biases in citations of articles written by female scholars.²⁷
 - Manuscripts submitted by women to top information science journals are not recommended for publication as often as those of their male colleagues.²⁸
 - Racially biased citation patterns have been found in a number of disciplines including philosophy, anthropology, sociology and communications.²⁹

²⁰ Steinpreis, R.E., Anders, K.A., & Ritzke, D. 1999. "The impact of gender on the review of the curricula vitae of job applicants and tenure candidates: A national empirical study." *Sex Roles* 41(7/8), 509– 528.

²¹ Lutz, Catherine. 1990. "The Erasure of Women's Writing in Sociocultural Anthropology." *American Ethnologist* vol. 17(4): 611-627, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1525/ae.1990.17.4.02a00010/abstract>

²² Ernst, E., & Kienbacher, T. 1991. "Chauvinism." *Nature* 352: 560.

²³ Herrera, A.J. 1999. "Language bias discredits the peer-review system." *Nature* 397(6719), 467.

²⁴ Sarsons, H. 2017. "Gender Differences in Recognition for Group Work." Accessed from https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/sarsons/files/full_v6.pdf.

²⁵ Erin Hengel, "Publishing While Female: Are Women Held to Higher Standards: Evidence from Peer Review," *Cambridge Working Paper Economics 1753*, December 2017, <https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1810/270621/cwpe1753.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

²⁶ Teele, D.L. & Thelen, K. 2017. "Gender in the Journals: Publication Patterns in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(2), 433–447.

²⁷ Maliniak D., Powers, R. and Walter, B., "The Gender Citation Gap in International Relations," *International Organization* (Fall 2013), <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43282090?seq=1#>; Mitchell, S. McL., Lange, S. and Brus, H., "Gendered Citation Patterns in International Relations Journals," *International Studies Perspectives* (November 2013), <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/insp.12026/full>.

²⁸ Demarest, B., Freeman, G., & Sugimoto, C. 2014. "The Reviewer in the Mirror: Examining Gendered and Ethnicized Notions of Reciprocity in Peer Review." *Scientometrics* 101, 717–735.

²⁹ Victor Ray, "The Racial Politics of Citation," *Inside Higher Ed*, April 27, 2018, <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2018/04/27/racial-exclusions-scholarly-citations-opinion>

Such conditions cannot be ignored when weighing publication output at the times of hiring and conducting promotion review for faculty. Our recommendations are consistent with the NSF-funded RIT (Rochester Institute of Technology) “Reimagining Our Careers and Campus Cultures” report³⁰ that outlines a number of areas involved in assessing a candidate’s dossier that may entail unconscious bias:

- Recommendation letters and gendered language therein.
- The gendered and racial dynamics of teaching evaluations.
- The invisible labor that a candidate performs in the form of service commitments.

Our interest in these aspects of the review process regards the potentially unequal conditions that faculty-under-review may face in conducting, publishing, and distributing their research. The tenure review process must account for the ways such factors may impinge upon the output and type of material that candidates have produced; and to sufficiently take account of such factors when assessing a candidate for tenure and promotion.

Recommended Policy

There are multiple caveats in trying to identify how structural bias affects individual scholars. How do we assess, for example, whether or to what degree bias has affected a particular case in the tenure and promotion process at Duke? At this very basic level, there was considerable difference of view amongst the members of our committee. Some feel that at Duke this has not been an issue except in the case of identity-based scholarship. Others, however, feel that, as is true in the academy generally, bias has certainly played a role in the promotion and tenure process. But, even if we were to proceed according to the possibility of bias, how would this be determined, or even just looked into? And whose responsibility would it be to consider whether particular journals, presses, or reviewers may be susceptible to, or have a history of, being biased in their review processes?

The approach we recommend here is as an initial step. Acknowledging that there is, or could be, bias of various sorts hampering the fairness and equity of the tenure and promotion review process, we seek to make all those parties involved in the process more cognizant of, and accountable to, such factors of discrimination. Our goals are, that in assessing the scholarship and dossiers of faculty, that the Duke community:

- Be constantly aware of how unconscious bias may creep into documents in the tenure and review process.
- Be reflexive about how we are all subject to unconscious bias, and make active efforts to confront it.
- Recognize how the differential status of committee members affects collective deliberations and conversations.
- Periodically re-evaluate the review process by which departments and APT account for diversity and take note of aspects that should change.

³⁰ The Advance RIT Project, Reimagining our Career and Campus Culture, National Science Foundation. <https://nsfadvance.rit.edu/assets/pdf/promotionandtenureworkshopunconsciousbiashandout%2030nov2016.pdf>

Recommendations at the Departmental Level

As exemplified by studies on discrimination in the review process, unconscious bias within particular promotion and tenure cases hinges upon particular disciplinary cultures. We recommend therefore that individual departments develop a robust awareness of how differences of multiple types in their own fields may impact upon both productivity and the ways in which it is reviewed and assessed at the time of promotion for their faculty. Rather than making it a requirement that departments submit a report on the state of bias and discrimination in their field to accompany promotion files (a matter the committee was divided on, but overall against), it is recommended that departments, as a general matter and separate from any particular case, undertake a review of relevant studies in their disciplines such as those cited. Such a review could include:

- Identification of their field's most prominent journals as well as the types of subdisciplines it disproportionately publishes (for, as scholars have pointed out, gender, ethnicity, race, and nationality tend to correspond to certain subdisciplines that certain journals do not publish).³¹
- Studies done that break down the demographics of the field to the end of considering how such demographics play out in publication within the field's major journals, major academic presses for books, and in tenured positions in the field.
- Review of policies and mechanisms the department already has in place for addressing issues of diversity; and consider how departmental activities and tasks (such as mentorship roles, reading or working groups, leadership positions) may reflect or exclude certain contingencies.
- Make note of any outstanding issues or events either within the field or within the specific department that may reflect issues of bias—whether by race, gender, sexuality, disability.

In particular cases where deemed warranted, concerns about such bias should be raised, perhaps including appending relevant studies to departmental reports. But, more than anything, it is critically important for departments to develop, and exercise, awareness of how bias may be impacting the scholarly output of its faculty, and how this gets evaluated and reviewed at the time of promotion.

Recommendations at the APT Level

Universities nationwide address the issue of diversity in multiple ways. University of Wisconsin, for example, attempts to do this in diverse representation of appointment/promotion/tenure committees so that evaluation benefits from a diversity of perspectives.³² But diverse representation of members alone is insufficient; nor should the university excessively rely on those representing diverse groups to perform this responsibility. What a number of universities also mandate is that faculty involved in promotion and tenure processes attend a yearly workshop on bias and discrimination. As RIT puts it, universities should “require committee members to

³¹ Teele, D.L. & Thelen, K. 2017. "Gender in the Journals: Publication Patterns in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(2), 433-447.

³² http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/SearchBook_Wisc.pdf

participate in a bias literacy workshop. Research provides evidence that educational interventions lead to a reduction in unconscious bias.”³³ We agree that it is important for all APT members to have a working literacy of diversity, as both a value of the university and as a factor that may have impacted dossiers under review (in a variety of ways including the forms of unconscious bias outlined above). The committee was divided on, but overall favorable to, recommending that APT members undergo training on the issues of diversity and discrimination. Rather than making this a stand-alone workshop or training that APT members undertake only upon starting their three-year appointment to the committee, our recommendation is that there is an annual training session for all APT members. One section of this will be on issues pertaining to diversity and bias in the review process, to be updated by current research on the topic culled from different disciplines and fields. As we see it, it is important for all APT members to have a working literacy of diversity, as both a value of the university and as a factor that may have impacted dossiers under review (in a variety of ways including the forms of unconscious bias outlined above).

³³ <https://nsfadvance.rit.edu/assets/pdf/promotionandtenureworkshopunconsciousbiashandout%2030nov2016.pdf>

4. PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP

Rationale

As stated in the Introduction to this report, the baseline rationale stems from our current strategic plan, *Together Duke*, and the Provost's charge in creating our committee:

“We recognize that increasingly diverse forms of scholarship have not been taken into account in our appointment, promotion and tenure processes...Criteria for rigor and impact in less traditional, alternative or emerging forms of scholarly expression, including...*public scholarship, and policy outreach* have not been well-defined. . . The Committee is to re-evaluate the criteria for tenure and promotion to clearly define criteria that reward the many scholarly activities we value as a community.”

This was further articulated and reinforced by President Price in his inaugural address:

“Are we bold enough now to invent more productive and sustainable ways to organize and catalyze scholarship around pressing problems . . . flexible enough to alter our expectations of **what “counts” as valuable research?**”

Indeed, two other major *Together Duke* initiatives, *Re-Imagining Doctoral Education*³⁴ (chaired by Vice Provost Ed Balleisen and Professor Susan Lozier), and *Policy Bridge: Connecting Research to Policy*³⁵ (chaired by Associate Provost Noah Pickus and Professor Frederick Mayer) are directed at goals related to our work on public scholarship within the tenure and promotion process.

Similar views about the importance of public scholarship are spreading across the world of higher education. “Public engagement—connecting scholarship to public debates and usages,” the American Sociological Association writes in a recent report, “is an essential component of scholarly excellence, of the university’s obligation to society at large, and of showcasing the public uses of Sociology.”³⁶ The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) has a major initiative for greater public engagement by university faculty and other scientists.³⁷ The American Political Science Association is currently conducting a survey of departmental members about the inclusion of public engagement in tenure and promotion guidelines with the intent of a report and recommendations later in the year. And a number of universities, both R-1 peer institutions and others, also are working for greater valuation of and incentives for public engagement and scholarship.

³⁴ <https://strategicplan.duke.edu/initiatives/re-imagining-doctoral-education/>

³⁵ <https://sites.duke.edu/policybridge/>

³⁶ http://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/tf_report_what_counts_evaluating_public_communication_in_tenure_and_promotion_final_august_2016.pdf

³⁷ <https://www.aaas.org/pes/what-public-engagement>

Definition

Having drawn on various terminology over the course of our work, we have concluded that the term “public scholarship” better reflects our focus than “public and policy engagement.” It more clearly makes the research-service distinction. And it better avoids being equated with the policy world (be it local, national or global), consistent with Duke’s earlier construct of knowledge in service of society.

