

**Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or
Promotion:
Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**

October 15, 2007

Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

I. Introduction

- A. Scope
- B. Definitions
- C. Variances
- D. Confidentiality of review materials

II. Tenure Procedures

- A. Actions to be taken generally
 - 1. Unit statement of criteria (7.12)
 - 2. Regular voting rules
 - a. Who is eligible to vote
 - b. Disqualifications
 - c. Voting procedures
 - d. Questions to be voted upon
 - e. Required majority
 - f. Report of the vote
 - 3. Rules governing the use of an exceptional majority
- B. Actions at the beginning of a probationary appointment
 - 4. Explaining the process to the candidate
- C. Annual review during the probationary period
 - 5. Elements of the annual review process
 - 6. Collecting information on the candidate's performance
 - 7. Annual review by the tenured faculty
 - 8. Annual conference with the candidate
- D. Unit consideration of the candidate for tenure or for termination of appointment
 - 9. Tenure decision may be made at any time.
 - 10. A decision to terminate an appointment may be made at any time.
 - 11. Schedule for unit action
 - 12. Preparation of the file for tenure decisions
 - 13. Vote and report of action
- E. Review by college, campus, or alternative second-level review committee
 - 14. Review by senior academic administrators
 - 15. Collegiate or campus review committee
 - 16. Applicable all-University criteria and standards
 - 17. Requests for reconsideration or for more information
 - 18. Dean's recommendation
- F. Central review and action
 - 19. Central review
 - 20. Standards for review and action
 - 21. Action by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; explanations to dean/chancellor, other academic administrators, and unit

III. Promotion Procedures

These procedures are adopted in accordance with sections 6, 7, 9, and 16 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. They cover additional elements of the tenure-granting and review process.

I. Introduction

A. Scope

This document contains procedural rules for the consideration of candidates for tenure and promotion. It is intended also to provide a convenient guide for unit heads, tenured faculty members, and candidates, to assist in understanding and organizing the tenure-granting and promotion process. Those faculty members who are governed by contracts with the University Education Association abide by some parts of these Procedures and not others, as specified in their individual contracts. The document restates some of the rules that are found in the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* and adds additional procedures. For additional detail or interpretation, see the relevant sections of *Faculty Tenure*.

The mandatory rules (those using "must" or "shall") established in this document are minimum requirements. Other procedures are simply recommendations or expressions of permission (those using "should" or "may"). Units, colleges, and campuses are encouraged to supplement them with additional rules that clarify the process for considering tenure and promotion while protecting the rights of candidates. Any supplemental rules must be consistent with these Procedures and with *Faculty Tenure*.

The procedural rules established by this document are intended to guide the orderly and fair administration of the tenure-and-promotion process. Units, review committees, unit heads, and other administrators should follow them carefully. But a decision may not be set aside merely because there have been minor or technical deviations from the rules. See *Faculty Tenure*, section 7.7(3), which gives the Judicial Committee authority to take action if a decision was "based in significant degree upon . . . [s]ubstantial and prejudicial deviation" from the procedural rules promulgated pursuant to sections 7.4 and 7.6.

These procedural rules apply to individuals regardless of the date of their initial appointment.

B. Definitions

Candidates include: (1) probationary faculty members eligible for indefinite tenure and promotion to the next rank; (2) probationary faculty members eligible to receive tenure in rank; and (3) faculty members with tenure eligible for promotion in rank.

In these Procedures, "unit" means the academic unit that makes the initial recommendation on tenure and promotion. That may be a department, a college (in colleges not subdivided into departments), or a division (on a coordinate campus).

The definitions of teaching, research, and service set forth in *Faculty Tenure*, section 7.11, as approved by the Board of Regents in June 2007 will not apply to probationary faculty members appointed before July 1, 2007, if those faculty members have chosen to be evaluated on the basis of a different version of *Faculty Tenure* in place when they were initially appointed.

C. Variances

If it is impossible or impracticable to implement these procedures, a unit may apply to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for a written variance. Variances will be given very sparingly, and will require that the unit take steps to ensure that the process conforms as far as possible to the principles set forth here. Applications for variance must be made in writing; approval must be given in writing by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, who will consult with the Faculty Senate Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee before acting on the request.

D. Confidentiality of review materials

All materials collected in the tenure or promotion file, all written reports of the deliberations, and all written reviews by college and central administration, are private and must not be disclosed to anyone except the candidate and those participating in the tenure or promotion decision, or in the review of that decision (e.g. members of the Senate Judicial Committee or the Office of the General Counsel addressing complaints regarding a promotion or tenure decision). Faculty members other than the candidate must destroy files given to them for review after the promotion and tenure process is concluded.

