

ADVANCE BU Recommendations for Revising Bradley's TPR Guidelines



ADVANCE BU

Advancing and Maintaining Equity

National Science Foundation Award #230732
bradley.edu/ADVANCEBU

TPR Team members: Matt O'Brien, Jackie Hogan, Paul Gullifor, Seth Katz (ret.), Claire McQuerry, Michelle Nielsen-Ott, Melissa Peterson, Shannon Timpe, Kat Bloompott

Lunch & Learn organizers: Melinda Faulkner, Rachel Borton, Scott Cavanah, Yufeng Lu, Yun Wang, Sindhu Parachuri (GA)



BRADLEY
University

Why do we need to revise our TPR guidelines?



"Is there any good reason to open up that can of worms?"



BRADLEY
University

- In 2024 survey, **less than 1/5** of BU faculty feel that TPR expectations are **“very clear.”**
- In 2024 survey, approximately **1/3** of men, and fewer than **1/5** of women and nonbinary faculty feel that **teaching and research are evaluated equitably** at BU.
- **Women Associate Professors** at BU **less likely see path to promotion** than men or non-binary faculty; only 25% of Full Professors at BU are women (36% nationally).
- Chairs in multiple colleges indicate that **TPR guidelines no longer accurately reflect the work faculty do.**

- 44% of Bradley's TPR guidelines are more than **10 years old**, with 24% being more than **15 years old**.
- Bradley's TPR guidelines **vary greatly in level of detail** (3-48 pages), and 4 units do not have TPR guidelines.
- Some TPR guidelines at BU contain **outdated information**, or are **out of alignment** with *Handbook* (eg. counting advising under service instead of teaching)
- TPR documents at Bradley are **not centrally archived** and there is **no expectation of regular reviews** to keep pace with changes in the field or the institution.
- Inconsistent policies on TPR voting provide **some people a double vote** in TPR decisions or record a **tie as a negative vote** (and national research shows underrepresented groups are more likely to have tie votes).
- **Lack of clear expectations** or uneven application of rules violates "**fair play**" and increases opportunity for **bias or the appearance of bias**.

Methods

In Spring of 2024, we met with every College Executive Committee to ask what is and isn't working well with TPR

We reviewed the scholarly literature and other institutions' policies for best practices in TPR

We systematically coded all Bradley TPR docs (418 pages) for 15 elements shown to improve clarity (and equity) in TPR processes



BRADLEY
University

15 elements that improve clarity & equity (Ampaw et. al 2024)

Teaching

1. Detailed description of **what “effective teaching” entails**
2. Detailed explanation of evidence and process used to **judge effective teaching**
3. Detailed explanation of how student evaluations of teaching (**SETs**) **will be used**
4. Concrete expectations for **teaching performance at each rank**
5. Concrete expectations for **quality advising**

Research/creative production (“scholarship”)

1. Detailed explanation of **research/creative production expectations**
2. Concrete expectations for **research/creative production by rank**
3. Detailed explanation of how **sole versus collaborative** contributions are valued and weighted



BRADLEY
University

15 elements that improve clarity & equity (Ampaw et. al 2024)

Service

1. Concrete expectations for **service by rank**

TPR Process

1. Detailed explanation of relative “**weight**” (or value) of **teaching, research and service** in TPR decisions
2. Detailed explanation of **what materials** to submit for TPR, how to organize them, and **when, where, and how** to submit them
3. Detailed explanation of membership of the **TPR review committee** (ie. criteria for inclusion and means of selection)
4. Detailed explanation of **how votes are counted** in TPR decisions
5. Detailed explanation of selecting **external reviewers** (when required)
6. Detailed information on (or links to) **policies for accommodations**, and pause in tenure clock



BRADLEY
University

Coding*

0 = element absent

1 = element present but lacking detail or clarity

2 = element present, detailed and clear

Almost every document scored a 2 in at least one element.
Every document scored a 0 in two or more elements.

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

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

*Intercoder reliability = 98.5%. See fully operationalized codes and median scores for each element in the full report and Appendix 1.

6 Recommendations

1. That all units develop TPR guidelines that incorporate clear articulations of the **15 elements** discussed here. (**Example language** from varied units at Bradley is presented in Appendix 2 of the full report.)
2. That all units ensure that no one gets a “**double vote**” and that **tie votes** are treated as such.
3. That all college and unit **TPR guidelines be reviewed and revised** (and ratified by vote) no less frequently **than every five years**, and **centrally archived**.
4. That all units develop a **Tenure and Promotion Roadmap** for both pre-tenure and post-tenure candidates to help guide their professional activities toward continued advancement. (Example in Appendix 4.)

5. That university, college, and unit TPR guidelines be updated to reflect the growing range of professional activities that faculty engage in, using Boyer's (1990) **expanded model of scholarship**: the scholarship of **discovery**; the scholarship of **teaching and learning**; the scholarship of **application**; and the scholarship of **integration**. Each unit may decide the appropriate "weighting" of these different types of scholarship. (See Appendix 3.)
6. That the Senate clarify *Handbook* language regarding the **relative "weight" of teaching and research/creative production**. It currently gives "highest priority" to teaching, but in practice, research/creative production is often the most important factor, particularly for promotion to Full Professor.

See example language whereby faculty applying for promotion to Associate or Full Professor must document **satisfactory performance in both** areas (teaching and research/creative production) AND a record of **excellence in at least one** area. (Appendix 2).

Questions & Discussion

- Do you have any questions about the recommendations?
- Do you have any suggestions for improving the recommendations?
- What do you see as benefits or barriers to implementing the recommendations in your department?
- What supports are needed to move the recommendations forward at the college or department level?
- What is a reasonable timeline for implementing the changes at the departmental, college, and university levels?

- Read full findings, recommendations and sample language on the “reports” page of the ADVANCE BU website (<https://bradley.edu/sites/ADVANCEBU/reports/>)
- Provide anonymous feedback through the “reports” page
- Contact jlhogan@bradley.edu to arrange for an ADVANCE BU team member to meet with your department or group to discuss the recommendations and help us further refine them.

Thank you!