Our research into other university policies which factor public scholarship into the scholarly research “basket,” as well as discussion of the issues in the higher education literature more broadly, yields various definitions. Examples include:

- “Conducting research related to the solution of practical problems of individuals, groups, organizations, or societies.”
- “Generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with University and unit missions.”
- “To engage broader audiences with their research and contribute to solutions of the pressing problems of our time.”
- “Research, analysis, writing and related activities that advance knowledge with an explicit priority of addressing policy questions.”³⁸

Variations notwithstanding, these definitions have a few elements in common. First, all are within tenure and promotion systems that continue to give principal emphasis to more strictly academic types of scholarly research, while giving greater relative weight to public scholarship than often is the case. Second, the public scholarship is based on the faculty member’s scholarly work and identity, as Michele Longino put it, as “the fundamental qualification of that individual to exercise agency in that area.” Third, while the nature of the research and scholarship is informed by theory, its main objective is more applied than purely or principally theoretical. Fourth, it encompasses both the “translational,” modifying the mode and language of presentation of work originally done for academic purposes and audiences, and work that more fundamentally builds a problem-orientation into the research design from the outset.

Some examples of public scholarship within these parameters:

- Articles and papers written for journals or other publications whose primary audience is not confined to the scholarly community, but which draw on the faculty member’s scholarly specialization and are subjected to expert review whether peer-review, editor or another comparable form.³⁹

³⁸ https://secfac.wiscweb.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/50/2017/09/Tenure-guidelines_SocSci_2016-2017_as-of-July2017.pdf; <http://ncsue.msu.edu/files/typology-092509.pdf>; http://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/tf_report_what_counts_evaluating_public_communication_in_tenure_and_promotion_final_august_2016.pdf; Bruce W. Jentleson and Ely Ratner, “Bridging the Beltway-Ivory Tower Gap,” *International Studies Review* 13:1 (March 2011).

³⁹ Some examples: for Humanities scholars *PMLA* (Publications of the Modern Languages Association), the most prestigious literature journal as well as *The New Yorker*, *London Review of Books*, *Atlantic Monthly*; for Divinity/Theology/History of Religion, *The Christian Century*, *Commonweal*, *Sojourners*, *Tikkun*; for Political

- Books stemming from the faculty member's scholarly specialization that are subjected to rigorous review (whether peer-review or comparable form) and are written for an audience not limited to the scholarly community including from major university presses (e.g., Oxford University Press) and commercial presses that publish for scholarly as well as general readerships (e.g., W.W. Norton and Company).
- Research that manifests in other forms such as websites and documentary films complementing articles and books, no less based on relevant scholarly research, in order to reach audiences and achieve objectives for which these forms are particularly well-suited.
- Development of databases for use by individuals or organizations which extend beyond the scholarly community which also draw on the faculty member's scholarly specialization.
- Patents and intellectual property based on scholarly research that have manifestations other than, or in addition to, peer-reviewed publications.

A number of other forms of productive output, or issues involving the public/academic interface are also at work such as how to weigh public and policy engagement that is based on a faculty member's research and scholarly standing but does not directly manifest as publications: e.g., serving in a government position based on one's scholarly identity through a leave or fellowship, serving on policy and public advisory boards in positions based on one's scholarly identity, and testifying and other direct engagement in policy and related processes drawing on one's research. While these continue to be part of the "service" category, they should be differentiated from intra-university and intra-disciplinary service and allotted greater weight and recognition than generally is the case under current procedures and criteria.

The committee was also keen to differentiate forms of broader societal engagement that would *not* count in tenure and promotion, such as private remunerated consulting, individual volunteerism, and public and policy engagement not primarily based on one's scholarly work.

Another matter to consider is less the purpose of the research than how the research is done. At our December meeting Mark Anthony Neal addressed community-engaged scholarship in which a faculty member engages non-academics not just as subjects of the research but as contributors to it. Along these lines from her work in environmental science and policy, Lisa Campbell raised a similar point: "I often find myself thinking about colleagues who work with communities, some of them indigenous, in order to answer questions that are meaningful to the scholars, but also to produce knowledge in a way that is meaningful to those in the communities with whom they work." This raises both practical questions (e.g., time to conduct participatory research, to secure rights to conduct such research, to co-author papers with community partners, etc.) and ethical issues related to intellectual ownership of ideas and ethical commitments to research subjects... "I'm suggesting that it isn't just about the research topic and its applied nature, but about recognizing the time commitments that sometimes come with public scholarship."

Recommended Policy

The approach we recommend is grounded in maintaining disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarly work as the principal basis for tenure and promotion, while giving greater weight in relevant cases within the research-scholarship “basket” to public scholarship. Such an approach is consistent with core University strategic interests in continuing to enhance the excellence of our faculty, as well as affirming Duke’s responsibility to contribute to the public good (local, national, global). It also connects well with other of *Together Duke’s* priority initiatives. Faculty interests also are well-served by distinct opportunities for intellectual interactions that can: help refine ideas and generate new ones; generate data gathering; expand professional networks; and yield a wider range of feedback that can improve research, reach additional cohorts and audiences, and apply knowledge to public problems in ways that are intellectually gratifying and socially meaningful.

Kavin Rowe’s distinction between avoiding “market scholars” and “truncated scholars” nicely delineates the balance to be struck. Market scholars are those who overemphasize topical and other such areas in their research agendas on the one hand, while “truncated scholars” are those “whose intellectual skills enhance substantively the university’s wider life and reputation but are discouraged from their fuller pursuit because of the inability of current parameters to recognize the full shape of their intellectual work.” This balance also comes through in the caution with which the American Sociological Association accompanies its support for public scholarship, that “it is all too easy for topics of research to be selected for their media appeal rather than for their scholarly value; for data to be analyzed in simplistic and misleading ways in order to be packaged for popular consumption; and for originality to be sacrificed in the name of drawing attention from a public that is unaware of the prior literature.”⁴⁰

Within these broader considerations, the “post-tenure” question arises: whether public engagement should come only later in one’s career, meaning that junior faculty would strictly stick to academic research and publications. A comparable argument pertains to associate professors waiting until promotion to full professor. Yet benefits such as those noted above have early and mid-career value as well. Moreover, certain opportunities—e.g., the Council on Foreign Relations International Affairs Fellowships (Political Science, Public Policy), the AAAS Early Career Award for Engagement with Science among others—are targeted at junior faculty. And while leery about generational generalizations, one gets a sense that in many disciplines a number of younger scholars are motivated by a mix of deep scholarly interests and strong beliefs in connecting their work to the broader society. Duke should very much want to have such young scholars as part of its core tenure-line faculty – our “human capital” -- going forward. Thus, while more strictly academic work should continue to get primary valuation in all cases of junior and associate faculty, public scholarship should also be given appropriate research basket weight.

These norms and strategies should extend into the hiring process. Consistent with making public scholarship part of the record for tenure and promotion, departments should be open to giving greater leeway and support in searches for faculty positions deemed especially conducive to academic excellence complemented by public scholarship.

⁴⁰http://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/tf_report_what_counts_evaluating_public_communication_in_tenure_and_promotion_final_august_2016.pdf

As we recommended in the earlier Existing Policies and Practices section, the templates for annual faculty reporting should be revised to include a section on public scholarship and engagement in addition to the existing section on Professional Activities. So too should the Scholars@Duke format.

For those Ph. D. students whose principal goal is a tenure-line faculty position, emphasis should continue to be heavily on developing their records in conventional scholarly terms. In addition, in synch with the Re-Imagining Doctoral Education Initiative, for individual Ph.D. students who are more interested in career paths outside of academia for which skills and records in public scholarship are valuable, faculty mentors should be open to working with them along these lines.

We make these recommendations with four caveats in mind:

1. Any changes along these lines would need to be designed to grant appropriate credit for tenure line faculty interested in public scholarship, but not be a new fixed mandate for all. The goal is not a one-size-fits-all alternative model, but greater intellectual pluralism and a range of types accorded excellence. At the same time if public scholarship were to be just an add-on, it would place additional expectations on faculty so inclined, and in effect would be the equivalent of not appropriately counting public scholarship as part of the research-scholarship basket.
2. The common practice among universities we have reviewed is to have a core set of central university standards that establish a baseline and framework for including public scholarship and policy engagement in tenure and promotion reviews, while leaving to schools and departments some tailoring and operationalizing with criteria and measurement methods appropriate to the particular discipline and/or interdisciplinary configuration. Both aspects of this, a firm statement of Duke's commitment to public scholarship and policy engagement and school-department tailoring, are crucial.
3. Any significant changes would be grandfathered in, in ways fair to current faculty (junior especially, but also associate-level).
4. Appropriate assessment measures and parameters need to be applied, as discussed next.

Assessing Public Scholarship

The Existing Policies and Practices section of our report addresses limitations and flaws in the reliability and validity of metrics (such as *h*-index, journal impact factor, and Eigenfactor) commonly used in assessing quality, impact, and productivity of more strictly academic scholarship. Metric-type assessment measures can be even more challenging for public scholarship both generally and with variation across fields.

The “Understanding Research Impact” guide published by ScholarWorks@Duke (<https://scholarworks.duke.edu/understanding-research-impact-metrics/>) is a very useful guide to various metrics and approaches to assessing research within, as well as outside, the academy.⁴¹

⁴¹ Our committee benefited greatly from working with Paolo Mangiafico, Duke ScholarWorks Coordinator of Scholarly Research Technologies, and David Hansen, Director of Copyright and Scholarly Communications, including a presentation they provided at our January 24 meeting.

Altmetric Explorer (<http://www.altmetricexplorer.com/>) is a web-based platform that tracks any mention of a particular publication appearing online. While details about how the software works and culls information online is presented in the following section in more detail, it should be noted here that Altmetric Explorer can be a useful heuristic for general visibility and for reaching sources and outlets that traditional citation indexes do not.

A number of questions arise in assessing quality. How to judge journals and other publications that make their publication selections through experts other than scholarly peer-review and editors other than fellow academics? What might be the equivalent of citation counts indicating how broadly the research is being read, discussed and drawn on beyond the academy? Some possible criteria, in part drawn from the American Sociological Association study:⁴²

- Is the publication at hand well-grounded (or otherwise grounded) in disciplinary or interdisciplinary theory and research?
- Has it been reviewed in a peer-reviewed like process (editors, peers)?
- Does it demonstrate “knowledge of the required format, needs, and frames of reference of the audiences it seeks to reach?”
- While not in the same format as more strictly academic publications, is the empirical basis and conceptual logic of findings claimed/arguments effectively presented?

Another issue is measuring impact. The American Sociological Association lays out three criteria: number of views and postings on new media indicating reach of the piece; testimonies by actors and populations directly impacted; and instances of policy change, changes in practices, or alteration in public debate.