Candidates may review the materials in their file at any time.

II. Tenure Procedures

A. Actions to be taken generally

1. Unit statement of criteria (7.12)

Faculty Tenure requires every unit to have a document specifying the indices and standards that will be used to evaluate candidates, and those standards will apply to all candidates for tenure and promotion in the unit, except as modified for faculty appointed pursuant to a special contract (*Faculty Tenure*, sections 7.12 and 3.6). If a unit votes to change its 7.12 statement, such changes do not become effective until the revised 7.12 statement has been reviewed and approved by the dean, chancellor, and other appropriate academic administrators, including the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, as specified in *Faculty Tenure* section 7.12 . When a unit changes its 7.12 statement, "current probationary faculty in the unit may elect to be evaluated on the criteria in the previous Subsection 7.12 Statement or on the new criteria. This option is also available to current tenured faculty in their evaluation for promotion to the next level. Probationary or tenured faculty must make this decision within one year of the date of administrative approval of the new criteria" (*Faculty Tenure*, Interpretation 6). The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost shall be responsible for obtaining a statement from each affected faculty member described in this paragraph and his/her unit head, dean or chancellor, and/or other appropriate academic administrator, specifying the faculty member's choice, within the one-year period specified in Interpretation 6 of *Faculty Tenure*.

2. Regular voting rules

Tenure votes are taken at meetings of the tenured faculty. A tenure vote may be taken in any year of the probationary period, but must be taken in the last year of the probationary period. See section D(9).

a. Who is eligible to vote

Attendance and participation at tenure and promotion meetings are essential obligations of the members of the tenured faculty. The head of the unit must schedule the time and place of the formal meeting of the tenured faculty well in advance, and must notify all tenured faculty members of the meeting. In ordinary circumstances, at least one month's notice of the meeting should be given. All faculty members eligible to vote are expected to review the candidate's file prior to the meeting and to attend the meeting unless unable to do so for compelling reasons.

Only members of the tenured faculty of the unit have the right to participate in the meeting and vote on granting tenure, except as specified in this paragraph. In the cases of small units, it may be appropriate to include, in the discussion and vote on tenure, a professor or professors from another unit or units in the college, campus, or University. Including additional faculty members is also warranted in cases of candidates whose work encompasses multiple disciplines. In order for faculty members from outside the unit to participate, the initiating unit and/or the dean or chancellor must submit a written request to and obtain authorization in writing by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The request must identify the faculty member under consideration, and give the name(s) and tenure homes of those faculty members who will be asked to vote on the candidate and the reasons for including them.

A unit head who is a member of the tenured faculty may participate and vote but has no additional tie-breaking vote.

b. Disqualifications

Persons who are or were closely related to a candidate, or who have or have had an intimate personal relationship with a candidate, must not attend or participate in the meeting where that candidate is being considered. If the candidate (or another member of the tenured faculty) wishes to challenge the participation of any member of the tenured faculty, that challenge must be made in writing to the challenged faculty member and to the head of the unit at least two weeks before the scheduled tenure meeting, stating the reasons for the challenge and setting forth the relevant evidence. The fact that a member of the tenured faculty has formed a negative view of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, or service during the course of the candidate's career is not a basis for disqualification. In most cases, the unit head will decide whether the challenged faculty member may participate in the decision. In cases where the unit head is the challenged faculty member, the decision will be made by the dean, chancellor, or other administrator to whom the unit head reports. In doubtful cases, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action should be consulted in reaching a decision about disqualification, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Nepotism and Consensual Relationships Policy of the Board of Regents. The record of

the challenge and its resolution will be included in the file forwarded for review. If the challenged faculty member is not permitted to participate in the discussion and vote, that person shall be considered ineligible to vote and therefore shall not count toward the quorum requirement established in these Procedures (see section 2(e)).

The same principles of disqualification apply to members of the review committees and to academic administrators who may be called upon to review the matter.

c. Voting procedures

The vote is taken by written, unsigned secret ballot. An effort must be made to provide a copy of the file to every tenured faculty member who will be absent from the meeting but wishes to cast a ballot. Such faculty members must be given an opportunity to vote by written absentee ballot, which should be sent in a sealed envelope to the unit head. Proxy votes, telephone votes, fax votes, and email votes are not permitted.

d. Questions to be voted upon

During any annual-review meeting before the final probationary year, a unit may vote upon either (or both) of the following questions:

Shall (the candidate) be recommended for tenure?

