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How Did We Get Here?

• COVID disrupted our probationary faculty: teaching, research, service (and home life)
  • Statements have been revealing about differences in impact
• Stopped all tenure clocks for one year
  • With option to not stop for flexibility
  • *Opt-out* not *opt-in*, to avoid stigma
  • Some took it, some did not, some are still deciding
• Considered stopping all clocks for a second year, but didn’t
• Pandemic highlighted inequities in fixed tenure timeline
  → “One size does **NOT** fit all”
Framing the Problem –
(more than just COVID, or childcare, or …)

• Concerns about work-life balance in academia/at WPI

• Some probationary faculty report extreme (not just high) levels of stress

• Inequities particularly affect women & underrepresented groups
  • Evidence suggests on average, women disadvantaged in tenure process, and do not necessarily benefit from “stop the clock” policies

• But also, inequities persist at individual level – everyone’s probationary experience is unique! i.e., “life happens”

• Also, practical questions of retention of talented faculty

⇒ Can we build in flexibility?
WPI’s Current Tenure Clock Policies

- Standard probationary period with no TT experience is decision in 6th year
- Shorter probationary period with prior TT experience (clock credit), but 2 year minimum
- Early tenure possible but with higher bar for tenure

Clock stoppage mechanisms
- New child provision: 1- year for “significant childcare responsibilities”
- Unpaid leave/part-time status that meets duration requirements
- Criteria same as if clock not stopped
Pros/Cons WPI’s Current Tenure Clock Policies

+ Within norm for doctoral universities (length, stoppage policies)

– Only stoppages for “known” events (e.g., childcare)

– No provisions for non-specified events (i.e., “life happens”)

– Clock stoppages have unequal benefits

– Advised clock stoppages not used

Both at WPI and in general, male faculty better able to avoid using, achieving tenure & promotion faster

Both at WPI and in general, probationary faculty express concern evaluated differently if exercise right to clock stoppage, and wary about using

Clock stoppages must be requested, not automatic

Instead of “stopping the clock” can we build in more flexibility?
Tenure Review Window –
Tenure Review Timing with Integrated Flexibility

Criteria *same* no matter when reviewed

Candidate chooses
Tenure Review Window – Tenure Review Timing with Integrated Flexibility

- Review window with no TT experience, decision in 5th, 6th, 7th or 8th year
  - Candidate consults with DTC, but decision on year their own
  - Tenure criteria same no matter when reviewed

- Keep current rules
  - Single review (one try only, not more)
  - Earlier window possible (clock credit) with prior TT experience

- Note: expectation is most reviews during 6th year, but now flexibility
Tenure Review Window – Tenure Review Timing with Integrated Flexibility

What’s still to figure out?

- Deadline for committing to review year (e.g., 1 year prior)?
- Guidance for DTCs and faculty to help with strategy?
- Eliminate or retain current child provision policy?  
  - Extenuating circumstances statement/guidance (extrapolate)
- Eliminate or retain current early tenure review possibility?
- Eliminate or retain current 2-year minimum before review?
- Have current probationary faculty follow new policy?
- Compensation retroactive to 5th year, regardless of review?

*WPI avg. ~2/year
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Please email me: Mark Claypool, claypool@wpi.edu

Or anyone on CTAF: Constance Clark, Kim Wobbe, Nima Rhabar, Renata Konrad, Mike Timko

Thank-you for your attention!
Questions? Comments? Suggestions?
Appendix
Additional Qualifying Reasons to Stop the Clock Found at other Universities

- adoption;
- significant elder care or dependent care responsibilities;
- disability or chronic illness of the professor;
- injured spouse or domestic partner who needs care;
- death of a parent, child, spouse, or domestic partner;
- catastrophic residential property loss (e.g., hurricanes);
- military service;
- legal issues (e.g., settling estate, divorce, custody, civil suit, criminal defense);
- unavoidable delays in the completion of a research lab;
- natural disaster that destroys research materials;
- unexpected bankruptcy of publishing company after book accepted;
- periods of purely administrative duties.
## Clock Stoppage Policies – Survey Results (1 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Doctoral (45)</th>
<th>Comprehensive Baccalaureate (10)</th>
<th>All Types (76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage with a policy</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage with an informal policy&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage with a formal policy&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage for birth or adoption&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage for birth only&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Women
- Number eligible: 49, 16, 15, 80
- Number using the policy: 17, 3, 2, 22
- Utilization rate: 34.7%, 18.8%, 7.5%, 27.5%

### Men
- Number eligible: 182, 40, 8, 230
- Number using the policy: 42, 1, 0, 43
- Utilization rate: 23.1%, 2.5%, 0%, 18.7%
### Clock Stoppage Policies – Survey Results (2 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Doctoral (45)</th>
<th>Comprehensive (10)</th>
<th>Baccalaureate (21)</th>
<th>All Types (76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of times clock can be stopped</td>
<td>One: 50%, two: 43%, three: 7% (N = 14)</td>
<td>One: 100% (N = 4)</td>
<td>Two: 100% (N = 1)</td>
<td>One: 58%, two: 37%, three: 5% (N = 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions to tenure review committees</td>
<td>Use your own judgment: 60.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate years on clock: 33.3%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate total years worked: 6.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average course load per year</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The numbers in parentheses in the column headings refer to the number of institutions in that category in the survey.

*aPercentages may not sum to the percentage of institutions with a policy because of missing answers to some survey questions.*