

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate

2-5-2003

Process Not Followed (Criteria for Tenure and Promotion)

Marc D. Cyr

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cyr, Marc D., "Process Not Followed (Criteria for Tenure and Promotion)" (2003). *Faculty Senate Index*. 523.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/523>

This other is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

To: David Allen, Senate Moderator

From: Marc Cyr, Senate Secretary

Date: 2-5-03

I believe it was during one of the Provost's open forums that some faculty (I don't think they were from CLASS) raised the issue of administrators not following procedures or applying criteria re: tenure and promotion as those procedures and criteria are laid out in departmental, college, and/or university handbooks. The Provost expressed a desire to be informed of such incidents. Subsequently, I believe during an SEC meeting and then an SEC breakfast with the Provost, I raised as an example of what the other faculty members had mentioned the situation pertaining to Dr. Bruce Krajewski, Chair of Literature and Philosophy, and the circumstances of his 3rd year review. Since then, he has successfully undergone full tenure review and is currently being reviewed as Chair.

1. The Department Manual states that for 3rd year review, "The faculty member submits a brief statement concerning his or her work at Georgia Southern University" (11). As Chair, Dr. Krajewski has rightly required such statements from other faculty, *yet supplied no such statement in his own portfolio.*
2. The Department Manual states that individuals under review should include in their portfolios "Peer classroom evaluations" (13), and not only has Dr. Krajewski rightly required that other faculty include these, but has insisted that he be one of the observers/evaluators. *However, in his own 3rd year review portfolio, he included no such evaluations.*

NOTE: At the time, Dr. Krajewski had taught the cross-disciplinary Turning Points class and English 1101, which is a Writing & Linguistics course; he had taught no courses offered by Literature and Philosophy. "Peers" would therefore not necessarily have had to be drawn from his own faculty.

3. On page 12 of the Department Manual (which Dr. Krajewski directs faculty to consult before completing tenure reviews), four tenure criteria are listed: Teaching, Professional Activity, Service, and Collegiality. When he drew up pre-tenure and tenure review forms for other faculty, he included the category "Collegiality"; however, *when he drew up the form for his own evaluation, he excluded that category.*

NOTE: It should be noted that he did this despite insisting (in the face of protests from several faculty) that collegiality be included as a separate item in promotion review forms, although prior to Dr. Krajewski's arrival at GSU our department decided not to list collegiality as a criterion for promotion in the Department Manual (13), and it is not listed as a promotion criterion in the 2001-2 University Faculty Handbook (23; p. 25 in the 2002-3 edition).

4. Dean Conway-Turner was informed of the information in items 1-3 and supplied with copies of the differing forms, those Dr. Krajewski drew up for others and those he drew up for himself. So far as I can tell, this information had little or no impact on Dr. Krajewski or Dean Conway-Turner: his 3rd year review was approved (see also items 5, 6, and 7 below).

5. When in Fall of 2002 Dr. Krajewski came up for tenure and put his portfolio forward to be reviewed by the department, once more he had no “Peer classroom evaluations.”

6. At our meeting with Dean Conway-Turner, when it was pointed out that these evaluations were required, that they were needed for a valid judgment on his teaching, and that this was *the second time* the department Chair had failed to provide them, we were assured that they would be forthcoming. Nonetheless, because she said a majority present wanted to go ahead and vote (I believe it was a 6-4 split; many faculty could not attend), we had a paper ballot.

NOTE: Peer evaluations were made available a few days later and we were given the opportunity to modify our comments and votes in writing to the Dean.

7. In that tenure review meeting with Dean Conway-Turner, any aspect of Dr. Krajewski’s performance as Chair was excluded from discussion despite the Dean being twice told about and finally shown an excerpt from the Provost’s page that states, “While academic contributions determine the outcome of promotion and tenure decisions for full-time administrators, administrative workload and the quality of applicants’ administrative performance shall be considered,” and despite some faculty protesting that they could not discuss his service or collegiality (see item #3 above) separately from his performance as chair. We were told that because she had renewed him as chair, his performance as chair in those areas was therefore good and no further discussion warranted or allowed.

Summary:

Anybody can make a mistake, but Dr. Krajewski has established a *pattern of not following established policies and procedures*, either by simply ignoring them (as with the “gaps” in his 3rd year review portfolio, and the belated filling of one of those gaps in his tenure review portfolio) or by using his administrative position to rig the process for his benefit: For example, Dr. Robinson, who is not liked by Dr. Krajewski, was denied promotion two years running solely on the basis of the separate criterion “collegiality” that Dr. Krajewski insisted be on the form, although it was repeatedly pointed out that that was not an applicable separate criterion; yet when he designed a form for his own review, a form on which “collegiality” *should* have been included as a separate criterion, he omitted it.

Dean Conway-Turner seems either not bothered by Dr. Krajewski’s pattern of behavior, or she has been unsuccessful in her attempts to modify it, or she has seemed to condone it (see items 6 and 7 above).