Shall (the candidate) be given notice of termination of appointment?

Any consideration of termination must be pursuant to the standards specified in Section 10 of these Procedures.

If no vote is taken or if there is no majority for either motion, the appointment will be continued.

In the last year of the probationary period, the question should be "Shall (the candidate) be recommended for tenure?" If there is no majority for that motion, the recommendation is automatically for termination of the appointment.

e. Required majority

A quorum must be present for discussion and vote on promotion and tenure. A quorum is defined as more than 50% of the faculty members eligible to vote on the matter. Unless the faculty of a unit adopts a rule requiring an exceptional majority (see section 3 below), the action of the unit is based on the vote of the majority of those voting on the question, including absentee ballots cast as specified in section 2(c). Abstentions are not counted in determining whether a majority of those voting cast votes in favor of tenure or promotion, as required to report an affirmative recommendation, but the number of abstentions is reported as part of the vote tally and, in the review process, they will be considered an indication of lack of support for the candidate by those abstaining. Abstentions are strongly discouraged. Tenured faculty members have an obligation to decide whether or not a candidate merits tenure or promotion and to vote for or

against tenure or promotion. If tenured faculty members are eligible to vote and do not cast a vote, the number of such non-votes is reported but they are not counted as affirmative or negative votes, or as abstentions.

If there is a tie vote, the recommendation is in the negative. In the final year of the probationary period, a tie vote on the question of tenure automatically results in a recommendation for termination of the appointment.

In a unit that has a rule requiring an exceptional majority (see section 3 below), if a recommendation to grant tenure receives an ordinary majority but not the required exceptional majority, the unit must prepare and send forward the file without a recommendation for tenure, unless the candidate requests in writing that the file not be reviewed beyond the unit.

f. Report of the vote

In all cases, the actual vote is to be reported. The report should indicate the number eligible to vote, the number present at the meeting, the number of affirmative and negative votes and abstentions, the number of absentee ballots cast, and the number of instances of ballots not cast. In the report of the vote, the unit head should explain if possible the number of eligible faculty members not voting (e.g., faculty members on leaves or sabbaticals, on phased retirements, or holding administrative positions). The percent affirmative vote equals the number of affirmative votes divided by the number of affirmative plus negative votes ($\times 100$). That is, abstentions are not included in the determination of the percentage of affirmative votes cast.

If there is a "reconsideration" after an initial vote, both the original and the reconsidered vote must be reported. Although the unit's recommendation is based upon the required majority by the rules applicable to the particular unit, reviewing committees and administrators may legitimately take into consideration the relative size of the majority in conducting their own review of the candidate.

3. Rules governing the use of an exceptional majority

As specified in section 2(e), if the unit does not specify otherwise, a majority of those voting on a personnel question will take action for the unit, if a quorum is present. A unit may, however, require an exceptional majority (for example, a 2/3 majority of those voting or an absolute majority of the tenured members of the unit) as a prerequisite for a recommendation for tenure (*Faculty Tenure*, section 7.4 (d)). If a unit chooses to do so, it must adopt that rule well in advance of the meeting in which the tenure decision will take place, normally no later than the end of the previous academic year. Any rule requiring an absolute majority must also make provision for excusing members who are unable to participate in person. All rules requiring special majorities must be reported to the dean or chancellor and to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the Faculty Senate Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee. The rule may be adopted as part of the unit constitution or as part of the rules adopted under section 7.12 of *Faculty Tenure*. If such a rule is adopted, it must be included as part of the unit statement required by section 7.12.

B. Actions at the beginning of a probationary appointment

4. Explaining the process to the candidate

In the first year of the probationary appointment, the unit head must review the terms of appointment with the probationary candidate. This includes:

- a. Making certain that credit for prior service has been granted and appropriately recorded, and that there is a common understanding about the maximum length of the probationary period (*Faculty Tenure*, section 5.4).
- b. Supplying the candidate with copies of *Faculty Tenure*, these Procedures, and the unit Statement about tenure expectations (*Faculty Tenure*, section 7.12). If the candidate is unsure about the application of the criteria, the head should seek to make that as clear as possible.
- c. Informing the candidate about the procedures used by the unit to review teaching, research, and service. The candidate must be informed about the annual-review process and made familiar with the annual report on Appraisal of Probationary Faculty (President's Form 12) that will be completed. The candidate must also be informed about his or her right to inspect the file and right of access to information.