Another model comes from National Science Foundation STEM grant applications, which are evaluated according to both intellectual merit and broader impacts. NSF defines broader impacts as “the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes.”⁴³ NSF specifies this further by speaking to the scope, urgency, or social need of the research (the project’s legitimacy related to public or social problems not just academic paradigms); the extent to which the candidate’s university research engages with relevant communities beyond the academic world (a point also stressed by Lisa Campbell); and extending the reach of the research through creative or curatorial means.

The “Research Excellence Framework” (REF) used by the British university system defines impact as “an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia.”⁴⁴ Having discussed this with Oxford and other UK colleagues and researched the most recent 2014 REF, a few issues arise: What about an important and high quality scholarly contribution that is rejected by policy makers for reasons other than its scholarly quality? How would a scientific insight or discovery be considered that is highly impactful eventually but only after an extended period of time?

⁴²http://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/tf_report_what_counts_evaluating_public_communication_in_tenure_and_promotion_final_august_2016.pdf

⁴³ https://www.nsf.gov/od/oia/publications/Broader_Impacts.pdf

⁴⁴ <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/rsrch/REFimpact/>

External Letters

The review process relies heavily on the expertise of external letter-writers, and how to incorporate the tallying of public scholarship with external letter writers was an issue the committee discussed at great length. Though we failed to come up with a single proposal, we raise here a number of factors to be considered and options for doing so.

One option would be to add a clause to the standard request for the reviewer asking, to the degree they are familiar with it, to address the candidate's public scholarship.

A more tailored approach would be to solicit reviewers who themselves are tenured professors known in part for their public scholarship. Stanford University provides models for building differentiated criteria for traditional academic and public scholarship into the external review process. For example, it included instructions to an external reviewer in a recent tenure case being considered largely on a disciplinary basis to address "whether the individual is performing the kind of innovative, cutting-edge research on important questions in the field that breaks new ground, changes the way the field is viewed, broadens our understanding of the field, or opens up new methods or new areas of investigation." In a case where the individual was a noted scholar already tenured at another university and being considered for a full professor equivalent appointment for which public scholarship was a key criterion, the external reviewers were asked to focus on "the candidate's commitment to understanding or addressing important, contemporary issues in ways that illuminate problems, propose innovative solutions, develop novel methods for approaching problems...Factors for consideration include: the nature and scope of public intellectual or policy engagement; leadership in policy-relevant teaching and training; impact in a public service role; formal or informal influence in policy circles; or ability to translate scholarship into policy formulations." While this particular example was geared to public scholarship related to contemporary issues, the approach could be used for other topics and historical periods; e.g., disseminating new work on slavery.

On the matter of whether or not to solicit letters from non-academics, the committee was divided. On the one hand, there was concern that their unfamiliarity with the tenure process may inherently limit the utility of such letters. On the other hand, if a non-academic has direct familiarity with the candidate's public scholarship, such expertise could be very valuable. Soliciting letters from such non-academic experts but doing so as a supplement to the usual number and range of external reviewer letters from noted scholars was recommended.

In sum, while there are issues that need to be further fleshed out and operationalized, doing so consistent with our recommendation of giving greater weight to public scholarship while maintaining disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarly work as the principal basis for tenure and promotion will have substantial potential benefits strategically for the University and for overall faculty excellence.

5. DIGITAL SCHOLARSHIP

Rationale

The need to recognize, encourage, and find effective evaluation procedures for scholarly output in digital (and other) media is widely recognized across the country in higher education. For example:

American Historical Association: “The context of historical scholarship is changing rapidly and profoundly. Disciplines and universities that emerged two centuries ago in a profusion of print now find themselves confronted with new digital forms. The historical discipline needs to address, directly and frankly, its particular disciplinary position at this historical juncture.”⁴⁵

Modern Language Association: “Digital media are transforming literacy, scholarship, teaching, and service as well as providing new venues for research, communication, and the creation of networked academic communities... Academic work in digital media must be evaluated in light of these rapidly changing technological, institutional, and professional contexts, and departments should recognize that many traditional notions of scholarship, teaching, and service are now being redefined.”⁴⁶

In Political Science and Public policy, blog sites like “Monkey Cage” have become well-established in the discipline, are peer-reviewed by scholar editors, and function as outlets for short articles based on deeper research (on an array of topics such as comparative politics, academia, foreign policy, environmental politics, education) aimed at circulating this to a broader audience mass.⁴⁷

In data-driven math and science fields, particularly computer science,⁴⁸ initiatives have developed advocating for new types of network-based scholarship that can increase collaboration, facilitate the exchange of information and data sets, and inaugurate new, holistic models for conducting and confirming scholarship.

The promulgation of digitally-supported or enhanced initiatives is also spreading across institutions of higher education including at peer R-1 universities. At Duke, for example, there is the Duke Digital Humanities Initiative, sponsored by the John Hope Franklin Humanities Institution with additional support from Trinity College of Arts and Sciences, Duke Libraries, and other groups on campus. Its mission is to promote “new ways to engage in and learn about

⁴⁵ Guidelines for the Professional Evaluation of Digital Scholarship by Historians, American Historical Association. <https://www.historians.org/teaching-and-learning/digital-history-resources-for-the-professional-evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-by-historians>.

⁴⁶ Guidelines for Evaluating Work in Digital Humanities and Digital Media. Modern Language Association. <https://www.mla.org/About-Us/Governance/Committees/Committee-Listing-Guidelines-for-Evaluating-Work-in-Digital-Humanities-and-Digital-Media>.

⁴⁷ themonekycage.org

⁴⁸ Thonas, Constantino. 2014. “The Future of Digital Scholarship.” *Procedia Computer Science* 38:22 – 27.

the use of technology in humanities scholarship” and “to connect scholars, teachers, librarians, technologists, and practitioners from around campus.” *Given such initiatives, and engagement with new technologies to seek, disseminate, share, and teach knowledge already in practice at the university, it is important for the standards used to measure scholarship output by its faculty to be in sync.* That there is a *disconnect*—between the adoption, even active encouragement of digital innovation by institutions that lag far behind in adopting appropriate guidelines and measures for evaluating digital scholarship in the tenure and promotion of its faculty—is a widespread concern.

Definition

The definition, and deployment, of digital (and other new) technologies differs significantly by discipline and sub-discipline.

In Biology, as pointed out by John Willis, this includes online databases and statistical/computational/bioinformatics analytical tools. As he explained with the example of sequencing genomes, some scholars assemble and annotate genomes first online so as to disseminate their findings as quickly as possible to the research community. Published papers—in what has been the more conventional standard for measurement of academic journals — usually follow but this may be at a much later date.

In Art and Architectural History: “Digital scholarship relies on digital tools and increased access to images and data from which new types of questions, methods, and results arise. . . Just as engineers and architects have embraced ever more sophisticated media in their work, from ink on paper to AutoCAD, so have scholars exploited the codex, chromolithograph, color slide, JPEG, and World Wide Web to further knowledge.”⁴⁹

Complicating this are also the divergent uses and purposes for digital scholarship and new scholastic technologies: as a new **method** or methodology for studying a new object or something in a new way (network analyses enable researchers to code, graph, and measure interactions between actors as disparate as humans and cells); a new form of knowledge **dissemination** which may, or may not, significantly alter the content of knowledge (a journal article written in exactly the same style as for a print journal but published in an online journal); a new means of **presentation** of scholarship or output (multi-media presentations or audio tours of a campus or archaeological site overseas); new collaborative or interdisciplinary formats/databases for **storing, archiving, or sharing** knowledge (virtual curatorial initiatives which enable teams of researchers to collaboratively bring together many objects or artifacts into a digital exhibition, with the option of crowdsourcing responses or reflections); or as a new forum for **communication** in conducting, debating, or transmitting news/events/scholarship to the public (open-access journals and blogs respond quickly to current events with short-form dialogues between relevant scholars and experts).

⁴⁹ Guidelines for the Evaluation of Digital Scholarship in Art and Architectural History. College Art Association and the Society of Architectural Historians. Task Force to Develop Guidelines for Evaluating Digital Art and Architectural History for Promotion and tenure. January 2016. Funded by Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, <http://www.collegeart.org/pdf/evaluating-digital-scholarship-in-art-and-architectural-history.pdf>.

Examples of such digitally-based projects include:

- Digital databases.
- Digital tools.
- Statistical analysis.
- Database sharing and management.
- Developing new code languages and algorithms.
- Open-source initiatives.
- Digital scholarly communication like blogs.
- Web portals, installations, gateways.
- Podcasts; online interviews/lectures.
- Electronic essays or exhibits.
- Refereed or non-refereed open access or online-only journals.
- Digital archives.
- Digital storytelling (as in creative nonfiction or graphic novels).
- Social media, platforms, blogs.
- Non-refereed articles and pre-prints posted on online archives (<https://www.biorxiv.org>).

Examples of digital/creative/public outputs in the field of African American Studies and Critical Race Studies, as shared by Mark Anthony Neal:

- *African Diaspora PhD*:⁵⁰ a curated blog featuring scholars and scholarship in the field of Atlantic African diasporic history. Curated by Jessica Maria Johnson at Johns Hopkins University.
- *The Colored Conventions Project*: a collaborative digital humanities project that brings 19th century Black organizing to digital life. Curated by P. Gabrielle Foreman at University of Delaware.

Measurement

In recognizing the need to assess digital scholarship, there is often an effort made to measure its “equivalence” to more traditional print publications such as single-authored books or refereed journal articles. But such impulses risk relegating digital scholarship to a subordinate status, making it justify itself—and translate itself into—the prevailing standards of scholarship that remain firmly in place. *A more forward-looking policy instead emphasizes the qualities of research that Duke University strives to cultivate, whether that research takes the form of a single-authored book published by a top-ranked academic press or a series of digital installations pertaining to an author’s field of expertise.* Publishing in either form must entail:

- *Rigor of scholarship.*
- *Originality and impact of the research within a designated (or emerging) field.*
- *A robust review process.*

⁵⁰ Tumblr: <http://africandiasporaphd.tumblr.com/>

By upholding these expectations of research without necessarily tying them to what have been the conventional form(s) of productivity, the aim is to be maintain scholarly rigor while also embracing and encouraging new productive outlets.

