Academic Computing Advisory Committee
Report on Information Technology Issues Affecting Salary, Promotion and Tenure

Introduction

It is the opinion of the Academic Computing Advisory Committee (ACAC) that the issues associated with the use of information technology (IT) as they relate to salary, promotion, and tenure decisions are under addressed. In the regular December, 1999, meeting of the ACAC, President Kupchella challenged the committee to undertake the task of offering recommendations about the way that the University should deal with appropriately crediting IT effort and production in the evaluation of teaching, research, and service on which salary, promotion, and tenure are based. The President suggested this effort would assist the work of the Information Technology Planning Task Force. Following is the report of the ACAC in response to the directive of President Kupchella.

Unaddressed Issues

We begin the report by noting some issues that remain unaddressed. They include:

1. How the institution and its component parts should address the issue of intellectual property rights is a major concern. The focus of this report is suggesting ways the institution should address issues of IT as they apply to scholarship and issues that surround the way in which scholarly activity is evaluated. We recognized that the way the institution deals with intellectual property is tied directly to the rewards afforded faculty, but we believed that addressing that issue went beyond the scope of this committee.

2. How the individual faculty member is to rearrange an already barely manageable schedule to accommodate new demands on time and energy created by the use of information technology remains an issue.

   a. Note: For most faculty members, there is no "free time." The time required for taking advantage of information technology must be taken from somewhere else.

3. How the rearrangement of faculty time and energy will impact the three areas on which salary, tenure and promotion decisions depend; research, service and teaching; remains an unknown.
Useful analogies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Technology Related</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time demands:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial acquisition of computer literacy</td>
<td>Learning to drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on specific hardware or software applications</td>
<td>Learning a new language (Martian, for example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping a web site up to date</td>
<td>Responsibility for department bulletin boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting to hardware and software upgrades</td>
<td>Restructuring a class to adjust to a new edition of a textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class offered completely on-line</td>
<td>Textbook published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating technology into existing course</td>
<td>New course preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course with particularly heavy technology demands</td>
<td>Factors taken into account for load; e.g., class size, class level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research (non-traditional publishing and other research efforts):**

Not e Because material published on-line ge rally makes the author responsible for a va ry of roles tra tionally taken by the book publisher and his agents (e ditor, typ e, illustr at or, lay out art is, to na m a f) succ essful on- ine publishing requires mor etim e and acquisition of a br ad e range of skills, than tra tion al publishing.
Information Technology Related          Traditional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creation and upkeep of a unit website</th>
<th>Acting as the unit's public relations department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acting as information technology consultant to other faculty members, staff and students</td>
<td>Tutoring, Mentoring, Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing and maintaining a computer lab</td>
<td>Complete responsibility for a unit library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as department computer technician</td>
<td>Maintenance engineer in a high-rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees on information technology issues</td>
<td>Any other committee work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating new knowledge about how to use technology for gathering, manipulating, understanding, and demonstrating information.</td>
<td>Responsible for developing a research project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service:

General principles:

- Information technology-related work, like other forms of research, teaching, and service, should be evaluated as an integral part of a faculty member’s accomplishments.

- Because the pace of change in information technology is so rapid and its changes of direction so unpredictable, any guidelines for evaluating work in those areas must be flexible and subject to change at any time.

- Any information technology-related activity that might be construed as falling under more than one of the traditional categories (research, teaching, service) may be credited to more than one category—e.g., creating a Web site that becomes an important resource for the larger profession may be credited as both research and service.

- It is important that the candidate's work be evaluated by persons knowledgeable about the use of information technology. If qualified reviewers are not available in the candidate's home department or even, in some instances, on the candidate’s home campus, it is appropriate to solicit outside reviewers.
• Fair and accurate evaluation of information technology-related work by faculty members must be implemented at all levels of the university, from the department level to those who are responsible for the final decision.

Suggested Guidelines:

University

• The University Senate and the Council of Deans should, in concert, undertake a leadership role in developing a system wide policy proposal for evaluating IT efforts in teaching, research, and service. They should then submit it to the appropriate decision making bodies for review and approval.

This committee believes the proposed policy should include:

a. A process for identifying qualified reviewers, and
b. Identification of the kinds of IT efforts and products that might be produced and the way these will apply to each of the following:
   1. Teaching,
   2. Research, and

School and College Level

• Schools and Colleges should develop a written policy concerning the evaluation of IT in the tenure and promotion process so that faculty members can make decisions about appropriate ways to distribute their time and energy. In addition, if faculty members are expected to provide IT support within the department, they should be appropriately compensated or rewarded.

• Because the IT field is dynamic and ever-changing, tenure and promotion committee guidelines must remain responsive to advancements in the field and innovations in IT applications.

• School and College tenure and promotions committees must include individuals who are qualified IT reviewers.

Department Level

• Departments should establish policies and standards whereby IT related work can be evaluated within their tenure and promotion procedures.
• Departments should make clear to individual faculty members, through performance agreements or some other clear delineation, the way in which IT efforts will apply specifically to their teaching, research, and service obligations and how much each such effort will apply in their salary, promotion, and tenure considerations.

• Issues that must be addressed include:
  a. How the department evaluates research and publication in non-traditional formats,
  b. What importance is attached to the development of new software and what criteria are used to evaluate such software,
  c. What credit is given for the integration of IT into courses,
  d. What recognition is given to professional activities relating to IT, and
  e. What criteria are used to evaluate faculty members who provide IT support to colleagues, staff, and students.

• Input on these policies must be made in close consultation with the faculty members involved in such work.

• Members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee should make appropriate use of outside reviewers in understanding and evaluating the IT work of candidates.

• Each department should address these issues in its strategic plan.

Faculty Members

• Faculty members are responsible for making a case for the value of their projects, articulating the intellectual assumptions underlying their work, and documenting their time and effort.

• Faculty members should be prepared to explain what theory informs their work, explain why their work is useful to the discipline, and provide the evidence of rigor and intellectual content in their work.

• In particular, faculty members expecting recognition for IT-related work should ensure that their projects remain compatible with departmental needs and university planning, as well as with current criteria.
• Documentation of projects might include internal or external funding, awards and professional recognition, and reviews and citations of work either in print or in electronic journals.

• For subsequent evaluation of professional service, faculty members should maintain a record of the duties involved in activities such as organizing and managing a lab facility, increasing the meaningful use of electronic media in instruction, training student aides or faculty colleagues, and moderating an electronic discussion group. The committee does not suggest that the recommendations presented here represent an inclusive list. The university, colleges and schools, and departments are encouraged to add additional elements to their lists.

Solutions Used by other Institutions

• Teaching and service

• Release time

• Load adjustment

• Financial compensation

• Teaching, service and research

• Informed assessment of accomplishment

• Appropriate recognition of that accomplishment in tenure, promotion and salary decisions