The unit head must make a written summary of this meeting, including the time and date it took place, and include it in the candidate's personnel record. The probationary faculty member must sign and date this summary. The unit head must forward a copy of this signed summary to the dean or chancellor and to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

C. Annual review during the probationary period

5. Elements of the annual review process

The process of reviewing a candidate's progress is continuous. It is intended to be encouraging and nurturing, although it is necessarily evaluative. Especially in the early years of the probationary period, the annual tenure review is intended to point out to the candidate his or her strengths and weaknesses, so that the strengths can be built upon and the weaknesses remedied. Three elements are essential to this process: information gathering, deliberation, and consultation with the candidate. The review is always to be conducted in accordance with the unit statement required by section 7.12 of *Faculty Tenure*.

The procedures set forth in these paragraphs (5-8) are minimum requirements. Some units may prefer to conduct a more formal annual review, comparable to the one that must take place when a formal recommendation will be made regarding the candidate in the decision year.

6. Collecting information on the candidate's performance

The unit head has the responsibility to ensure that the unit gathers data annually about the candidate's performance on all relevant criteria and must make the assembled file available to the candidate for his or her review. These functions must be performed by the unit head or by a designated member or committee of the tenured faculty and may not be delegated to staff or students, although they may play appropriate supporting roles. The candidate must assist in the preparation of the file if asked to do so.

The annual review file should include as appropriate:

- i. The candidate's current curriculum vitae and annual activity reports;
- ii. Summaries of the candidate's teaching assignments, and student and peer evaluations, using the methods of evaluation that have been adopted for the unit or college (see *Faculty Tenure (2007)*, footnote 4, for the definition of teaching, or if the probationary faculty member is still governed by Section 7.11 of *Faculty Tenure (2001)*, then see footnote 6 for the definition of teaching; see also Policy and Protocol on the Evaluation of Instruction approved by the Faculty Senate);
- iii. Copies (or descriptions) of the candidate's scholarly research and/or appropriate representations of other creative work (see *Faculty Tenure (2007)*, footnote 4, for the definition of scholarly research and other creative work; or if the probationary faculty member is still governed by Section 7.11 of *Faculty Tenure (2001)*, then see footnote 7 for the definition of research);
- iv. Summaries of the candidate's service activities (see *Faculty Tenure (2007)*, footnote 4, for the definition of service; or if the probationary faculty member is still governed by Section 7.11 of *Faculty Tenure (2001)*, then see footnote 8 for the definition of service);
- v. Copies of the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty forms for the current and previous years;
and
- vi. Any other relevant material.

The file may also include evaluations of the candidate's scholarly research or other creative work by persons inside and outside the University.

The probationary faculty member has not only the right but the responsibility to inspect the annual-review file annually. He or she has a right also to submit written comments and to add relevant materials to the file. Material provided by a candidate should be identified as such.

The annual-review file is only one part of the candidate's personnel file in the unit and contains only those materials that are relevant to an eventual tenure decision. It is accessible to the

candidate and to all of the tenured faculty members in the unit, while other portions of the candidate's personnel file are accessible only to the candidate and to those who have reason to have access to particular information contained in it.

Faculty eligible to vote at the unit level may request of the unit head copies of any relevant materials not included in the file. The new material becomes part of the candidate's file. The unit head shall notify the candidate of the addition. The candidate must have the opportunity to respond to any new material before the unit vote.

7. Annual review by the tenured faculty

The tenured faculty members of the unit must review the progress of each probationary faculty member annually, either at the annual tenure meeting or at a separate meeting. The files for the probationary faculty members must be made available to the tenured faculty a reasonable time in advance of the meeting. The annual review does not require a formal ballot or recommendation of the faculty, but units may take a vote, if they wish, as specified in section 2(d). If there is balloting, the procedures must be specified in the unit 7.12 statement. (Note that under *Faculty Tenure*, an appointment will automatically be renewed annually until the maximum probationary period is reached, unless there is an earlier recommendation for granting tenure or terminating the appointment.)

Under section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure*, a probationary faculty member may request that his or her tenure clock be stopped for one year at a time for the birth or adoption of a child, for caregiver responsibilities, or for personal illness. Stopping the tenure clock is not a leave. If a faculty member has stopped the tenure clock, this must be noted on President's Form 12 during the annual review. If a faculty member has stopped the clock during one year of the probationary period (e.g., year 3), then the following year of the probationary period is considered a continuation of that same year (in the example given, year 3 once again). That is, this probationary faculty member would have an annual review each year, but the expectations for the continuation year would not be equal to those for a new, separate year. During the year or years that a faculty member has stopped the tenure clock, he or she continues with regular teaching, research, and service activities as determined by established workload policies, but the expectations for progress in research, teaching, and service are reduced during the time the tenure clock has been stopped.