From examining departments, universities, and professional associations across the country, we have found a number of guiding principles worth considering. One, as with the Department of Anthropology at UNC, proposes evaluation on a case by case basis, seeking professional opinions from those skilled in digital production. Another, The Modern Language Association (MLA), offers the following guidelines:

- Delineate and communicate responsibilities to candidate upon hiring: put responsibility on candidate to justify/present their own work.
- Engage qualified reviewers, externally and internally.
- Respect medium specificity when reviewing work.
- Stay informed about accessibility (remain informed of technological innovations that permit persons with disabilities to carry out their work effectively).

A more robust model, offered as a series of questions, comes from the Department of Folklore & Linguistics at Indiana University. Rather than and in lieu of quantitative metrics of assessment (such as the impact factors discussed in the Existing Policies and Practices section), these questions are crafted to specifically address if a scholar's publications—whether digital or more traditional—entail a level of excellence that the university demands:

- Is the product based on and/or presents original scholarship?
- Does it explore a topic of significance in great depth?
- Was there major external/internal funding for the project (and what was the candidate's role in securing it)?
- Is there discussion of scholarly literature or does the product provoke consideration of prominent theories or utilize methodologies within/across academic fields?
- Did the candidate take a leading role in assembling/producing content?
- Was there a process of peer review?
- How big was the project (number of artifacts, i.e.)?
- Is the intended audience scholarly?
- Does the product involve supervision of others?
- Evidence that it has gained attention ("hits" on a website i.e.)
- Serious reviews of the product?
- Is the venue prestigious?
- Does the product make a significant contribution to our understanding of an important topic?
- Is the item self-published?
- Can an editorial board, publisher, or sponsoring organization be identified?
- Is there a stated editorial policy?
- Have recognized scholars published in this venue?
- Is there a process assuring duration & longevity of the product?
- Is there a mechanism for post-publication review?

- Can the reputation or impact of venue be corroborated?

In the past decade, as evidenced in the higher education literature as well as the Scholars@Duke presentation to our committee, “Altmetrics” has emerged as a novel tool for assessing scholarship on a contextual, author-based basis, rather than traditional, journal or company-based metrics.⁵¹ Altmetric aggregators are not meant to replace more traditional metrics, but augment them. Altmetric applications use the unique identifiers of publications (DOI, ISBN, name) to aggregate all sources that mention a certain publication, including from sources that older metrics do not consider: from open-access journals, social media, and policy reports to conference proceedings, book reviews, blogs, and open syllabi projects. Closed-access journals and closed systems (e.g., Academic.edu) are not accessible through Altmetric reports. Nor does it include sources that fail to include DOI, ISBN or a specific title.

Using Altmetrics along with more established quantitative metrics shows how a piece of scholarship is impacting different realms. In addition, publishers are increasingly updating the article-level metrics of articles on a daily or weekly basis so that one can see a specific article’s views, links, downloads, etc. As compared to impact factors or *h*-index, these article-based number provide a quicker and more personalized sense of the impact of an article because it can take time for an article to accrue citation counts within more traditional publication indexes. Altmetrics also offer a more personalized reading of an article or an author’s impact because, unlike Impact Factor, it accrues individualized mentions rather than relying on citation rates of a journal or publication within which an article is housed.

Finally, Altmetric numbers are not ends in and of themselves but are contextual; this means that APT committees must assess Altmetric reports in order to gauge the responses to a scholar’s work and the types of publications and individuals participating in these conversations. Scholars who work on two different topics will have completely incomparable Altmetric factors. For example, those who work on heart disease and whose work is published in popular science reports and news articles will have a completely different Altmetric aggregate than someone who works on a rare liver disorder, who is rarely cited in popular media.

Recommended Policy

Recommendations at the University Level

We recommend an approach that, incorporating a number of proposals, principles, and guidelines that have been established elsewhere in the country, reflects the very specific academic principles and values put forth by Duke University. *As a baseline, we endorse promoting the development, engagement with, and dissemination of digital scholarship alongside clearly-stated guidelines (at both the departmental and APT level) that ensure maintaining standards of rigor in evaluation for tenure and promotion.* As with the proposal put forth for public scholarship in the previous section, the approach we recommend is grounded in maintaining disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarly work as the principal basis for tenure and

⁵¹ “Understanding Research Impact,” Duke ScholarWorks, <https://scholarworks.duke.edu/understanding-research-impact-metrics/>; <http://www.altmetricexplorer.com/>

promotion, while acknowledging the different forms this scholarship can take. As alternative/digital scholarly forms may be expressly chosen as a means of better contributing to the public good (local, national, global), we also propose that, in such relevant cases, the scholarship be assessed according to the recommendations proposed for public scholarship. (Please see the separate section/recommendations for public scholarship.)

As a first point, Duke should clearly state that it values, and recognizes, the pursuit of digital scholarship as a general policy, according to parameters and guidelines that are worked out at the departmental (or school) level.

Recommendations at the Departmental Level

Departments should remain consistent in commitments made to incoming faculty regarding digital work, and remain informed of advances in both digital scholarship and means to evaluate it as candidates advance towards promotion. Responsibility for best presenting digital output (methods and forms employed, reasons for employing it, theoretical significance to the scholar/department/field for having done so, and intellectual rigor of their work) rests with both the individual scholar and the department putting them up for promotion. In documenting the usage, and scholarly significance, of digital technology, presentation should be particularly attentive to documenting:

- The rigor of the intellectual inquiry.
- The type of review process employed.
- The impact of the scholarship and on what audiences.
- The contribution made by the individual scholar and the advantages of having done collaborative work (if the work was collaborative).
- How the usage of digital technology complements, extends, or enhances what this scholarship would have otherwise achieved by conventional medium.

External reviewers should include experts in the digital methods/scholarship used by the candidate. (Ideally, these should be academics conversant in the tenure and promotion process operating at universities.) If no experts are digitally conversant within a department at Duke University, then relevant departments are encouraged to draw on lists of such experts if their own disciplinary associations have them. A number of professional associations, such as the American Anthropological Association, have now assembled lists of digitally savvy scholars to contact/consult when preparing files of candidates with such scholarship/output (*AAA Resource Panel for External Tenure and Promotion Review and External Program Review*). Such disciplinary organizations should be used as resources for contacting fitting external reviewers.

Recommendations at the APT Level

APT members should undergo training in digital literacy and sensitivity. We recommend that this take place in the annual training session we are recommending all members undergo and that it be run by the information science librarians at Duke.

- When appropriate, APT should draw upon the expertise of the information science librarians when evaluating a case involving digital scholarship.
- Digital scholarship should be evaluated in its native environment and in consideration of its medium specificity; e.g. where a piece is published or where their work is displayed (a blog, a public show, a periodical, etc.) affects the arguments, subject matter, length, and other variables. The same applies to the venue of publication or distribution: the ecology of this new form of presentation and dissemination should be adequately considered.
- Support impact measurements beyond citation. This can be done by using alternative forms of metrics or by inquiring about rigor, review, impact along the lines outlined above by the Department of Folklore and Linguistics at Indiana University.
- To avoid over-reliance upon metrics (including alternative forms of metrics), critical primary review of the work should be exercised at every level.

The multiple questions and forms of scrutinization included in the Measurement section above (including the list drawn from Indiana University's Department of Folklore & Linguistics) should function as core issues guiding the evaluation of digital scholarship.

6. THE ARTS

Rationale

The arts have become a prominent part of undergraduate and graduate education at Duke. Section 5 of the previous strategic plan, *Making a Difference*, committed Duke to transforming the arts by investing in facilities, faculty development, university presenting organizations, expanding student opportunities for art-making, and engaging with artists through courses and co-curricular programs. Duke has made impressive progress on all fronts. New and renovated facilities include the Nasher Museum of Art, Baldwin Auditorium, the Smith Warehouse, the Carpentry Shop, the Student Arts Annex, and, most recently, the Rubenstein Arts Center. Every arts department and program has hired new artist faculty committed to melding practical art-making with research and scholarship. Duke has hosted more than 70 visiting artists in residence since 2007, and many have visited campus multiple times each year. While arts departments and programs have been eager sponsors of these residencies, departments and schools outside of the arts have also hosted visiting artists, including the Sanford School for Public Policy, the Nicholas School for the Environment, DIBS, Chemistry, Mathematics, Biology, and the Divinity School. These residencies require artists to participate in classroom instruction as well as offer a performance or exhibition.

An important consequence of our investment is the creation of new graduate degree programs for practicing artists. A Ph.D. in Music Composition has been in place since 1992. The MFA in Experimental and Documentary Art (MFAEDA), which leverages Duke's faculty's strengths in AAH&VS, Arts of the Moving Image (AMI), and the Center for Documentary Studies, was launched in 2011. In 2018, the Board of Trustees approved a new MFA program in Dance: Embodied Interdisciplinary Praxis, which entails a partnership with the American Dance Festival; the first class matriculates in Fall 2019. Other arts-related graduate programs bring together applied art-making with theoretical and historical research. These include a new Ph.D. in Computational Media, Arts, and Cultures (CMAC), a Master's degree in Historical Visualization, and the Ph.D. in Literature.

Our graduate arts programs collaborate significantly with Duke's presenting organizations: Duke Performances; the Nasher Museum; and the Full Frame Documentary Film Festival. These nationally acclaimed presenters offer a conduit for our artists and students to engage with a broader public, both locally and nationally. These collaborations have become an important lever for recruiting faculty and graduate students to Duke. Integrating public engagement into our graduate programs through these partnerships is consonant with Duke's new commitment to Re-imagining Doctoral Education, through which we prepare students "to make a difference in a wide array of professional contexts."

Students graduating from our graduate composition and visual art programs have gone onto arts-related professions outside of the academy as well as tenure-track faculty positions at colleges and universities as well. For the latter, such positions require a terminal degree that is appropriate to the discipline: the MFA in dance, theater, visual art, and creative writing; the DMA or Ph.D. in music composition; and the MM or DMA in music performance. Every faculty search in the

arts begins with a careful assessment of the candidates' artistic portfolios, and the most substantial part of the tenure dossier consists of artistic works. Yet, in most cases, faculty who teach in Duke's graduate arts programs are not eligible for tenure. Presently, Duke has three tenure-track appointments in music composition. We also have tenured faculty in poetry (Nathaniel Mackey in English) computational media (Bill Seaman in AAH&VS), and dance (Tommy DeFrantz, whose tenure resides in AAAS), but all three colleagues came to Duke as full professors with tenure. Furthermore, it is our colleagues' conventional scholarly publications which made their tenure dossiers legible to APT even though their efforts center on creating new choreography, poetry, and media art. Music composition, then, is the only faculty appointment at Duke that awards tenure solely based on artistic production, and it is the only program in which its tenured faculty arrived at Duke with initial appointments as Assistant Professors.

