

Departmental Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion Issued
by the Provost on March 1, 2009

These procedures replace all prior ones. (Consult the annual "Target Dates for Tenure and Promotion Review" for specific dates for each step.)

In June before the review begins, the department provides the Dean with the names of two external references.

In the fall, once the candidate's dossier is ready, all tenured members of the department who are required to participate in the process will study the materials. All tenured faculty, except those on sabbatical or other leave who wish to be excused from the R&T process, should participate in the departmental consideration of a candidate from their department. If a tenured faculty member is on sabbatical or other leave, he or she may choose either to be excused or to participate in the R&T process. A tenured faculty member who asks to be excused may not participate in any part of the R&T process. Departmental discussions of R&T candidates should be scheduled so that all tenured faculty who wish to participate are able to do so.

Participating faculty members meet and discuss thoroughly the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's dossier, which each has previously reviewed. (Here dossier refers to all the materials submitted by the candidates and any letters from the department's outside referees.) The purpose of this discussion is to share with one another, in a confidential setting, the faculty members' evaluations of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. **No vote is taken at this meeting.**

When the faculty meet, someone (not necessarily the chair) records the flow and major contents of the discussion, without attribution. This "Department Summary" is neither a transcript nor a set of minutes. Later this document will be signed by all, verifying that it reflects the voiced opinions of the participants. The chair will include it in the materials that she or he forwards to the dean.

After the faculty conclude their meeting or meetings, each person (including the department chair) writes her or his individual letter, expressing his or her evaluation of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. This letter should be as objective as possible; it is not an advocacy letter. At its conclusion, the writer gives her or his numerical evaluation, using whole numbers on a scale of 0 to 5. Those faculty who are members of a rank and tenure committee, at either the school or the university level, may cast a "ballot" only at the department level. All participating faculty should address their evaluation letters to the department chair. They should not submit letters directly to the dean or to a rank and tenure committee. If there is a compelling reason to seek an exception to this rule, the faculty member should consult with the dean and the provost. The chair's letter is addressed to the dean.

A tenured faculty member who is unable for good reason to participate in the departmental discussion, but who wishes to write a letter with a numerical evaluation, may do so. In this case, the faculty member's letter should explain why he or she could not participate in the departmental discussion. The chair's contextual letter should

acknowledge the faculty member's letter but note that the faculty member did not participate in the departmental discussion.

In addition to writing an individual letter of evaluation, the department chair writes a separate letter that gives a summary of the individual faculty letters, offering a context where appropriate. This letter contains the numerical evaluations found in the individual letters. For example, in a department of 7 tenured faculty where all 7 are participating, the letter would say, "The individual votes are 4, 4, 4, 4, 3, 3, 3." The contextual summary letter is not to be reviewed by other department members.

Appended to this contextual summary letter from the chair are the letters from each participating faculty member (including the chair's own letter) and the signed "Department Summary" which records the major points of the departmental discussion(s). This packet of recommendations is sent to the dean by the date specified.

The chair informs tenured faculty members of the numerical votes, without attribution, reminding them that this information is confidential and may not be shared with anyone.