Probationary faculty members who stop the tenure clock for the conditions listed in *Faculty Tenure* (section 5.5) must be allowed to do so without fear of prejudice on the part of the unit head or of the tenured faculty members of the unit. Probationary faculty members may not be given notice of termination of their appointment during a year in which the clock has been stopped except as otherwise specified in *Faculty Tenure* (e.g. fiscal emergency, disciplinary action, etc.).

8. Annual conference with the candidate

The unit head must discuss annually with the candidate his or her progress toward achieving tenure. The unit head also reports to the candidate the sense of the meeting of the tenured faculty, and any recommendations made by it. If the candidate has not reviewed the individual evaluations of performance contained in the file (as permitted by section 6), the unit head summarizes them. It is important that this conversation be candid and that the candidate be clearly told if there are areas in which performance needs to be improved. The candidate must be given a copy of the annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty report, which must reflect the major elements of this conversation, as well as a written summary of any additional matters discussed. The annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty report must state clearly the concerns of the tenured faculty regarding the candidate's progress toward tenure and must provide guidance for addressing any weaknesses that have been noted. The review of the probationary faculty member by the tenured faculty, the conference with the probationary faculty member, and the final written report must reflect the criteria and indices of performance in the unit's 7.12 statement. If the candidate has questions about the application of the criteria or about what he or she is expected to do, the unit head must explain the criteria. If the candidate has stopped the tenure clock according to section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure*, the annual report must clearly report that fact.

The head of the unit must place in the candidate's file each year the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty report (President's Form 12) and a written summary—with date and time specified—of any additional matters discussed. This report is signed by the candidate and the unit head, and evaluated and signed by the dean of the candidate's college or by the chancellor of the coordinate campus, and by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost or Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences.

D. Unit consideration of the candidate for tenure or for termination of appointment

9. Tenure decision may be made at any time.

A decision on tenure may be made in any year of the probationary period, including the extended probationary period of a candidate who has stopped the tenure clock according to section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure*.

A probationary faculty member may request an early tenure review; the unit will decide whether to conduct it. Because the process of conducting a formal review involves a number of steps, including external evaluations, and because there is a fixed time schedule for review of unit recommendations, a decision to conduct a formal tenure review must be made well in advance of the date on which a vote will be taken. In most cases, it will be necessary to initiate the process during the summer preceding the academic year in which the vote will be taken.

A candidate must be considered in a formal tenure review no later than in the last year of the probationary period; that is,

- i. in the sixth year of an ordinary probationary period, or
- ii. at the designated time in a shorter or longer probationary period; or
- iii. at the end of the extended probationary period for a candidate who has stopped the tenure clock according to section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure*; or
- iv. at the time required by special contract.

A formal review may be initiated at any earlier time by the unit head or by vote of the tenured faculty of the unit.

Candidates must be told that the outcome of an early tenure evaluation may be a recommendation for (1) promotion and tenure; (2) continuation of the probationary appointment without tenure and promotion at this time; or (3) termination.

10. A decision to terminate an appointment may be made at any time.

A decision to recommend termination may be made in any year of the probationary period, except that faculty members who have stopped the clock according to Section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure* may not be terminated during the year in which the clock is stopped except as otherwise specified in *Faculty Tenure* (e.g. fiscal emergency, disciplinary action, etc.).

A unit may recommend termination of a candidate's appointment if his or her overall performance is so clearly below the standards required by the unit's 7.12 statement that this course of action is necessary, or (2) performance on any of the primary criteria is so deficient that positive evaluation of the other criteria would not warrant continuation of appointment. The reasons for this action must be clearly documented in a written evaluation.

11. Schedule for unit action

The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (and the dean or chancellor) annually establishes schedules for formal action by units and the subsequent review of those recommendations by the colleges, campuses, and central administration. It is important that the units, colleges, and campuses comply with these schedules, so that appropriate and unhurried review of decisions may take place and required notice be given in a timely manner.