Peer institutions, including Cornell, Stanford, Princeton, Dartmouth, Brown, and Chicago, have tenured faculty in multiple arts disciplines,⁵² though we note that none of these institutions award tenure to performers in music, dance, or theater. We select these institutions because they do not host independent art schools or conservatories as do Yale, Washington University, the University of Rochester, the University of Southern California, Oberlin, Northwestern, and a great many state universities. At Duke, the lack of tenure-track positions compromises our ability to recruit top artist faculty as evidenced by the fact that two highly qualified applicants for a faculty position in filmmaking recently withdrew from candidacy when they learned that Duke was not offering a tenure-track position.

To summarize, Duke has made a substantial investment in new arts programs and facilities, but this investment is not aligned with our tenure policies. We also lag behind established tenure practices for artists at peer institutions.

Definition

An artist produces work that is valued for aesthetic and affective criteria as well as for its conceptual and technical sophistication. Conventional examples include practitioners in visual arts (painting, sculpture, printmaking, photography, filmmaking, and digital media); performing arts (music, theater, dance); creative writing (fiction, poetry); and hybrids of these disciplines. Within the performing arts, an important distinction exists between artists who create new works (composers, playwrights, choreographers, directors) and interpretive artists (musicians, dancers, actors). In R-1 institutions, the so-called creative artists are more frequently tenured than interpretive artists. This common-sense taxonomy is complicated by emerging artistic practices that engage in a critique of established arts institutions. These include "social practice" artists who enlist participants (including people without artistic training) in aesthetic experiences that interrogate the marginalization of certain peoples by hegemonic social structures; and "post-disciplinary" artists who reject conventional ideas of skill and virtuosity that draw on artistic practices from historically marginalized communities. While professional art schools are

⁵² Stanford has tenured six studio artists, four composers, six creative writers, and three documentary artists; Chicago has tenured three composers, ten visual and media artists, and three creative writers; Princeton has tenured five composers, six visual artists (including film), and nine creative writers; Cornell has tenured three composers, eight creative writers, and a large faculty of studio artists with appointments in the School for Art, Architecture & Planning

launching programs in social practice art and post-disciplinary art,⁵³ these practices have not taken hold as distinct degree programs in R1 institutions, making evaluation exceedingly difficult.

Metrics

Colleagues in the upper administration at Stanford, Cornell, and Chicago⁵⁴ all expressed reservations along the lines of those delineated in the Existing Policies and Practices section of our Report about the uncritical use of “metrics” as a means of assessing scholarship of any kind, not to mention assessing arts portfolios. Similar issues have been raised in previous sections on public and digital scholarship.

That said, each artistic discipline has reasonably clear expectations for productivity. Experts in the field, which include external evaluators, understand these criteria, and have flagged low productivity as a problem in an arts tenure dossier. Duke has denied tenure to a practicing artist because of low productivity.

Publication, on the other hand, is an increasingly contested criterion for assessment. To some extent, the difficulty of securing a recording contract or a print publisher speaks to the importance of the artist’s work, but, in all cases, these publication channels are commercial in nature; the decision to publish an artwork depends on its commercial viability or on external funding. For example, most music recordings, including those by highly regarded artists at top music schools, are self-funded or supported by an external grant secured by the artist. Established record labels dedicated to contemporary music (e.g., Naxos, Albany, Innova, New Amsterdam, and Bridge) expect artists to bring their own funding, whether from their pockets or from an external grant, to produce the CD. That said, the labels exert a strong curatorial role to maintain credibility in the professional music world if only to ensure reasonable sales; they will not produce a recording simply because the artist can fund it. *We are not suggesting that recordings (or comparable publications in other areas of the arts) not be required, but rather that their importance be properly contextualized.*

A more reliable metric for evaluating artistic production, especially in the performing and visual arts, is a substantial record of concert performances, theatrical productions, dance performances, screenings, and exhibits. These presentations are publications in their own right, and their significance can be gleaned from the stature of the venues, presenting organizations, and collaborating artists. In most cases, established arts institutions provide financial and logistical support to present the artworks. The tenure dossier should explicitly state how presentations are being supported to distinguish those that are self-produced or that take place in an informal setting (e.g., a “house concert”) from those that are sponsored by a professional presenter.

⁵³ <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/07/education/edlife/social-practice-degrees-take-art-to-a-communal-level.html>; <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Art-Schools-Build-New/129420>

⁵⁴ Telephone conversations with Richard Saller, Dean of Humanities & Sciences, Stanford University; Bill Brown, Senior Advisory to the Provost on Arts, University of Chicago; John Siliciano, Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, Cornell University

Some artistic works, especially musical compositions for wind band or chorus, may be performed dozens if not hundreds of times in a given year. In most cases these performances are given by high school and college music ensembles as well as by amateur youth orchestras and other community groups. In some institutions, including prominent music schools, this kind of success counts for a great deal—it is not an exaggeration to say that the most accomplished composers in these genres are household names. At the other extreme, an artist may engage in experimental practices that are legible only to trained practitioners, scholars, and theorists. Such works do not circulate widely but nonetheless embrace innovative technical and conceptual ideas that inform contemporary artistic practices.

A comparable situation exists for theatrical directors, playwrights, and choreographers. Much of their daily effort goes into producing performances by students in their home institutions or at other colleges and universities. Among these, it is important to distinguish productions at highly regarded professional schools (e.g., Yale Repertory Theater or the Juilliard School) from those presented by departmental ensembles in liberal arts colleges.

In both of these cases, amateur performances are not a substitute for professional performances and productions, which can include presentations by prestigious university museums and performing arts presenters (e.g., the Nasher Museum, the Cantor Museum, Stanford Live, Duke Performances) as well as professional orchestras, chamber groups, theater, and dance companies.

Assessing the stature of the presenting organizations, galleries, and collaborators is difficult whether for the candidate, the department, or APT. The institution could help by assembling a list of representative galleries, concert venues, theaters, museums, presses, and presenting organizations and ask departments to situate the candidate's work in relation to that list. Criteria for significance may include venue size, the stature of the artists presented each year, selectivity, annual budget, amount spent on the presentation, and critical attention. Similarly, the prestige of awards, grants, fellowships, and commissions can be assessed by selectivity, reputation of the institution offering the award, and the amount of the award.

Speaking engagements and residencies at art schools, museums, galleries, conferences, university departments, and festivals are another useful indicator of the artist's prominence in the field. As with presentation venues, assessing the importance of these engagements is relatively straightforward when based on the prominence of the organization, program, or school. The departmental report must make the case and external evaluators can verify the department's argument.

Finally, the artist/candidate must thoroughly document public presentations of her work. A visual artist's CV typically includes a long list of gallery exhibitions identified by date and place, but not by the number of works presented, whether the exhibit was a solo or group show, the stature of the gallery, or even the duration of the exhibit. The candidate must make the significance of these presentations legible to non-specialist readers.

Assessing Artistic Works

Unlike scholarship, which is a unique product of the university, artistic production is defined and judged outside of the academy as well as within. Questions of expertise quickly arise. Who is the

authority? The tenured professor of painting, the art historian, the critic writing for *Art Forum*, or a distinguished artist working outside of the academy?

Critical reviews by scholars, journalists, and established artists vary in quality. Very few art reviews appear in academic journals and books, and if they do, they appear long after the artwork was created, possibly not in time for the artist's tenure review. More timely reviews may appear in magazines, newspapers, and online venues, and the best of these (e.g., the *New Yorker*, the *New York Times*, and *Art Forum*) may offer sophisticated criticism. That said, critical reviews published in mainstream media are likely to reflect the personal biases of the writer, and, because they are addressed to general audiences, they rarely offer an extended critique of the work. At best, mainstream writings suggest the degree to which the work is part of a larger cultural conversation about art. They are not sufficiently detailed to constitute a sophisticated critical assessment of the artwork.

In the absence of a well-defined infrastructure for critical assessment in academic publications, it is up to external evaluators to offer penetrating, fair-minded, and technically informed judgements of an arts portfolio. Even here, external letters vary dramatically in quality: some writers take great pains to analyze and assess each work in the portfolio while others, often the most distinguished artists in the field, offer cursory and superficial evaluations. Letters from non-academic professionals are not likely to be helpful because the writers do not understand the academic review process. The template letter also might be rewritten, as was suggested in the Public Scholarship section. Too often evaluators assume that we are asking for an assessment of the candidate's scholarship. While regarding artistic work as scholarship is rhetorically welcome, framing the request in this way (for an assessment of the candidate's scholarship) is still likely to be confusing to the evaluator. The template letter might substitute "artistic works" for "scholarship" to make our expectations clear.

Finally, it is notable that none of our peer institutions award tenure to actors, dancers, and performing musicians unless they hold appointments in professional schools within the university (e.g., Yale School of Music, Yale School of Drama, University of Michigan School of Theater and Music, Oberlin Conservatory, Peabody Conservatory at Johns Hopkins, Eastman School of Music at the University of Rochester). One reason for this is that tenure criteria for performing musicians at top conservatories may take into account the quality of the candidate's undergraduate students.⁵⁵ Another reason is that late-career performers in dance and music (especially voice) do not concertize or perform as frequently as they did earlier.

In the case of Duke, the first issue is complicated by the fact that Duke does not judge our tenured faculty scholars by the quality of our undergraduates. Given that we do note how many dissertations our faculty supervise, however, we could tabulate thesis advisees for faculty teaching in our MFA programs, particularly when considering promotion to Full Professor. As for the second issue: a late-career artist who steps way from a full schedule professional performance presents a delicate issue. Just as Duke evaluates promotion to Full Professor by considering the "tripod" of research, teaching, and service, the same criteria could apply to

⁵⁵ This emerged in letters from external evaluators with appointments at music schools when asked to state whether our Duke colleague would be reappointed or promoted at their home institutions. It is not unusual for young musicians to apply to a school in order to study with a particular artist.

performing artists. It is not unusual for a late-career dancer or musician to attract graduate students, for example. Also, externally, a distinguished faculty artist may present masterclasses at other schools and serve as a judge in national and international competitions. In some cases, late-career dancers and actors become choreographers and directors (e.g., dancers Paul Taylor and Merce Cunningham).

