

Clarification on the Promotion and Tenure Process September 29, 2004

This document outlines changes and clarifications in the Promotion and Tenure process that are to be implemented immediately. They are based on recommendations from the Faculty Roles and Rewards Taskforce, the Campus P & T Committee, and the Provost and his staff. They also bring some practices into better compliance with the UM System requirements for Promotion and Tenure. These issues were discussed with the Deans Council, the Faculty Senate, and with people involved in making Promotion and Tenure recommendations. This final version supercedes the previous versions that were labeled as “talking points.”

1. **The Portfolio.** Candidates are advised that the recommended format for a portfolio is one three-ring binder. Candidates have the right to decide what to include in the portfolio and how to organize it, but must include Part I. A suggested table of contents has been provided. Bulky items that will not fit in the binder (such as a book), may be included as an appendix to the portfolio. This advise was recommended by the Campus P & T committee.
2. **Voting on P & T Committees.** Members of P & T Committees can vote on applications for those seeking the same or lower rank as the committee member, and for those seeking tenure status that the members already have. Thus, Associate Professors cannot vote on an application seeking promotion to full Professor, nor can untenured faculty members vote on applications seeking tenure. If a department does not have a sufficient number of full professors for a committee, it should “borrow” faculty members from a related discipline. The restriction on voting rights is not meant to preclude faculty members of any rank or status from commenting through the existing procedures on applications seeking promotion to any rank or seeking tenure. The voting change was recommended by the Roles and Rewards Taskforce and the Provost and his staff.
3. **Candidate’s Opportunity to Respond to Recommendations.** These changes were recommended by the Roles and Rewards Taskforce and by the Provost and his staff. They also bring our practice into better compliance with CRR 320.035A.4.b, which states in part: “To insure fair and timely review of all actions, committees, chairpersons, and deans shall communicate their recommendations to candidates under consideration and give each candidate a reasonable time to submit written rebuttal to the recommendation so that both recommendation and rebuttal may be forwarded to the next level of review.”
 - a. **Notice of recommendations.** A copy of each recommendation from a P & T Committee, a Chair and the Dean is to be given to the candidate promptly after a decision is made. Disclosure should include the vote tally, if a vote was taken, and the written text of the recommendation. A copy of the recommendation should be given regardless of whether it is positive or negative.
 - b. **Opportunity to respond.** Candidates should be given a reasonable opportunity to respond to each recommendation. The response is to be added to the portfolio.
 - c. **Review of responses and “appeals.”** The recommendation and the response generally should be reviewed by the next recommending person or body in the review sequence. Thus, if a candidate provides a response to a Dean’s recommendation, the response would be considered in the review done by the Campus P & T Committee. However, if an academic unit’s by-laws, promotion and tenure guidelines, or custom and practice require that a response be considered by the committee or person that made the recommendation, that procedure may be followed.
4. **All Files Go Forward.** Although Chancellor’s Memorandum 35 provides that only positive recommendation from the Dean go forward, the Collected Rules provide that the Dean “shall then forward all recommendations to the chancellor.” CRR 320.035A.2.b(2).
5. **Confidentiality.** Letters from External Evaluator letters are confidential, and should not be disclosed to the candidates. However, if in making a recommendation a specific letter is relied upon by the recommending body or person, the content of that letter should be disclosed to give the candidate an opportunity to respond. If part or all of the content of a letter is disclosed to a candidate, the identity of the author of the letter (as well as any information from which the author’s identity could be determined) should not be disclosed. The names of the proposed and approved external evaluators are not confidential and normally are disclosed during the approval process for external evaluators. This process gives candidates an opportunity to identify persons whom they believe cannot be objective or whom they believe are otherwise inappropriate. This paragraph is not a change in policy, but is a clarification of the scope of confidentiality in light of greater transparency outlined above.