12. Preparation of the file for tenure decisions

The head of the unit has the responsibility of seeing that a file is prepared for each candidate, with the help and advice of at least one senior faculty member. The file must contain relevant information on teaching, scholarly research and other creative work, and service, and on other factors relevant to the decision, including outside evaluations of the candidate's contributions to scholarly research and other creative work. The unit should seek appraisals both from persons

suggested by the candidate and from other recognized scholars in the field. Units may determine a minimum number of external appraisals that they require, but at least half, and no fewer than four, of the external reviews must be obtained from individuals with no direct professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate's career (for example, they should not be former advisors, mentors, co-authors, or co-investigators on previous work). The file must specify clearly the relationship of each external reviewer to the candidate and should contain a description of each external reviewer and his or her credentials to enable collegiate/campus review committees and collegiate and central administrators to interpret reviews more fully. External reviewers must be told that their evaluations will not be held confidential, because state law permits the candidate to inspect them. They must be told if and when a candidate has stopped the tenure clock and for how long. They are not told the reason that the tenure clock was stopped but should be advised to allow for reduced productivity during the time the clock was stopped.

Relevant information must not be excluded from the file, but the weight to be given to the views of any particular external reviewer, internal evaluator, or student is a matter to be considered by the decision-making bodies. Anonymous statements (except for comments on student rating forms) must not be included in the file and cannot be considered. Unsolicited signed comments will be included in the file if they are relevant and material to the decision. Candidates are encouraged to suggest names of external reviewers but may not solicit comments or evaluations independently. Candidates may not discuss their tenure and promotion candidacy with external reviewers.

This file is similar to that prepared for the annual review, but it should encompass the entire probationary period. It includes:

- i. The candidate's current curriculum vitae and a summary of his or her accomplishments during the probationary period.
- ii. A summary of the candidate's teaching assignments; student and peer evaluations, using the methods of evaluation that have been adopted for the unit or college; and a statement by the candidate on his/her teaching, including, for example, a discussion of teaching philosophy, learning outcomes, and the like.
- iii. Descriptions of the candidate's research or other scholarly contributions or creative work. (Copies of the scholarly publications and/or representations of other creative work should not be forwarded in the review process to central administration unless a specific request is made for them by the reviewing authorities. The review will be conducted on the basis of descriptions and evaluations. Copies of the candidate's scholarly contributions and representations of other creative work are part of a supplementary file that will be available upon request). Candidates must supply a research statement that describes his or her program of scholarly research or creative work completed to date along with plans for future work.

- iv. A summary and narrative of the candidate's service activities.
- v. A copy of the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty reports for each of the probationary years as well as of other evaluations by the unit or unit head.
- vi. Any other relevant material relating to the candidate's satisfaction of the requirements for tenure, including evaluations of the candidate's scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service, by persons inside or outside of the University, as appropriate.

The candidate must assist in assembling the file if asked. The unit head must make the assembled file available to the candidate for his or her review. The candidate has the right and responsibility to inspect the file and the right to submit written comments and add relevant materials to the file. Material provided by a candidate should be identified as such.

Faculty eligible to vote at the unit level may request of the unit head copies of any relevant materials not included in the file. The new material becomes part of the candidate's file. The unit head shall notify the candidate of the addition. The candidate must have the opportunity to respond to any new material before the unit vote.

13. Vote and report of action

The unit takes a vote and reports it according to Section II.A.2. All reports must be dated.

The unit head (or the designated tenured faculty member or committee) prepares a draft report that states the faculty's recommendation, specifies the results of all votes taken, summarizes the candidate's file, and gives the reasons for the actions taken at the meeting of the tenured faculty, including any minority views expressed at the meeting that had substantial support.

Serving in the capacity of the initiating academic administrator, the unit head also prepares an additional statement of his or her agreement or disagreement with the unit's recommendation, including the reasons for any disagreement.

The draft report is made available to tenured faculty members, who may comment and suggest changes, and may file separate reports if they believe that their views are not adequately reflected in the unit's report. Copies of such separate reports must be given to the unit head and to the candidate. The submission of such reports is the only appropriate way for faculty members to present their individual views to those reviewing the unit recommendation. The unit head informs the candidate of the unit's recommendation and of his or her own recommendation and gives the candidate a copy of each written report. The candidate has the right to submit a supplementary statement on the unit review for inclusion in the file. Copies of the statement must be given to the head of the unit and distributed to the tenured faculty.

The unit forwards for review (1) the file, (2) the unit recommendation, (3) the unit head's recommendation, (4) the unit report, (5) any separate statements by members of the tenured

faculty, and (6) any statement by the candidate. (As noted above, copies of the candidate's scholarly publications and/or representations of other creative work are not to be forwarded, unless the reviewing authorities request them.)