Recommended Policy

As at Duke, our peer institutions struggle with the assessment of the scholarly output of its performing/creative artists. And, based on interviews with deans and upper administrators at Stanford, Cornell, Princeton, and Chicago, it is apparent that there is vast variability and inconsistency (between, and even within, institutions) in how arts departments are assessing artistic quality. For example, while valuing composers in the Music Department who are committed to speculation and experiment, Stanford also supports novelists in its Creative Writing program who work with commercial publishers. And while colleagues at Princeton emphasized the importance of the departmental report and the external letters, its tenure review committee does not directly inspect the candidate's publications or art works (citing the usual problem of a scientist evaluating a humanist's monograph and vice versa.) The committee was the most persuaded perhaps by Chicago's approach to tenuring artists: hire distinguished senior artists with tenure and enlist their help in defining tenure criteria within their disciplines.

While still at a preliminary stage in thinking about the review/promotion/tenure process for creative artists, the committee proposes the following steps:

- Identify strategic opportunities to make senior appointments with tenure for practicing artists with the understanding that these colleagues will help Duke articulate and maintain rigorous standards for awarding tenure to artists; our MFA programs in Experimental and Documentary Art and Dance require immediate attention.
- Specify qualifications for a tenure track appointment required of artists with an MFA (theater, creative writing, visual art, film, dance) and a Ph.D. or DMA (music composition, music performance, creative writing).
- Compile lists of prominent arts organizations, presenters, publishers, and awards for each arts discipline as a way to help departments assess the professional stature of candidates.
- Develop criteria for productivity for each arts discipline that is analogous to expectations for our research faculty.
- Develop means of helping artist faculty to grow professionally; these should include not only scheduled sabbaticals but also internal funding to support recordings, productions, travel, and related professional development efforts.
- Clarify our expectations from external evaluators; adapt the standard request letter to address relevant criteria for practicing artists.

7. CONCLUSION:

In the first meeting the co-chairs had with Provost Kornbluth, she posed the goal as the same as it has been for Duke since its founding: faculty excellence. For our committee this has meant assessing the mix of continuity and change in the criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion for sustaining and indeed furthering the excellence of Duke faculty going forward. We believe the policy recommendations our Report provides, grounded in our own deliberations as well as consultations within and beyond Duke and research on relevant policies and studies, are affirming of that mandate.

APPENDIX 1: Committee Members

Name	Affiliation	E-mail address
Anne Allison, Co-Chair	Arts & Sciences—Cultural Anthropology & Gender, Sexuality and Feminist Studies	aaa@duke.edu
Nancy Armstrong	Arts & Sciences—English	n.b.armstrong@duke.edu
Ashish Arora	Fuqua School of Business	ashish.arora@duke.edu
Lisa Campbell	Nicholas School of the Environment	lisa.m.campbell@duke.edu
Merlise Clyde	Arts & Sciences—Statistical Science	clyde@duke.edu
Stephen Craig	Arts & Sciences—Chemistry	stephen.craig@duke.edu
David Dunson	Arts & Sciences—Statistical Science	dunson@duke.edu
Kevin Hoover	Arts & Sciences—Economics & Philosophy	kd.hoover@duke.edu
Joe Izatt	Pratt School of Engineering	joseph.izatt@duke.edu
Bruce Jentleson, Co-Chair	Sanford School of Public Policy School of Medicine—Molecular Genetics & Microbiology	bwj7@duke.edu sue.robertson@duke.edu
Sue Jinks-Robertson	Arts & Sciences—Romance Studies	michele.longino@duke.edu
Michele Longino	Arts & Sciences—African & African-American Studies	man9@duke.edu
Mark Anthony Neal	Divinity School	kavin.rowe@duke.edu
Kavin Rowe	Arts & Sciences—Biology	jwillis@duke.edu
John Willis		
<i>Ex officio</i>		
Abbas Benmamoun	Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement	abbas.benmamoun@duke.edu
Jennifer Francis	Vice Provost for Academic Affairs	jfrancis@duke.edu
Scott Lindroth	Vice Provost for the Arts	scott.lindroth@duke.edu
Kevin Moore	Vice Dean for Faculty, Arts & Sciences	kevin.moore@duke.edu
Paula Tanabe	School of Nursing	paula.tanabe@duke.edu
Jeff Vincent	Dean, Nicholas School of the Environment	jeff.vincent@duke.edu
Gennifer Weisenfeld	Dean of Humanities, Arts & Sciences	gennifer.weisenfeld@duke.edu

APPENDIX 2: Schedule of TSC Meetings

September 26, 2017, Rubenstein Library 249

Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Discussion of Committee Charge
- Key Issues
- Work Plan

October 30, 2017, Rubenstein Library 249

Agenda

- General Business
- Discussion of School and Departmental Initial Reports
 - Existing Policies and Practices
 - Public and Policy Engagement
 - Digital Domain
 - Arts and Non-Textual Scholarly Output
- Subcommittee Volunteers
- Next Steps
 - Additional intra-Duke input
 - External Outreach
 - Other?

December 7, 2017, Sanford School of Public Policy, Rhodes Conference Room

Agenda

- Reviewing Our Mandate, Various Updates
- Subcommittee Work
 - Existing Policies and Practices
 - Public and Policy Engagement
 - Digital and Other New Technologies
 - Arts
- Research on other Universities, Professional Associations
- Diversity
- Next Steps
 - Researching the issues
 - Committee work
 - Further faculty outreach

January 24, 2018, Rubenstein Library 249

Agenda

- Understanding Research Impact, Paolo Mangiafico & David Hansen
- Existing Policies and Practices Report
- Public and Policy Engagement Report

- Digital and Other New Technologies Report
- Diversity Report
- Arts Report
- Completing Our Work

February 22, 2018, Sanford School of Public Policy, Rubenstein Hall 200

Agenda

- Public Scholarship Report
- Digital and Other New Technologies Report
- Digital and New Technologies
- Completing Our Work

March 29, 2018, Perkins Library 218

Agenda

- Arts Report
- Digital and Other New Technologies Report
- Public Scholarship Report
- Diversity Report
- Existing Policies and Practices Report

May 3, 2018, Rubenstein Library 249

Agenda

- Discussion and Approval of Final Report

APPENDIX 3: Sub-committees

Existing Policies and Practices

Sub-committee Members: Jentleson, Clyde, Dunson, Hoover, Arora, Izatt

A review of what in the way of current practices and standards could be readjusted, updated, and improved. This includes such aspects of the review process as the preparation of the promotion files by departments and the three-year (midterm) review all pre-tenure faculty undergo.

Diversity

Sub-committee Members: Allison, Rowe, Tanabe

Given Duke's commitment to diversity of its faculty (in terms of gender, ethnicity, nationality, sexual preference, diverse-ableism), a consideration of how the review process could better take account of various forms of bias or discrimination involved in evaluating and recognizing scholarly productivity.

Public Scholarship

Sub-committee Members: Jentleson, Longino, Campbell, Jinks-Robertson, Rowe

At a time when more and more Duke faculty are extending/engaging/performing their scholarship in avenues that are "public" as variously defined, a consideration of how such scholarship can be better reviewed, evaluated, and (thereby) promoted.

Digital Scholarship

Sub-committee Members: Allison, Craig, Willis, Neal

As new forms of digital and other media are becoming increasingly adopted in research and teaching, an examination of how, with what standards, and with what rubrics or mechanisms this could be evaluated.

The Arts

Sub-committee Members: Armstrong, Lindroth, Weisenfeld

In light of the fact that in the creative, performing, and fine arts, many faculty engage in output that falls outside conventions of evaluation existing in other disciplines, a consideration of whether, and, if so, how, such scholars should be on tenure-track lines with an appropriate evaluation process.

APPENDIX 4:
Additional Duke Consultations

Formal meetings, presentation by Committee Co-Chairs:

October 16, 2017, Deans' Cabinet

November 1, 2017, Academic Programs Committee

December 1, 2017, Board of Trustees' Academic Affairs Committee

February 15, 2018, Academic Council

Additional consultations by Committee Members with their respective Departments and Schools

Arts and Sciences survey by Vice Dean Kevin Moore

Numerous meetings and e-mail communications with individual faculty

APPENDIX 5:

CHAPTER 3: FACULTY APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Introduction

The following section on appointment, promotion, and tenure is applicable to the faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Pratt School of Engineering, the Nicholas School of the Environment, the Divinity School, School of Nursing, the Fuqua School of Business, the Sanford School of Public Policy, authorized university institutes, and the basic science departments in the School of Medicine. Details of procedures of each of these units may be found in relevant appendices. Procedures for the School of Law may be found in Appendix I, and for the School of Nursing in Appendix K. Bylaws related to the clinical sciences in the School of Medicine are in Appendix L.

The quality of its faculty is the most vital determinant of a great university. Further, the highest standards of appointment, promotion, and awarding of tenure are best achieved by a process of careful examination and review. Such review is most effectively accomplished by a collaborative process whereby the faculty itself, through highly respected representatives, provides its best judgment and advice to the responsible administrative officers.

Judgments of academic excellence are complex. They cannot be reduced to a quantitative formula nor can the considerations that must be applied in each individual case be completely described in general terms. At the same time, the criteria to be applied in all cases must represent excellence in scholarship, a demonstrated commitment to high-quality teaching/mentoring, and a willingness to contribute to university/professional service. ~~the quality of the candidate's performance, especially as a teacher and as a scholar. Scholarly productivity must reflect a serious and sustained commitment to the life of scholarship.~~

Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

All tenured members of the university's regular rank faculty are appointed or promoted by the Board of Trustees or the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the provost, with the approval of the president.

Appointment and Promotion without Tenure

Faculty appointments may be made without tenure either in a tenure track or a non-tenure track. The terms of that appointment shall be made clear to the faculty member at the time of appointment.

Tenure track positions are normally filled by faculty with the Ph.D. at the three regular rank tenure track titles of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. In Arts and Sciences, regular rank faculty without the Ph.D. are commonly appointed at the non-tenure track rank of lecturer. When such an appointment is made, the faculty member will not begin to accrue time toward tenure until the degree is awarded and he or she has been given a tenure track appointment. Subject to variations in some schools, initial appointment to a regular rank tenure track position without tenure will be for a term of four years.

Faculty who do not hold tenure track positions will be given modified titles. The complete set of modified titles for non-tenure track faculty, approved by the Academic Council and affirmed by the Board of Trustees, appears in Chapter 2 of this handbook.

