

## Discussion of changes in the policy from the March Senate meeting proposal

The ad hoc promotion and tenure committee carefully considered the comments at the forum, the Senate meeting and comments sent by individual faculty. The main issues of concern included the composition of the appeals committee, time towards tenure, no summary letter being required, de facto tenure changes and the fact that internal letters are open but external letters are closed. We revised the composition of the appeals committee to include no voting members from the original P&T committee (9). We clarified that we were referring to going up early towards tenure (4). We now propose a requirement for a departmental summary and college committee (if there is one) letter (6a).

We discussed at length the openness of outside letters versus internal letters. The committee believes quality outside letters are essential to the process; they provide unbiased feedback on the national standing of the candidate in his/her field. Although we endorse a transparent internal letter writing process as possible, we acknowledge that we must respect the norms of external referees. Therefore, we endorse leaving external letters closed (or open only if that is the desire of the external referee.) However, we expect internal letters that are available to the candidate will include important information from these letters, so the candidate will have a chance to rebut any important information that may impact the tenure decision. We adhere to our belief that the process should be as transparent as possible including all internal letters. Faculty do not need to write individual letters if they do not want their name attached to the opinion. Summary letters should include all discussion in the faculty meeting so each opinion can be heard by all considering the candidate. However, these individual opinions will be recorded without attribution in the summary letter. If individuals want to write individual letters, they are welcome to write the letters, but these will be available to the candidate.

## Proposal for changes in the Promotion and Tenure Process

### **Rationale for proposed changes in the Promotion and Tenure Process**

In the Strategic Plan, one of the goals is to improve the promotion and tenure process. The University Senate Steering committee formed an Ad Hoc Promotion and Tenure revision committee to explore making changes to the PT process. The committee's objectives in all recommendations are to promote transparency, equity, consistency, due process and clarity in the Promotion and Tenure process.

### **The recommended changes in the process are:**

1. Refer to departmental guidelines as the evaluation method for all areas when the guidelines become effective for the candidate. Require the guidelines in the P&T dossier.
2. Standards for promotion and tenure are based on the weights of each performance area as described in the letter of offer and subsequent annual evaluations.
3. Change collegiality from a separate area of consideration for tenure to a factor in all areas. For tenure, the candidate must demonstrate quality and potential to contribute as a productive and collegial member of the academic unit in all relevant areas.
4. Candidates can be promoted or tenured when they demonstrate they have met (rather than exceeded) requirements even when they go up early.
5. De Facto tenure is clarified to only include faculty on the tenure track.
6. Transparency in the process so the whole dossier excluding outside letters is available to the candidate:
  - a. The eligible departmental faculty will write one summary letter representing all aspects of the discussion. Individual letters can also be submitted at the department level. The department chair/head will also submit an evaluative letter. All letters (except those from the college committee and dean) are submitted at the departmental level and candidate can review inside letters and write a rebuttal if desired (within five working days).
  - b. The college committee will submit a summary letter (if there is a college committee) and the candidate can review the college committee and dean's letter and write a rebuttal if desired (within five working days).
  - c. If a faculty member is denied tenure, a letter with the vote of the University committee and the specific reasons for denial will be sent to the candidate.
7. The dean and the department head/chair cannot vote in the departmental vote.
8. Clarification that departmental members can only vote once on the candidate's application; the departmental member can choose the level at which he/she votes.
9. The Appeals committee will be a new committee with one non-voting member of the current P&T committee (selected by the P&T committee) and at least five former members of the P&T committee. These five members will represent colleges, but not departments, of the appealing candidates. If more than five members are needed to represent the appellants, more than five members will be chosen. Each year the Senate Rules Committee will provide a list of recommended members for the appeals committee based on the guidelines above; the Provost will choose the new committee members from this list.