E. Review by college, campus, or alternative second-level review committee

14. Review by senior academic administrators

The unit recommendation is reviewed by the academic administrator to whom the unit head reports. For most units on the Twin Cities campus, the review is by the dean of the college, who may receive a recommendation from a collegiate review committee (see section 15). For colleges in the Academic Health Center, the dean's recommendation is forwarded for review to the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences.

For coordinate campuses, the review is by the chancellor, who will receive a recommendation from a campus-wide review committee.

For Twin-Cities-campus colleges that are not subdivided into departments, the review is by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, who will receive a recommendation from a review committee composed of tenured faculty both from the participating colleges and from other colleges he or she designates. [At the present time (2007), the Humphrey Institute, the Carlson School of Management, and the Law School use this process, as do some colleges in the Academic Health Center.]

The membership of all review committees is public information.

An administrator reviewing a tenure recommendation may consult with persons other than the review committee advising him or her, but each such consultation must be recorded in the candidate's file. Any relevant material added to the file by senior academic administrators during the review, as permitted in sections 17, 18, and 19, shall be copied to the candidate and the unit head at the time it is added to the file. The unit head shall make all such material available to the unit faculty who are eligible to vote.

Senior academic administrators and review committees are governed by the rules for voting and for evaluating candidates contained in sections 15-17.

15. Collegiate or campus review committee

The collegiate or campus review committee is composed of members of the tenured faculty of the college or campus, selected as specified in the college or campus Procedures. The committee makes a recommendation to the dean or chancellor. Because faculty members have an obligation to participate in the unit recommendation and in the evaluation of the candidate throughout the probationary period, a member of a unit who serves on a review committee may not participate in the discussion of or vote on a candidate from his or her own unit. A committee member also

may not participate in a review in circumstances in which he or she would have been disqualified by part 2(b) of these Procedures (because of a relationship with the candidate).

The review committee must review the matter on the basis of the file and other documents that are forwarded to the dean. It may not seek additional information either from members of the unit or from others. If it finds that the file contains insufficient information for it to make an informed judgment, or if there are matters on which the committee would like clarification from the unit or the candidate, the committee may return the file to the dean or chancellor with a request that the unit and candidate be asked to provide the additional information required.

16. Applicable all-University criteria and standards

The review committee and the senior academic administrators must use the indices and standards for tenure applicable to the unit and position involved. These are the criteria set forth in section 7.11 of *Faculty Tenure*, the unit statement required under section 7.12, and in any special contract under section 3.6. Subject only to that limitation, the review committee should examine the merits of the decision, not merely its procedural regularity.

The review committee must make a written recommendation to the dean or chancellor. If it differs from the unit in its recommendation, it must state the reasons for such difference. A copy of the recommendation must be supplied to the candidate. The recommendation becomes part of the candidate's file.

17. Requests for reconsideration or for more information

Any senior academic administrator reviewing the unit recommendation may ask the unit to reconsider the matter on the basis of his or her specific concerns expressed in writing. In such case, the tenured faculty must meet again to discuss the question in light of the specific comments or questions. The procedures are the same as those for initial consideration by the unit. The vote is again by secret ballot. A supplemental report is prepared and transmitted in the same manner as the original recommendation.

Before making a decision on review, the senior academic administrator, either on his or her own motion or at the request of the review committee, may ask the unit or the candidate to provide additional information. Providing such additional information does not require full unit consideration, but the candidate should be informed of the request and given an opportunity to participate in the reply to it.

18. Dean's recommendation

The dean makes the recommendation for the college. (A dean or other reviewing officer may not participate in circumstances in which the officer would be disqualified from participating in the initial decision. See part 2(b) of these Procedures.) Copies of the recommendation must be sent

to the unit head and made available to the tenured members of the unit faculty, and to the candidate

Every case must be forwarded to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for review and final recommendation. The forwarded file must include (a) the unit recommendation, together with the unit report and letters of recommendation upon which it relies; (b) the unit head's report; (c) the review committee's report; (d) the report of the senior academic administrators who reviewed the unit recommendation; and (e) any other information in the file requested by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Other parts of the file, e.g., publications or teaching evaluations, must be retained by the college or campus and forwarded only if requested.

The dean must add to the file any communication that has been received concerning the candidate and memoranda summarizing conversations he or she has had concerning the candidate that have been taken into consideration in any way.