Term (non-tenured) tenure track appointments at the ranks of assistant professor and associate professor, and promotions to assistant professor or associate professor without tenure, shall be made by the provost, based on appropriate recommendations by the deans or the heads of trustee-authorized faculty hiring units in accordance with internal departmental or school procedures. Additional review by an advisory committee is not required.

Annual Reviews and Reappointment to a Second Term

Annual reviews of regular rank non-tenured tenure track faculty will be conducted by the director of a program, chair, or dean for the purpose of providing direction and advice to the faculty member regarding progress at Duke. In general, the advice of senior faculty in the unit will be solicited for this review. Renewal of the initial tenure track appointment for a second term which may extend through the end of the probationary period will be made only on the basis of a careful departmental or school review and of approval by the dean and provost. The purpose of this

comprehensive review is to develop a judgment as to the faculty member's probable suitability for tenure at Duke. Once approval has been granted for the second term appointment in a tenure track rank, the faculty member becomes eligible to apply for a junior faculty leave (see policy on leaves).

Appointment and Promotion with Tenure

Appointments or promotions of full-time faculty members to tenured rank are made upon recommendations originating in the academic units authorized to make such appointments (e.g., departments and schools) described in Chapter 2 of this handbook. Recommendations for appointments from the outside must take into account program, departmental, school, and university needs.

Tenure track faculty members who are currently on a Flexible Work Arrangements (FWA) plan, and who have served at least half of their tenure track time as non-FWA, are eligible to be considered for tenure. The same expectations for tenure as those for non-FWA faculty members will apply. Once tenured, it is the expectation that the faculty member will return to non-FWA within three years of achieving tenure.

~~This rule goes into effect in the 2013-14 academic year. Those already on FWA and untenured prior to that date should consult with their dean who will make recommendations to the provost regarding their tenure process.~~

Tenure at Duke University, whether awarded to a faculty member currently on the Duke faculty or offered to a scholar who is being recruited for the Duke faculty, should be reserved for those who have clearly demonstrated through their performance as scholars and teachers that their excellence in scholarship, and whose work has been widely perceived among their peers as outstanding. Persons holding the rank of associate professor with tenure are expected to stand in competition with the foremost persons of similar rank in similar fields and to show clear evidence of continuing excellence in scholarly activity in their years at the university scholarship. Good teaching/mentoring and university/professional service should be expected but cannot in and of themselves be sufficient grounds for tenure. ~~The expectation of continuous intellectual development and leadership, as demonstrated by published scholarship that is recognized by leading scholars at Duke and elsewhere must be an indispensable qualification for tenure at Duke University.~~ Sustained scholarly output is required for tenure.

Full professors play a critical role in determining the intellectual quality of the university. Thus the rank of professor should be reserved for those who have clearly met the criteria for tenure and have demonstrated their continuous intellectual development and leadership. ~~It should be clear that appointment~~ Appointment to associate professor does not necessarily imply eventual promotion to full professor. Promotion to full professor should be reserved for those who have an academic record documenting a continuous high-quality performance level in at minimum two of the following three required components of scholarly productivity--research, teaching and service--together with a good performance record in the third required component. Length of service alone should not produce an expectation for promotion.

Responsibilities of the Department, Program, or School

All Trustee-authorized faculty hiring units (e.g., departments, programs, and schools) must have a set of formal procedures to govern their internal evaluation processes. The deans, directors, and department chairs are responsible for submitting these procedures to the provost. The provost will review the procedures and assure that they are generally acceptable and consistent with the policies described herein. The deans, directors, and department chairs will be responsible for distributing these procedures, once endorsed, to all members of the department, program, or school and to new members of the faculty at the time of appointment.

Appointments

For appointments at the rank of associate professor with tenure or at the rank of full professor made from outside Duke University, the evaluation process can be initiated at any convenient time. Although the thoroughness and completeness of the process must not be compromised, sometimes the evaluation may pose problems in the recruitment process and must be conducted with delicacy and dispatch. The procedures to be followed are essentially the same as those for promotion described below and will be initiated whenever the outside scholar indicates a willingness to become a candidate and the authorized unit places his or her name in nomination along with a dossier (see section on dossier). In all but the rarest circumstance, the dossier for an outside scholar should be submitted before the candidate assumes residency at the university.

Promotion and Tenure

Reviews for granting tenure or for promotion to associate professor with tenure or to professor shall be conducted first in the basic authorized academic unit, be it the department (in Arts and Sciences or the Pratt School of Engineering), the section, division, program or institute, or the school. The head of the unit shall inform the

candidate of the review and indicate the approximate time in which the review process will be completed. Prior to requesting approval from the dean for the membership of the departmental review committee or inviting any faculty to serve on it, the head of the unit shall request from the candidate (providing a copy to the dean to inform the dean's required approval of the review committee and for inclusion in the dossier) a brief written synopsis of his or her intellectual interest, including a description of any factors – interdisciplinary or otherwise – that the candidate believes should be taken into consideration in establishing said review committee. Except in cases when a basic authorized academic unit has fewer than five tenured faculty eligible and available to vote (see below), whenever a tenured faculty member from another authorized academic unit is invited to serve on a candidate's review committee, said extra-departmental faculty member shall be added to the standard unit review committee for this instance. All members of the review committee shall have the right to vote on the report of the committee and to attend the discussion in the candidate's department regarding the case.

When candidates hold secondary/joint appointments and/or participate in interdisciplinary activities beyond the primary department, it is expected that such other academic units will be asked to provide a statement for the dossier about the level and quality of the candidate's contribution there. Furthermore, the dean shall be actively involved in determining the membership of the faculty review committee so as to assure an informed evaluation of the candidate's disciplinary or interdisciplinary contributions.

When the unit has completed its review, if it has reached a favorable decision the chair shall forward the recommendation along with the complete dossier (see section on dossier) of the candidate to the dean, and the dean, in turn, to the provost. Opinions from the chair and the dean will be added to the file, but even should such intermediate recommendations be negative a dossier with a favorable recommendation from the unit must ultimately be forwarded to the provost. A recommendation for promotion and/or tenure is made by secret unsigned ballot of tenured faculty members consistent with the unit's procedure. These recommendations should be forwarded along with a list of those present and the tally of the vote.

When the review by the basic authorized academic unit (generally a department) reaches a negative conclusion, the chair or director shall inform the dean and the candidate of the decision and the reasons for it. The faculty member may appeal this decision to the provost through the dean within two weeks of notification.

When a basic authorized academic unit has fewer than five tenured faculty available to vote, the provost, after consulting with the head of the unit (generally the chair or dean), shall add tenured faculty members from other authorized academic units who are considered knowledgeable in the candidate's area. In this way, the voting membership of those passing on the candidate's credentials will number at least five.

Schedule

Formal review procedures for promotion and/or tenure by the basic authorized academic unit (e.g., department or school) shall be initiated in the spring or summer of the academic year prior to that in which action by the Board of Trustees is required. Review schedules may vary slightly among the schools. It should, however, be noted that the work of the provost's Advisory Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure is conducted principally during the fall and spring semesters of the regular academic year. Faculty members will be notified of the provost's decision by April 1 when the recommendation of the department or school and complete dossier, including the dean's written assessment, are submitted to the committee no later than November 1 for promotion to full professor and December 1 for promotion with tenure.

Dossier

It is the responsibility of the recommending unit to assemble all the materials necessary for the review. The head of the unit initiating the recommendation (e.g., director of a program, chair [in Arts and Sciences or the Pratt School of Engineering], or dean) has the responsibility of insuring that the dossier sent on for review is as complete as possible.

The complete list of materials to be included in the dossier is provided to the deans by the Office of the Provost.

In Arts and Sciences, the Pratt School of Engineering, the Nicholas School of the Environment, and the Medical School, the dean will examine the dossier submitted by a department (or Trustee-authorized division in the Nicholas School of the Environment) for completeness and, if the dean considers it incomplete or inadequate, return it to the department or division for more preparation. In schools without departments (e.g., Divinity School, Sanford School of Public Policy, and Fuqua School of Business), the dean will examine the dossier for completeness. If the dean considers the dossier adequately presented and documented, it will be forwarded to the provost. However, the dean

may seek supplementary information to inform his or her recommendation. All such requests and the resulting information shall be added to the dossier and kept confidential. The dean shall present in writing his or her assessment of the candidate's scholarly credentials and suitability for appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion. For the purposes of the AP&T Committee's consideration, the dean should address only the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service. If he or she so wishes, in a separate letter addressed only to the provost, the dean may also present in writing additional information about the school, its goals, needs, and the relation of the dossier to them; this institutional information is solely for the provost's consideration and is not germane to the considerations of the AP&T Committee. Such strategic considerations are not to be considered by the AP&T Committee or the provost in cases of internal promotion to tenure.

Responsibilities of Provost's Advisory Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

All appointments and promotions that confer tenure and promotions to the rank of professor shall be considered by the Advisory Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (AP&T), a group that advises the provost.

This committee is appointed by the provost and, in addition to the chair, consists of at minimum twelve full professors nominated by the Executive Committee of the Academic Council (ECAC) on the basis of scholarly distinction, aptitude for service on this demanding committee, and availability for the term involved. In making nominations, ECAC shall seek balance among divisions, schools, and academic disciplines within the faculty. Normally at least two members will come from the Arts and Sciences Division of Humanities, two from the Division of Social Sciences, two from the Division of Natural Sciences, one from the Pratt School of Engineering, one from the Fuqua School of Business, one from the basic medical sciences, and three from these or other units, subject to review. The chair shall be a faculty member nominated by ECAC and appointed by the provost. The chair will be appointed for a one year term, renewable. The president, the provost, and the dean of the Graduate School will serve as nonvoting ex-officio members of the committee.

The Advisory Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure is charged with evaluating the dossiers forwarded to it, consistent with standards enunciated in this document. If the AP&T Committee has questions about materials in the dossier, or if it lacks certain documentation, the committee will ask the chair, director of the program, or dean of the originating unit for clarification or additional materials. The AP&T Committee may supplement the outside letters received about a candidate with additional letters or reports from evaluators who are competent to judge the candidate's scholarship. Should the AP&T Committee decide, in its sole discretion that it needs additional advice, it reserves the option to establish an ad hoc panel to review the dossier. This panel may gather additional information, if necessary, and will be asked to provide the AP&T Committee with a written evaluation. Panel members will be selected on the basis of their knowledge of the candidate's field and an overall balance of perspectives. One or more panel members may be Duke faculty, and it is typical to include at least one member from another institution. An AP&T Committee member normally will serve as liaison between the ad hoc panel and the AP&T Committee. In the case of current Duke faculty being evaluated for tenure the chair (or director) of the originating academic unit and dean will usually meet with the AP&T Committee to discuss significant issues raised in the course of the evaluation; in the case of external tenure candidates or internal candidates for promotion to full professor such interviews may be scheduled at the AP&T Committee's discretion.

