



The John Knoblock  
Faculty Senate Office  
Ashe Administration Building, #325  
1252 Memorial Drive  
Coral Gables, FL 33146

[facsen@miami.edu](mailto:facsen@miami.edu)  
web site: [www.miami.edu/fs](http://www.miami.edu/fs)  
P: 305-284-3721  
F: 305-284-5515

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Julio Frenk  
University President

**From:** Tomás A. Salerno  
Chair, Faculty Senate

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Tomás'.

**Date:** May 4, 2018

**Subject:** Faculty Senate Legislation #2017-47 (D) – 2018 Faculty Senate Committee on Rank, Salary and Conditions of Employment Annual Report and Recommendations

\*\*\*\*\*

The Faculty Senate, at its April 18, 2018 meeting, unanimously approved to accept the annual report and recommendations of the Faculty Senate Committee on Rank, Salary and Conditions of Employment.

This legislation is sent to you for your information.

TAS/rh

Enclosure

cc: Jeffrey Duerk, Executive Vice President and Provost  
Robert Johnson, Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Rank, Salary and Conditions of Employment



## Faculty Senate Committee on Rank, Salary, and Conditions of Employment

### 2017-2018 Annual Report

#### Committee Membership

Robert J. Johnson (chair), Helen Bramlett, Rosina Cianelli, Tamay M. Ozgokmen, Stephen J. Schnably, Weizhao Zhao, and Linda Neider (*ex officio*).

#### Committee Activities

The Committee on Rank, Salary, and Conditions of Employment (CRSCE) received one appeal from a faculty member, and made a recommendation to the President. This appeal is pending a decision from the President at this time.

#### Committee Recommendations

This final report contains recommendations that are intended to prevent or mitigate consequential errors in the application and review of candidates for promotion.

Special attention should be given to the need for ensuring transparency of promotion guidelines. Misunderstandings at each level of review can create false expectations about what are and are not required for promotion. Each department and college should periodically review their standards and ensure that they are transparent and accessible to both the candidate undergoing review and the review committee members who are conducting it.

An example of the recurrent theme noted above is the (in)appropriate use of citation data obtained in the bibliographic record. These data have known methodological and disciplinary bias. Interviews with both candidates and administrative personnel conducting reviews indicate a great deal of miscommunication occurs among themselves and with candidates for promotion as well (some candidates are aware of their use, others not, and few share the same expected standards). This situation will only worsen as the field of publishing changes (as it is doing so rapidly at present). When used, bibliographic data should be adjusted for disciplinary field, length of time during which the candidate's career of publishing is being assessed, and language of publication outlets.

Finally, it may be useful to consider clarifying what ethical standards might apply for recusal by review committee members when reviewing a candidate's promotion file. Animus or favoritism towards a candidate is inconsistent with a just decision on promotion, whether favorable or unfavorable to the candidate. There currently is no standard we could find in the Faculty Manual

guarding against unjust favoritism or animus in the review of promotion. The manual currently addresses these matters only in cases of research misconduct, professional ethics, and amorous relationships. This matter should be reviewed.