F. Central review and action

19. Central review

The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost has the final authority to make recommendations on tenure and promotion to the Board of Regents for all Twin Cities colleges and coordinate campuses. (1) He or she receives recommendations from the deans who report directly to him or her. (2) Chancellors of coordinate campuses forward their recommendations both to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for decision and to the Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration for information. (3) In the Academic Health Center, after receiving the recommendation of the dean, the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences forwards his or her recommendation to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Senior vice presidents and chancellors may consult with other persons before making a decision, but each such consultation or review shall be recorded in the candidate's file.

If the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost uses a committee to review one or more candidates, it is subject to restrictions and procedures parallel to those governing the collegiate review committees. If the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost consults with individuals about a particular candidate's qualifications, the consultation must be recorded and included in the candidate's file.

20. Standards for review and action

The central reviews and action must be based upon the standards for tenure applicable to the unit and position involved. See part 16 of these procedures.

21. Action by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; explanations to dean/ chancellor, other academic administrators, and unit

The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost takes action on the recommendation from the dean, chancellor, or Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences. If his or her action differs from the recommendation of the unit, he or she must send to the tenured faculty members of the unit and to the candidate a written statement of the substantive reasons for differing with the judgment of the tenured faculty of the unit (*Faculty Tenure*, section 7.63). That statement must be an evaluation of the candidate's substantive qualifications and include an explanation of the reasons for which the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost believes it appropriate to substitute his or her judgment for that of the unit with regard to those qualifications. It may not be a mere recitation of the evaluations in the file with a different conclusion. If the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost's action differs from the recommendation of the dean or chancellor, a similar written statement must be sent to the dean or chancellor and to the candidate.

The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost presents his or her final recommendations to the Board of Regents for its decision whether to confer indefinite tenure and/or to approve promotion.

III. Promotion Procedures

Procedures for considering promotions either to the rank of associate professor or to the rank of professor must parallel those for considering candidates for tenure, from the unit review through the central review. *Faculty Tenure* requires that promotion of a probationary appointee to the rank of associate professor or professor must be accompanied by an appointment with indefinite tenure. Since the standards for granting tenure are ordinarily at least as rigorous as those for promotion to associate professor, the granting of tenure to an assistant professor will almost always be accompanied by a promotion to associate professor. Promotion to the rank of professor may occur at any time after appointment as or promotion to the rank of associate professor.

Consideration for promotion to the rank of professor may occur whenever it is initiated by the unit head or by the professors in the unit. An associate professor may at any time request that a promotion review take place, but the professors in the unit will decide whether to conduct it. If an associate professor believes that a decision not to conduct a promotion review was made unfairly, he or she may raise his or her concerns with the unit head, the dean or chancellor, or the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

Unit criteria for promotion to the rank of professor as written in the unit 7.12 statement must be consistent with those stated in section 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure*, Criteria for Promotion to Professor. Only tenured professors senior in rank to the candidate for promotion are eligible to vote on the promotion. Heads who are associate professors are not eligible to vote in the cases of candidates for promotion to professor, but they are required to attend the promotion review meeting and to

write a statement as the unit head as part of the promotion process (see Section 13). The unit report must be written by a professor who attended the meeting. The role of the unit head who is an associate professor is to listen to the discussion, to provide information, and to make a statement of his or her agreement or disagreement with the unit recommendation.

In the cases of small units with very few faculty members at the rank of professor, especially if an associate professor is the unit head, it may be appropriate to include, in the discussion and vote on promotion, a professor or professors from another unit or units in the college, campus, or University. Including additional faculty members is warranted also in cases of candidates whose work encompasses multiple disciplines. In order for faculty members from outside the unit to participate, the initiating unit and/or the dean or chancellor must submit a written request to and obtain authorization in writing by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The request must identify the faculty member under consideration, and give the name(s) and tenure homes of those faculty members who will be asked to vote on the candidate and the reasons for including them.

When an associate professor who is the head of a unit is being considered for promotion, a tenured full professor in the unit may act as the unit head for the purposes of considering that promotion. Alternatively, with the concurrence of the faculty in the unit, this role could be assumed by a tenured full professor from another unit who has been approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (see preceding paragraph). The tenured full professor acting as unit head will write a letter summarizing his or her own evaluation of the candidate in lieu of the letter from the unit head that is ordinarily part of a promotion dossier.

The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost presents his or her final recommendations to the Board of Regents for its approval or disapproval of promotion.