Individual faculty members may write to the AP&T Committee (or to the provost, who will refer such letters to the AP&T Committee) with regard to any case being considered by that committee. Such communications will be added to the dossier and kept confidential.

The Advisory Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure must then formulate its own recommendations for presentation to the provost. In general, a quorum requires ~~nine~~ at minimum three-quarters of the voting members unless a sufficient number of votes, affirmative or negative, has been cast to represent an absolute majority (~~seven~~) of the committee. A recommendation should be considered definitive only if it has been supported, affirmatively or negatively, by vote of an absolute majority (~~seven~~) of the AP&T Committee. In the event the AP&T Committee's recommendation is negative, the provost will review the dossier (prior to notification of the candidate or department) to determine whether all factors relating to the merit and value of the candidate, including ethnic, racial, and gender diversity, have been fully and adequately considered.

The provost will inform the AP&T Committee of his or her decision. Should the provost choose not to accept the recommendation made by the AP&T Committee, the provost shall so inform the committee ~~in writing~~ and indicate the basis for the decision.

The provost will communicate to the appropriate dean his or her decision and the major factors underlying it. The dean of the school is responsible for transmitting this information to the head of the originating academic unit (e.g., department chair), if there is one, and either the dean or chair will communicate this to the candidate. If the provost intends to render a negative decision on a case already considered by the AP&T Committee, or a case that has not received a positive recommendation from the department, the provost will inform the candidate, the departmental chair and the relevant dean. An appeal of the provost's impending decision, from any or all of these three parties, may then be made within the following two weeks, submitted through the Dean. The provost will also provide a copy of the official APT memo summarizing the case and the deliberations of the APT Committee, ~~or of the chair's review summary~~. If the provost intends to act contrary to a positive recommendation from the APT Committee, the provost must provide the basis for this decision. On the basis of this appeal, the provost may then either refer the case back to the AP&T Committee, including the departmental appeal, and ask for reconsideration of its recommendation or make his or her decision without referral. On any one case the originating academic unit, school, and/or candidate ~~is~~ **are** limited to one appeal.

Generally if a candidate's tenure dossier is forwarded by the academic unit, the AP&T Committee will consider the candidate only once. Thus, a faculty member whose tenure review is undertaken by the AP&T Committee during his or her initial contract term, and who is turned down for tenure by the University, shall be allowed to complete the term of the original appointment, but his or her tenure track appointment shall not be renewed or extended. However, a tenure track faculty member who has been turned down for tenure by the University may apply during an authorized national search for an existing non-tenure track position at Duke.

When the provost's recommendation is favorable, the provost shall consult with the president. With the president's approval, the provost shall submit the recommendation to the Board of Trustees for final action.

Records of each case shall be properly safeguarded and when the case is completed, retained or deposited under appropriate controls in the University Archives for a period to be determined by the university counsel.

Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of regular rank non-tenure track faculty for schools and institutes under the provost

The following text will supersede the language in Appendix C (C7-C10) of the Faculty Handbook for regular rank non-tenure track faculty for schools and institutes under the Provost.

The following guidelines apply to non-tenure track appointments within the Provost management center and are not directly applicable to the Schools of Medicine and Nursing.

Regular rank non-tenure track faculty members are integral to the intellectual life and teaching mission of the schools and several of the institutes at Duke, filling important roles, through the roles differ somewhat between units. It is the intent that these positions will have long term and an ongoing contractual relationship with the University (e.g. repetitive contract, participation in continuing research grants, etc.). As with tenure-track faculty, university rules and procedures governing the appointment, reappointment, and promotion of regular rank non-tenure track faculty are intended to uphold the highest standards of excellence. They also seek to honor the diversity of activities and service that regular rank non-tenure track faculty provide within various schools and institutes.

Guidelines for New Appointments in Regular Rank Non-tenure Track Positions

The dean of each school or director of each institute requests authorization from the Provost for each new regular non-tenure line faculty appointments. The dean or institute director establishes policy regarding whether a search is required for new appointments, with the expectation that (inter)national searches will normally be required for all new regular rank appointments. The dean or institute director, in collaboration with the faculty, defines the procedures for such a search.

The possible non-tenure track faculty titles include:

- Assistant/Associate/(Full) Professor of the Practice
- Assistant/Associate/(Full) Research Professor
- Assistant/Associate/(Full) Clinical Professor
- Lecturer/Senior Lecturer

Guidelines for Review of Regular Rank Non-tenure Track Positions

The intent of an ongoing contractual relationship is a requirement for all regular rank positions. Some regular rank non-tenure track positions may be connected to limited-term grants or specific instructional needs. Thus it is important to maintain a distinction between review and contract renewal. Whether the review is for an initial appointment, reappointment, or promotion of full-time faculty in regular, non-tenure track ranks, the review process will focus on evaluating an individual's qualifications for a specific faculty title. Successful review is not necessarily synonymous with contract issuance or renewal, since this may depend upon funding support or curricular need. Before authorizing a review, the dean or institute director should consider carefully the intention for an ongoing contractual relationship between the faculty member and the University, and the availability of funding support to determine the ongoing status of the position. Contract periods should be synchronized with appointment periods. However, when funding is not ensured for the duration of the contract, the contract should make this clear. Furthermore, in the event of impending termination, faculty must be notified no later than one year before the termination. Termination of external funding will not result in termination of the Duke affiliation specified in the contract, but it may result in termination of compensation absent other sources of funding. Until a contract expires, the faculty member can apply for additional external funding as a Duke faculty member.

Annual formative reviews

Annual reviews of regular rank non-tenure track faculty will be conducted by the director or program chair, or dean or institute director, or an appropriate delegate for the purpose for providing direction and advice to the faculty member regarding their progress at Duke.

Periodicity of formal evaluative reviews

Initial appointments to regular rank non-tenure track appointments will be reviewed for reappointment (and, when appropriate, promotion) in the penultimate year of the current contract, except under conditions as requested by the dean and granted by the provost. Subsequent review will typically be conducted at least every five years. The dean or institute director may approve an interval as long as 10 years for a faculty member at the level of (full) Professor of the Practice, Research Professor, or Clinical Professor. Reviews for initial appointments, the first review after appointment, and reviews for promotion should be detailed; reviews for subsequent reappointment may be less detailed. For cases where annual reviews demonstrate that the faculty member clearly exceeds the standards required for reappointment the school or director may authorize an expedited review process for reappointment at the same rank. The dean or director of each school or institute, in collaboration with the faculty, shall determine what materials are required for an expedited or less detailed review, as well as any limitations or restrictions on when faculty are eligible for it.

Responsibilities of the Department, Institute, or School

Each unit with hiring authority, such as a program or department (in schools with departments) or school or institute is permitted—and expected—to establish criteria and procedural guidelines for evaluating candidates for appointment, reappointment, and promotion in regular, non-tenure track ranks, which are appropriate to its discipline. These criteria and guidelines must be generated in partnership between the faculty and the unit Chair, and be submitted in writing to the dean (for schools with departments), the governing faculty body of that School or institute, and provost for approval. Criteria should be more rigorous for each higher level of faculty rank and should be equally rigorous, though not identical to, those used for tenure track faculty. In the case where criteria differ among hiring units or departments, the dean or institute director is responsible for assuring that the criteria are equally rigorous for equivalent ranks in different departments. The provost is responsible for review of and approval of the guidelines assuring appropriate and equally rigorous criteria are applied in different schools and institutes. Criteria and guidelines for each department or school must be made readily available to faculty, preferably through posting on a unit website, and criteria will be consistent for similar cases within a given unit. Annual reviews will provide an opportunity to evaluate progress relative to these criteria.

Components of regular rank non-tenure track review process

1. Each school or institute will establish guidelines for the size and composition of the review committee that prepares the initial report on appointment, reappointment, or promotion.
2. While a general template of items to include in the review portfolio is provided by the provost's office, each school or institute will have some flexibility to reshape that list to fit the nature of the position being reviewed.

3. All qualified faculty in the hiring unit, including program or department (for schools with departments or hiring unit programs) or school or institute will be allowed to vote on the potential appointment, reappointment, or promotion of regular rank non-tenure track faculty, after consulting the review committee report.
 - a. On candidate for initial appointment at any regular non-tenure track rank, all regular-rank faculty are eligible to vote, regardless of the rank proposed for the candidate.
 - b. On candidate for reappointment to the same regular non-tenure track rank, all regular rank faculty, who hold the same rank as the candidate or a higher rank are eligible to vote.
 - c. On regular non-tenure track candidates for reappointment with promotion, all regular rank faculty, who hold either the same or higher rank than the proposed promotion shall be eligible to vote.
4. In cases receiving a favorable program or departmental or school or institute recommendation, the dean or institute director will decide whether to proceed with the initial appointment, reappointment, or promotion, and will forward the decision to the provost, who will take it to the Board of Trustees for approval. In cases where the program or departmental recommendation is unfavorable the candidate may appeal the decision to the provost within two weeks of the notification date.
5. Finally, at the point of their decision to support or decline the relevant action, the dean or institute director will notify the candidate of the decision.

Continuance after an unfavorable review

In the event of an unfavorable review, regular rank non-tenure track faculty members will be allowed to continue in their position to the end of their current contract.

Confidentiality Policy

Pursuant to university custom and policy, all documents contained in the dossier with the exception of the materials directly submitted by the candidate are considered confidential, as is the identity of all external reviewers. The total dossier is made available only to those individuals officially responsible for recommendations and/or decisions on the candidate's status. These individuals include (1) the voting members of the departmental faculty in cases of appointment; (2) tenured departmental faculty of rank higher than the candidate in cases of reappointment, promotion, and tenure within the university; (3) the departmental chairs and administrative assistants of the chairs; (4) the appropriate deans, the provost, the provost's Advisory Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure, and related committees; (5) the president; and (6) the Board of Trustees. All individuals participating in the APT process are expected to adhere to this statement regarding confidentiality.

Ad hoc panels and/or individual additional external reviewers may be consulted by any of the above listed university administrators or faculty bodies with the expectation that the privacy and confidentiality of the dossier is protected.

Academic Council
 March 31, 1988
 Revised September 2001
 Revised June 2017